

9/26/96

Moment of Silence:

P. MICHAEL SPARKS

Professor of Human Resources Management
Department of Organizational Behavior and Environment
CSUS 1976-1996

.....

Welcome to New Senators:

ASI:	Craig Grivette Jeff Hamblin Michael Walton
Athletics:	Kathy Strahan
English:	Linda Palmer
Ethnic Studies:	Shotaro Hayashigatani
Public Policy and Administration:	Ted Lascher

1996-97
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, September 26, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
3:00-5:00 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Fall 1996 Schedule of Meetings (*=tentative):
October 3*, 10, 17*, 24, 31 (Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture)
November 7*, 14, 21*
December 5*, 12
2. Report on September 4-5, 1996, CSU Academic Senate Meeting -- Statewide Senator Sylvia Navari

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 96-67/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

Academic Telecommunications Advisory Committee:

Paul Cahill, Faculty At-large, 1999

Administrative Review, Committee on:

Xin Ren, At-large, 1999

AIDS Advisory Committee:

Joanne Marrow, Academic Senate Chair/Designee, 1997

ASI Board, Faculty Representative:

Robyn Nelson, At-large, 1997

ASI Elections Complaint Committee:

Tim Hodson, At-large, 1997

CSU Governmental Affairs Specialist:

Cristy Jensen, At-large, 1997

Council for University Planning:

Rhonda Rios Kravitz, Faculty Policies Committee, 1997

Diversity Awards, Committee for:

Xin Ren, Faculty At-large, 1997

Rhonda Rios Kravitz, At-large, 1997

Grade Appeal Procedural Appeals Board:

Ken DeBow, At-large, 1997

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

Len Wycosky, Student Affairs, 1999

Multicultural Center Advisory Board:

Satsuki Ina, Faculty, At-large, 1998

Rhonda Rios Kravitz, At-large (diversity expertise), 1997

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

Vince Pantalone, Student Affairs Professional, 1998

Student Academic Development Committee:

Xin Ren, At-large, 1998

Mel Holland, At-large, 1998

Student Complaint Hearing Panel:

Angus Dunstan, A-large, 1997

Student Disciplinary Hearing Officer:

Bonnie Walker, At-large, 1997

Roland Dart, At-large, 1997

Paul Falzone, At-large, 1997

Erwin Kelly, At-large, 1997

Robin Reese, At-large, 1997

Margaret Cleek, At-large, 1997

Student Economic Support Committee, University Committee for:

Harriet Neal, Education, 1996

Mel Holland, E&CS, 1999

University Copyright and Patent Committee:

Paul Cahill, Faculty At-large, 1999

University Union Board of Directors:

Joseph Kilpatrick, Faculty At-large, 1997

AS 96-68/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL--GRADUATE

M.S. in Business Administration: The Academic Senate recommends approval of the addition of a new option in Taxation.

AS 96-69/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE PROGRAMS: GRADUATE EDUCATION AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

In accordance with the Instructional Program Priorities (PM 91-12), the mission of graduate education at CSUS is to provide the following:

I. MISSION

GRADUATE EDUCATION provides:

- a. personal enrichment and intellectual development;
- b. entry-level qualifications for professions;
- c. essential improvements of skills for those already in the professions;
- d. preparation for doctoral-level study;
- e. an enrichment of the region's cultural life and an important contribution to a diverse democratic society;
- f. enhanced opportunities for faculty scholarly activity and research in collaboration with advanced students in order to create an attractive environment for the most highly qualified faculty and graduate students.

II. GOALS

GRADUATE EDUCATION provides:

- a. critical thinking skills appropriate for independent research and decision making in professional life and in doctoral studies;
- b. communication skills appropriate for work in the professions and for doctoral-level study;
- c. an advanced knowledge of the auxiliary skills expected in the professions or in doctoral study;
- d. an advanced knowledge of a field's theoretical concepts and experience with their application in the field and in research;
- e. a current general knowledge of the discipline and opportunities for specialization;
- f. a knowledge of relevant concepts and information from related disciplines;
- g. an acquaintanceship with the most important journals and other sources illustrating current developments within the discipline, such as lectures and performances by

- outstanding practitioners in the discipline, and opportunities to attend professional meetings in the discipline;
- h. when appropriate, an opportunity for collaborative research with faculty and other students as well as an opportunity for independent research;
- i. when appropriate, opportunities to teach under the supervision of faculty;
- j. when appropriate, valuable student work in their fields as a resource to the community.

III. STANDARDS

GRADUATE EDUCATION requires:

- a. effective University-level, school and departmental systems for admissions, student advising and program monitoring;
- b. faculty fully qualified for graduate instruction;
- c. scheduling and course offerings suitable for the needs of all students qualified for University programs in the University's area of responsibility;
- d. advanced equipment, learning resources, and other support services appropriate for the goals of graduate study.
- e. graduate classes specially designed to permit maximum interaction between the student, the instructor and other students, and practice at professional-level oral and written communication;
- f. an intensive culminating experience appropriate for the student's goals: a thesis or project demonstrating the skills necessary for independent research or comprehensive examinations;
- g. adequate compensation for faculty supervision of graduate work (including teaching graduate courses, advising, supervising culminating experience work, and departmental administration of programs).

REGULAR AGENDA

Approved

AS 96-66/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of September 12 (#3), 1996.

AS 96-70/CPC GRADUATE PROGRAMS: STANDARDS FOR COMPENSATION OF GRADUATE COORDINATION AND SUPERVISION OF CULMINATING EXPERIENCE

[Note: The Executive Committee forwards the following recommendation from the Curriculum Policies Committee "without recommendation" (see Attachment A for Curriculum Policies

Committee's background).]

PURPOSE

The purpose of this proposal is to establish standards of **minimum** compensation for coordination and supervision. It is not intended to establish one set of standards binding on all units, to reduce the compensation already earned by a number of CSUS units or to prevent deans from providing additional compensation.

A. COMPENSATION FOR GRADUATE COORDINATORS

Sound support for graduate programs requires that the University provide

Six units per academic year of compensated assigned time to the graduate coordinators of programs with more than 60 students counted as on-campus enrollment;

three units per academic year of compensated assigned time to the graduate coordinators of programs with 40-60 students counted as on-campus enrollment, and

three units per four semesters for programs with 20-40 students counted as on-campus enrollment,

provided that

the programs do not ^{assign} generate the units through S courses.

+ c1

B. COMPENSATION FOR CULMINATING EXPERIENCE SUPERVISION

Sound support for graduate programs requires that the University provide faculty in programs generating on-campus enrollment

who are the main supervisors (first reader or chair of committee) of theses/projects with

three units of a compensated reduction in teaching load for each **five** theses and projects completed

provided that

programs granting the degrees do not ^{already assign} generate compensating units through S courses.

The University shall provide directors of comprehensive examinations (the faculty member

agreed

A

agreed
B

with chief responsibility for preparing, administering and evaluating the examination) with one-half unit of compensation for each examination completed, unless the director is otherwise compensated.

702

C. IMPLEMENTATION

1. Beginning Fall, 1996, Academic Affairs shall distribute compensation for graduate coordinator assigned time as determined by the formula in Section A. The enrollment figures in Section A shall be determined by averaging program enrollments at census date for the three previous years.**

[** Census figures to include students enrolled in RCE 599]

2. The deans of the schools shall distribute the released-time funds allocated by the University according to the following "point" formula:

Beginning Fall, 1996, each completed thesis or project earns one point and each completed comprehensive examination earns one-half point.

The deans shall compensate faculty culminating experience supervisors generating five points with a compensated three-unit reduction in class assignments.

Departments may, with the consent of the dean, establish a policy to divide points between first readers and second readers and between directors and other faculty serving on a comprehensive examination committee.

agreed

AS 96-71/Ex. PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE--MEMBERSHIP (Amends AS 91-73B; PM FSA 95-06)

The Academic Senate recommends continuation of the membership of the Professional Leave Committee as elected for 1996-97.

However, as a result of the reorganization of the School of Arts and Sciences, the Academic Senate recommends that in Spring 1997 the committee be reconstituted and an election conducted for a representative from each school and the library (proposed amendments shown in Attachment B).

agreed

AS 96-72/Ex. SENATE/UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

The Academic Senate recommends that, unless otherwise specified, the composition of Senate and University committees where previously each of the professional schools had one

member and the School of Arts and Sciences had a designated number shall now be changed to specify one member from each school.

AS 96-73/Ex. OUTSTANDING TEACHER AWARD (Amends AS 92-46)

The CSUS Outstanding Teaching program (AS 92-46) shall be amended as follows [strikeover = deletion; underscore = addition]:

The Award

Each spring semester, ~~no more than~~ one faculty member from each of the ~~professional~~ schools ~~and up to four faculty members from the School of Arts and Sciences~~ may receive an award for ~~their~~ his/her accomplishments as a teacher. Recognition of the award will include:

...

AS 96-74/Ex. ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP--FACULTY EMERITUS ASSOCIATION

The Academic Senate recommends that the membership of the Academic Senate be amended to include the President of the Emeritus Association of CSU, Sacramento, as an ex officio, non-voting member. *[Note: If adopted, this would require an amendment of Article II, Section 5.A, Membership, of the "Constitution of the Faculty of California State University, Sacramento" (see Attachment C). Amendments to the Constitution require approval by a majority of faculty voting upon the amendment and the President of the University.]*

COMPENSATION FOR COORDINATION AND SUPERVISION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Which standards of **minimum** compensation should the University adopt to implement system recommendations and the CSUS Strategic Plan commitment to a graduate differential?

BACKGROUND: DATA AND INTERESTED GROUPS CONSULTED

- **The Dinielli Report**, Graduate Education in the California State University, (1989) declares adequate compensation for graduate coordinators and for culminating experience work supervisors essential to sound graduate programs. **The Academic Senate** has endorsed the Report and the University's **Strategic Plan** (p. 22) makes the implementation of a graduate differential a crucial University goal.
- The Curriculum Policies Committee conducted two polls of graduate programs: **one** to determine the level of compensation regularly given for these tasks and the effects on faculty and programs of any inadequate compensation; and a **second** to determine the number of faculty who have directed five or more theses or projects to completion in the last five years.
- The 2/7 Graduate Coordinators meeting considered an initial proposal submitted by CPC and the Committee invited them to submit further comments concerning the proposal. In light of the discussion and further comments, the Committee made a number of important changes in the proposal and submitted the revised proposal to the 3/6 Coordinators meeting for further comment.
- At the Committee's request, Associate Vice President Ric Brown queried the Graduate Deans of our CSU sister campuses -- and found that they suffer from the same compensation problems and are most anxious to hear of CSUS's compensation policy.

A Summary of Information Received

All sources of information agree with the results of the Committee polls regarding compensation levels and their effects on the quality of CSUS graduate programs.

- **Inadequate Compensation for Thesis/Project Supervision**

Six of 18 A&S programs report that their faculty receive regular compensation, but two of those programs give only comprehensive examinations, while two others are only graduate programs -- have no undergraduate responsibilities. No ECS program faculty receive regular compensation. Two HHS programs report regular compensation, two do not receive it and one response is ambiguous. One of three SBA programs reports regular compensation, while all five EDU program faculty receive regular compensation.

Compensation, when it happens, is for the chairs (first reader) of the thesis/project; second readers receive no compensation.

- **Uneven Supervision Responsibilities**

The great majority of programs report that supervisory burdens fall unevenly on faculty, that is, a **minority of faculty do most of the culminating experience supervision**. Of 18 Arts and Sciences programs, 15 reported serious inequities in culminating experience supervision assignments, and two of those without the problem only offer the comprehensive examination. All ECS departments reported significantly uneven faculty participation, as did all three SBA programs.

Three of five HHS programs reported uneven participation, while a fourth said it is a problem they are solving. One EDU program reported uneven participation.

One reason for the uneven distribution is curricular, i.e. students simply prefer to do their work in particular areas, but poll comments also show that some faculty are unwilling to supervise without compensation.

Responses to the second poll designed to identify the number of faculty supervising five or more culminating experiences to completion in the last five years without receiving regular compensation support programs' claim that the work is most unevenly distributed.

- **Coordinator Assigned Time**

Four of 18 A&S programs report that their coordinators receive assigned time, as do three of five programs in EDU -- with one program having the chair do the coordinator work and one assigning the responsibility to a staff member. SBA reports that two programs receive assigned time, while the chair does the work for the third. All ECS programs have assigned time. All HHS programs have assigned time, except for one which has it irregularly.

- **Units Which Provide Regular Compensation**

The polls indicate that units which do provide regular compensation for supervision and coordination comprise two overlapping types: (1) those which are exclusively graduate programs, and (2) those which generate many S WTUs (as for internships, field work etc.).

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Current System or Modification?

Alternative I: Maintain the current system of allocating compensation.

Alternative II: Maintain the current system but devise means at the school and departmental levels of increasing compensation within that system.

Alternative III: Modify the current system of allocating compensation.

The Committee first considered **Alternative I**, that of maintaining the current compensation system. The Committee considered the following arguments in defense of the current system:

- Our current allocation system recognizes that schools and departments can best judge how to use their limited resources. They are free to compensate supervision and coordination, but commonly choose not to -- choose to invest the funds in other ways.
- The current uneven compensation for supervision and coordination has not destroyed our graduate programs. Indeed, they are increasing their share of University FTE.
- Since faculty in programs without regular compensation may refuse to do supervision or coordination, the current system does not violate faculty rights. Departments in which a large share of faculty choose not to participate, do not support their graduate programs and University curriculum evaluations are entitled to draw that conclusion.

The Committee considered the following arguments against Alternative I.

- The current system works most unevenly across the University, within schools and within departments. While some units and faculty receive regular and full compensation, many do not and some are grotesquely exploited by their disproportionate share of the work. The uneven distribution of compensation does not reflect the prudence of compensated units and the profligacy of the uncompensated, but units' uneven access to S classification courses.
- The current system is damaging many graduate programs. Poll results show that many faculty now refuse, in light of their heavier work loads, to coordinate or supervise without compensation. Several programs which would prefer to use thesis/projects as a culminating experience have switched to comprehensive examinations.
- One may agree that Instructional Priority and Program Review Committees should make a unit's coordination and supervision budget one standard for judging its graduate program. However, units have such uneven access to a compensation under the current compensation system that the imposition of that standard would constitute using different and conflicting standards to judge graduate programs.

The Committee also considered **Alternative II**, maintenance of the current allocation system, but with a coordinated effort at the school and departmental level to generate more funds within that system for compensation.

The Committee considered the following arguments in favor of Alternative II:

- Departments may, under the current system, use various means of compensating coordination. Those means include the use of over-enrolled classes to generate the FTE necessary to pay for coordinator assigned time, committee sharing of the responsibilities of the coordinator, the use of funds saved by the greater use of TAs to teach sections, and the pooling of units generated by, e.g., internship supervision.
- Departments may individually or collectively reach an agreement with their school dean regarding the reservation of part of the school budget for purposes of coordinator and supervisor compensation.

The Committee considered the following arguments against Alternative II:

- The various department measures proposed in support of the Alternative have all been tried and failed. Many departments currently over-enroll classes to meet their FTE targets, without affording any compensation for coordination and supervision. Furthermore, it seems that undergraduate course over-enrollments fall on coordinators and supervisors in graduate programs at least as frequently as on other faculty. Committee sharing of coordination is notoriously ineffective; one person must have the expertise and the time to execute coordination responsibilities. Most departments have too limited an access to quality TAs to assign them a greater share of instruction. Finally, the pooling of internship supervision is only possible for departments which generate substantial S classification WTUs outside graduate supervision; the option is effectively unavailable for precisely those departments which currently lack minimum compensation.
- Departments may indeed negotiate with their school deans, but the deans cannot give what they do not have.

Committee Conclusion

The Committee finds the arguments against Alternatives I and II compelling. It concludes that the maintenance of our graduate programs requires a new system of allocation designed to guarantee minimum coordinator and supervisor support to units which cannot generate that support.

MODIFICATION ALTERNATIVES

In developing its proposal for modification the Committee considered a series of further alternatives. Although aware that the CPC and the Senate do not write the budget, the Committee chose among alternatives on the basis of **Financial Feasibility** as well as on the basis of the **Quality of Graduate Programs**. As a consequence of its commitment to the standard of financial feasibility, the Committee recommends a proposal which does not fully implement the Dinielli Report recommendations -- which does not, for instance, require regular compensation for 299 supervision. The Committee decided to recommend a "safety-net" or "minimum wage" system providing important support for currently uncompensated programs.

RESPONSIBILITY

Alternative I: (1) Urge or (2) Require that the deans of the school provide the necessary minimum compensation;

Alternative II: Provide the minimum compensation through a University allocation.

Committee Conclusion:

The Committee's proposal assigns responsibility for allocating funds for minimum coordination and supervision compensation to the University. It assigns the deans of the schools an implementing role in the minimum compensation system, but specifies that the funds are "**allocated by the University.**" The Committee is, of course, aware that our current budget allocation system is generally decentralized, but considers a number of arguments decisive in recommending a University allocation:

- The current budget system has not solved the compensation problem; it has not begun to provide many units with even a minimum share of the compensation required by the CSU-sanctioned Dinielli Report. Furthermore, all means of generating adequate compensation for currently deprived units by school or department action (e.g. over-enrollments) have either failed or exacerbated the problem.
- Assigning responsibility for compensation to the deans of those units which cannot now generate the WTUs for compensation will amount to financing a measure to help the poor by imposing an additional tax on the poor! A University allocation will minimize the sacrifice required of any one unit and recognize that graduate studies are essential to the University's mission and curriculum.
- At the same time, the proposed policy leaves the school deans with important discretion in supporting graduate programs: They are free to provide any additional compensation for coordination and supervision they wish.
- The required University allocation is by no means unprecedented. The University is currently considering a modest budget for improved compensation for supervision, and it allocates off-the-top funds for such programs as Research and Scholarly Activities and Faculty Development.

LEVEL AND RANGE OF COMPENSATION

NB: The Committee's proposal provides compensation only for on-campus FTE programs.

Level of Compensation for Graduate Coordinators:

Alternative I: (1) a higher rate of compensation and/or (2) a wider range of compensation proposals.

Alternative II: A guarantee of minimum compensation at the rate of 6 units per academic year for programs with 60 or more students; 3 units for programs with 40-60 students and 3 units per four semesters for programs with 20-40 students.

Committee Conclusion:

The Committee recommends Alternative II. The original Committee draft proposal provided no compensation for units with fewer than 40 students, but the Committee modified its proposal in light of Graduate Coordinator comments. The Committee recognizes that the proposal provides no higher rate of compensation for programs with enrollments much larger than 60, and that it does not provide for lesser or more nuanced compensation for smaller units. The Committee believes that those ranges of compensation should be the responsibility of the school deans.

Enrollment vs. Completion of Culminating Experience Work:

Alternative I: Provide compensation for the number of students who enroll for Culminating Experience.

Alternative II: Provide compensation only for completed theses/projects and comprehensive examinations.

Committee Conclusion:

A number of units and Coordinators argued that the compensation should be for enrollment. They argued that many students enroll for Culminating Experience work, consume many hours of faculty time and then never finish the work, and that that time should be compensated. In light of these criticisms, the Committee modified its original draft proposal; the current proposal provides for compensation on the completion of 5 theses/projects or 10 comprehensive examinations. The figure of 5 is lower than that recommended by the Dinielli Report, and represents an effort to compromise between the enrollment and completion positions. The Committee believes that compensating for enrollments presents too unwieldy an implementation problem, but reducing the completed requirement provides indirect compensation for time lost on unfinished work.

Time Limits

Alternative I: Set a time-period limit for the accumulation of points.

Alternative II: Compensate upon the completion of 5 units without any time limit on their accumulation.

Committee Conclusion:

The Committee's original draft proposal included a five-year time limit. The Coordinators made an effective argument against that limit: It conflicts with the intent of the proposal to compensate work done, and it would discriminate against smaller programs which provide fewer opportunities for the accumulation of points in a specific period. The Committee omitted the limit.

Compensation for Comprehensive Examination Direction

Alternative I: Do not compensate for comprehensive examination direction.

Alternative II: Compensate for comprehensive examination direction at a rate lower than thesis/project direction.

Committee Conclusion:

The Committee's original draft proposal omitted provision for compensation of comprehensive examination direction on the grounds that such direction is not nearly as time-consuming as thesis/project direction. Graduate coordinator comments inspired further Committee consideration and the Committee modified its proposal to provide compensation for comprehensive examinations at the rate of one-half point per examination direction.

Compensation for Second Readers, Other Members of Comprehensive Examination Committees

Alternative I: Compensate second readers and other members of examination committees at a lower rate than first readers.

Alternative II: Provide no guarantee of compensation for second readers and other members of comprehensive examination committees.

Committee Conclusion:

The Committee agrees that second readers often deserve compensation -- indeed, the Dinielli Report recommends it. The Committee decided, however, that such compensation should be consequent on an policy agreement between departments and school deans to share points earned.

RE: AS 96-71/Ex.

From Page 1 of 5, POLICY ON LEAVES WITH PAY (PM FSA 95-06):

The President shall allocate professional leaves on the basis of recommendations of a Professional Leave Committee. The Professional Leave Committee will be a University Committee, composed of ~~nine~~ eight elected members serving staggered three-year terms; to include ~~four members elected by and from faculty members in Arts and Sciences, and one each elected by and from faculty members in Business and Public Administration, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Services;~~ one member from each school and the Library. Persons applying for sabbatical or difference-in-pay leaves shall be ineligible for election to the Professional Leave Committee. Normally, the term of membership shall be three years. Persons elected previously to membership on the Professional Leave Committee who apply for sabbatical or difference-in-pay leaves shall become ineligible to serve during the year in which their application is to be considered and shall be replaced for the remainder of their term by an appropriate election. The Professional Leave Committee shall recognize the importance to individual faculty members and to the University of professional leaves. The Committee shall function according to the following process and criteria.

RE: AS 96-74/Ex.

From: "Constitution of the Faculty of California State University, California"

[Note: *Italics* = suggested editorial corrections; strikeover = deletions; underscore = additions]

Article II
Academic Senate

Section 5. MEMBERSHIP

- A. The membership of the Academic Senate shall be composed of (1) the representatives of the electing units; (2) four representatives to be elected at-large by the temporary faculty from those temporary faculty who are teaching six or more units during the semester in which the election is conducted; (3) chairs of certain standing committees of the Academic Senate (when specified in the committee's charge), as ex officio, non-voting members; (4) the statewide academic senators, as ex officio, non-voting members; (5) three student representatives, as non-voting members, chosen by, and in a manner determined by, the Associated Students of CSUS; (6) the *Provost and* Vice President for Academic Affairs, ~~the Executive Vice President~~, and the ~~Dean of Students~~ *Vice President for Student Affairs* as ex officio non-voting members; (7) the School Deans, as ex officio, non-voting members; (8) the University Librarian as an ex officio, non-voting member; (9) two staff representatives, as non-voting members, chosen by, and in a manner determined by, the University Staff Assembly; (10) the President of the faculty Emeritus Association, as an ex officio non-voting member.

Questions for Pres. Gerth

9/26/96
Distributed by
Coalition
(Hornback, Syer)

1. How much of your time will be required to preside over the Int'l. Asso. of University Presidents? What direct benefit will CSUS receive from your involvement with IAUP?
2. Besides yourself, what other CSUS administrative and support personnel are working on IAUP matters? What is the cost to CSUS or the Foundation of this work for IAUP?
3. How much money from the State of California, the Foundation, and your discretionary funds was spent on your installation as head of IAUP?
4. In the past five years, which CSUS administrators have traveled abroad on university business? What are the amounts and sources of travel funds for each of these trips?
5. Is Beverly Gerth an employee of CSUS or the Foundation at a minimal salary so that she may receive travel reimbursements? Since 1984, what is the total amount of Mrs. Gerth's travel that has been paid for by CSUS and the Foundation?
6. What are the annual amounts that you expend from each of your discretionary funds? Will you voluntarily release itemized records of the expenditures from your discretionary funds?
7. Is it really necessary that you retain the services of every member of your Senior Administrative Group? Does it take eighteen persons (each making in excess of \$100,000 per year) to manage this campus?
8. With legal services available from CSU headquarters in Long Beach, why is it necessary to pay a highly-salaried lawyer as your assistant?
9. Since 1984, what has been the total cost of remodeling the administrative offices (northeast corner to southeast corner) on the second floor of Sacramento Hall?
10. What percentage of your current salary will you receive upon retirement?
11. What is the amount of your annual housing allowance?
12. What is the amount of your annual entertainment allowance?
13. What was your prior relationship with the outside consultant who conducted your presidential evaluation during the last academic year?
14. What outside boards have you served on since becoming President of CSUS? What compensation have you received for your service on these boards?
15. Why did you disregard the recommendation of the university-wide committee that each PSSI recipient be awarded a single step?

YOUR COOPERATION IN PROVIDING UNIVERSITY RECORDS WILL BE APPRECIATED