

1996-97
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, November 14, 1996
Forest Suite, University Union
3:00-5:00 p.m.

INFORMATION

1. Moment of Silence:

DARRELL J. INABNIT
Vice President for
Administration Emeritus
CSUS 1966-1977

LYNN GIESE
Associate Professor of Communication
Studies Emeritus
CSUS 1967-1991

BRUCE McELROY
Professor of Marketing
CSUS 1976-1996

2. Fall 1996 Schedule of Meetings (*=tentative):

November 7*, 14, 21 (General Faculty Meeting--Report of CSUS Fact Finding Hearing
Commission)
December 5*, 12

3. Report on November 7-8, 1996, CSU Academic Senate Meeting

4. Memorandum from Senator Linda Palmer (Attachment A)

5. Committee Vacancies:

Instructionally Related Activities Committee:

At-large, 1997 [prev. chr/designee Curriculum Committee]

{declined: A. Radimsky, M. Lu}

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

Education, 1999

{declined: C. Gunston-Parks, M. Lewis, L. Jacobs, P. Gardner, S. Alexander}

SS&IS, 1997 (new position)

{declined: K. DeBow}

Non-academic Program Review, Committee for:

Faculty At-large w/Dept. Chr. Exp, 1999

{declined: T. Hodson}

CONSENT CALENDAR

AS 96-84/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--University

ASI Appellate Council:

Margaret Cleek, At-large, 1997

Campus Cooperative Education Advisory Committee:

GWEN AMOS, At-large, 1997

Diversity Awards, Committee for:

Francisco Reveles, At-large, 1997

Instructional Related Activities Committee:

NICK BURNETT, At-large, 1997

Lottery Fund Allocation Committee:

MARY JANE LEE, E&CS, 1999

DON TAYLOR, A&L, 1998 (repl. S. Meyer)

Persons with Disabilities, Committee for:

SENON VALADEZ, Instructional Faculty, A&S, 1998

AS 96-85/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

ERWIN KELLY, At-large, 1997 (repl. D. Orey)

Faculty Policies Committee:

CHRISTINE MILLER, Executive Committee Member, 1997

JOYCE BURRIS, At-large, 1999 (repl. C. Miller)

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:

CHEVELLE NEWSOME, Senator, 1997 (repl. J. McFadden)

*to
Regular
Agenda*

AS 96-86/CPC, Ex. GRADUATE PROGRAMS: GRADUATE STUDENTS TAKING UNDERGRADUATE CLASSES [Note: Amended version of AS 96-49, pulled from Consent Calendar at final 1995-96 Senate meeting (see concerns expressed in Attachment B); meeting was adjourned before item could be addressed.]

The CSUS Academic Senate recommends that: CSUS graduate programs shall normally require that graduate students taking undergraduate courses for degree credit in their

department or interdisciplinary program shall do additional assignments demonstrating graduate-level skills. Academic Affairs may grant exceptions for required auxiliary skills courses.

AS 96-87/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM POLICIES COMMITTEE: SUBCOMMITTEE FOR CURRICULUM

The charge to the Subcommittee for Curriculum, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate's Curriculum Policies Committee, shall be:

Review and make recommendations regarding modifications to existing courses/academic programs and proposed new courses and academic programs, including all undergraduate, graduate, interdisciplinary, extended learning, minors, options, emphasis and study centers, and off-campus programs based on University policies (e.g., the Blue Book).

Recommendations on substantive program change proposals or creation of new academic programs are made to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and recommendations on non-substantive program change proposals are made to the Office of Academic Affairs. The subcommittee shall report periodically to the Curriculum Policies Committee.

AS 96-88/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM POLICIES COMMITTEE: SUBCOMMITTEE FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS

The charge to the Subcommittee for Program Reviews, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate's Curriculum Policies Committee, shall be:

1. Provide Panels to:
 - evaluate draft program reviews and departmental responses to drafts;
 - determine final program review recommendations for transmittal to the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs and the Academic Senate.
2. Hear and decide appropriate appeals from the decisions of Panels.
3. Report periodically to the Curriculum Policies Committee and the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Programs on subcommittee activities and on possible improvements in program review procedures.

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 96-83/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 17 (#5), 1996.

AS 96-89/Ex. FACULTY TRUSTEE NOMINEE, CSU BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Academic Senate endorses the nomination by faculty petition of Juanita C. Barrena for the Faculty Trustee on the CSU Board of Trustees.

AS 96-90/Flr. DISCUSSION--PROPOSED CSUS POLICY ON 24 HOUR ACCESS PLAN

Attachment C

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m., Arthur Jensen, Professor of Management

AS 96-86



California State University, Sacramento

California State University, Sacramento, CALIFORNIA 95819-6075
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

NOV - 1 1996

Academic Senate Received
413

November 1, 1996

To: Michael Fitzgerald, Academic Senate Chair
Donald Gerth, CSUS President

As a faculty member and a member of the Academic Senate, I would like to request that we bring before the senate a discussion of some of the issues that have been raised recently in letters to the editors, memos from the "Coalition," and campus chatter. Juanita Barrena's Livingston Lecture yesterday helped me to realize that the Academic Senate is the appropriate venue for such a discussion, and I feel an open, collegial discussion is in order. A good many letters to the Hornet editor, Hornet articles, Coalition memos, and formal presentations at the senate have recently taken place, but it seems to me that a real *dialogue* among senate members, other interested faculty, and administrators would be beneficial to all of us.

I feel on campus this semester a sense of defeat that I have not known since I came here thirteen years ago. I hear many people, in various academic meetings and other settings, expresses the sense that they are working extraordinarily hard both in the classroom and in university governance, and that at least in terms of the latter, they are at best running in place. Most have expressed a strong feeling of defeat. Today I attended a committee meeting in which hard working committee members almost unanimously expressed their despair at continuing with the work at hand. I hear people who have long been richly involved in the university wanting to "just come in, teach class, and leave" rather than feel tense and defeated. I sit in meeting after meeting in which people express the feeling that our work outside the classroom seems to take more and more time and accomplish less and less. I attend meetings, certainly including the recent CFA-sponsored budget meeting, in which faculty are blamed for various university failings and problems; I hear faculty anger as a response. The anger is distressing; more distressing is the sense of defeat which I believe is infecting the campus, or at least many faculty members.

Please consider this a formal request for a series of open discussions in the Academic Senate. We have an enormous job to do on this campus. If the news we hear about budget, demographics, priorities, and the future of the university is anywhere close to true, we can't afford to let ourselves split and grow further demoralized without even having a focused, organized, collegial discussion.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda Palmer".

Linda Palmer, English

cc: Hornback
Barrena

To: Michael Fitzgerald, Chair, Academic Senate

October 2, 1996

Fr: Lige Christian, Chair, Curriculum Policies Committee



At the request of the Executive Committee, CPC has evaluated Professor Fred Marshall's comments on AS 96/49:

The Committee thanks Fred for his comments; it makes the following specific responses:

Enforcement

The 1995-96 Committee discussed the question of how to enforce such a policy. It concluded that application of the standard would depend largely on voluntary compliance by the faculty -- although the issue would be appropriate for program review consideration. The standard would then parallel grading standards which also depend on the faculty's professional discretion. Departments might, of course, adopt such enforcement measures as they consider proper; indeed, we understand that some departments have attempted to institute such a standard for their programs and met resistance from faculty who claim that they need not do the extra work which extra assignments involve. The adoption of the proposed standard would give such departments the authority to enforce a standard they consider essential to sound graduate education.

The Committee was impressed with Fred's argument that it will be difficult to implement the policy in the case of a student who takes a course without intending to use it for degree credit and then wishes to count it toward the degree. We believe that such a course could count toward the degree because of the "good faith" of the student; however, we agree with the 1995-96 Committee that the simplest and best approach is to give graduate students extra assignments in *all* classes. The Committee therefore recommends an amendment to the proposal -- specifically the **omission of "for degree credit"** and the addition of "**in their department or interdisciplinary program.**"

CSUS graduate programs shall require that graduate students taking undergraduate courses ~~for degree credit in their department or interdisciplinary program~~ shall do additional assignments demonstrating graduate-level skills. Academic Affairs may grant exceptions for required auxiliary skills courses.

Please note that the requirement would not apply to electives taken outside the program -- e.g. a history student taking Chinese.

Grading

Title V makes no distinction between grading standards for undergraduates and graduate students in a given course. It and University policy do require that graduate students have a minimum "B" average for courses counted for advancement to candidacy. It seems, therefore, that graduate students must in all courses, graduate or undergraduate, do above-average work. The policy requires above

-average work regardless of the assignments required in a class. (As you know, the Senate is now establishing a task force to examine the grading issue, for there are indeed many puzzling aspects to current grading policy and practice.)

Grading in the narrow sense raises the issue of matching assignments to a graduate student's background. For instance, what do extra assignments and higher grade expectations mean for a graduate student who is taking a course in a field (e.g. Chaucer) for the first time in which undergraduate classmates have strong backgrounds? The proposed policy does not require that graduate students *know* more than undergraduates about the field, but only that they do extra work and that they use such skills as writing at a graduate level.

Compensation

The proposal provides no compensation for faculty doing the extra work the standard requires. It assumes that the great majority of faculty want to provide graduate students with assignments which will best help them toward their degree objectives. Similarly, the proposal assumes that graduate students interested in a field offered only at the undergraduate level (e.g. Mark Twain) will want to take that course and will not be dissuaded by extra assignments. We certainly hope that these key assumptions about faculty and graduate students are valid!

It is also important that AS 96/49 is *one of a series* of proposed standards for graduate education and that one of those standards, a proposal for compensation for graduate coordinators and culminating experience supervisors, does involve important compensation to faculty.

Double-Listing

Fred suggests that double-listing classes might provide a better way of achieving the goal sought by AS 96/49. Aside from the pedagogical problems with the suggestion, the alternative is impractical. Last year the University approved a policy allowing double-listing only under emergency and temporary circumstances.

The Committee thanks the Executive Committee for the opportunity to evaluate Fred Marshall's comments. It is, of course, ready to answer any further questions regarding the proposal.

cc: F. Marshall, D. Madden, T. Hornback

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee
From: Fred Marshall *JM*
Academic Senator, English Department, 1994-96
Date: May 17, 1996

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

JUL 17 1996

Academic Senate Received
413

I was one of those who requested that AS 96-49 (on graduate students taking undergraduate classes) be taken off the consent calendar for the May 16, 1996 meeting. I hope that the Executive Committee will send the proposal back to the Curriculum Policies Committee for revision, along with a copy of this memo.

The basic impetus for the proposal is one I agree with whole-heartedly: graduate education should be more demanding and at a higher level than undergraduate education. The problem is with the vagueness and open-endedness of the proposal in AS 96-49: to require that graduate students taking undergraduate classes do additional assignments demonstrating graduate level skills. A number of questions immediately come to mind:

Who will police this requirement? Is the graduate coordinator, who has to approve an Advancement to Candidacy form which lists the courses, supposed to verify that additional assignments were done for each undergraduate course in each student's Masters program? Is the faculty member teaching the undergraduate class, who may teach no graduate classes, supposed to verify that the additional assignments demonstrate graduate level work?

How is the faculty member supposed to know which students need to do the additional assignments? A graduate student may take an undergraduate course with no intention at that time of counting it towards their degree, and then wish later to include the course in their program because a graduate class they had intended to take was not offered. Should the fact that a student is a graduate student in an undergraduate class automatically trigger a requirement of additional assignments?

Does the faculty member get compensated in any way for the additional work involved? Graduate classes are supposed to be limited to 15 students in part because the faculty member does more: the assignments and their evaluation are typically more detailed and complex. The proposal asks that faculty members teach undergraduate size classes, while requiring the faculty to evaluate additional graduate level work. Some of us might take on the additional burden without any compensating relief, others may give a minimal additional assignment, and still others may prohibit graduate students from their undergraduate classes; none of these seem to be desirable outcomes.

What grading standards apply? Are the graduate students graded on the basis of just that work that the undergraduate students do, or are they given some kind of extra credit for the additional work, or is a second, graduate grading standard applied to all of

their work in the class? How can one later look at a grade of, say, "A-" in such a course, and know whether it reflects "A-" work at the graduate or the undergraduate level?

There are sometimes good reasons why a graduate student may take an undergraduate course. In English, for example, we offer a course at the undergraduate level on Mark Twain, but not one at the graduate level. A graduate student specializing in 19th century American literature would certainly want to take such a course; why should they be dissuaded from taking the only one our resources allow us to offer?

I am not persuaded that "double-listing" courses is, in fact, any more dangerous than the policy proposed in AS 96-49. A course with both a graduate and undergraduate course number could be set up through the course approval process so that specific additional work was required of those students who registered under the graduate number. The faculty member would apply undergraduate standards in grading students taking 1XX, and graduate standards to those who registered for 2XX. A course in danger of cancellation because it did not attract a large number of students would have a better chance of survival with two pools of students to draw from. Greater use of such cross-listing might, in fact, serve to strengthen undergraduate education rather than weaken graduate education.

If the proposed policy could be used as a lever to pry out more resources for graduate education, by applying the logic that graduate students are ill-served by a degree program that includes undergraduate classes and so we need to offer a full complement of graduate classes, I would find it more attractive. That, unfortunately, does not appear to be the CPC's intent. Given the problems I have pointed out above regarding what the policy means and how it can be implemented, I ask that the Executive Committee send AS 96-49 back to the CPC for further consideration.

Dred Marshall

cc: V.T. Hornback
C. Gregory
D. Madden

California State University, Sacramento

24 Hour Access Plan

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

[Background](#)|[Task Group](#)|[Proposed Plan](#)|[CSU,S Home Page](#)

Introduction

These pages provide information about the current status of a university plan being developed to respond to a directive from Chancellor Munitz. The pages will change regularly during the Fall Semester, 1996, as the plan is drafted by the task group charged with its development. Readers are encouraged to review and provide the task group feedback on the proposed plan, by addressing e-mail to jensena@csus.edu, by voice mail to x6642, or campus mail to Art Jensen (6088), School of Business Administration.

Background

The CSU Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (*CLRIT*) completed an indepth study of student and faculty needs for access to the computing and network resources of the CSU. The study led to an *Implementation Plan: Related to the Resolution for 24-Hour Access to Computing Resources and the Network* and a companion document, *Guidelines Relating to Adoption of a Requirement for Students to have 24-Hour Access to a Personal Computer and the Network*, being forwarded to the Chancellor. Chancellor Munitz approved the "implementation Plan" and sent a *memorandum*, dated June 14, 1995, to the CSU campuses, directing them to develop implementation plans.

[\(back to top\)](#)

Task Group

CSU'S's Vice President for Academic Affairs, Jolene Koester, in a *memorandum* dated April 19, 1996, formed a task group to develop a plan that would allow CSUS to respond to the mandate. The members of the task group are:

- [Spencer Freund](#), Associate Vice President, Telecommunications and Administration
- [Marilyn Hopkins](#), Professor, Division of Nursing
- [Art Jensen](#), Professor, Department of Management
- [Mary Jane Lee](#), Professor, Department of Computer Science
- [Nancy Shulock](#), Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
- J.P. Werlin, past President, Associated Students, Inc.

The task group started meeting during the latter part of the Spring semester, continued through the summer and once a week since the beginning of the Fall semester. Two plans, already developed by other CSU campuses: [CSU, Chico](#) and [CSU, Sonoma](#), were reviewed and a survey of current CSUS student

access was developed and implemented during the Fall semester registration on *Casper*. The group then developed an outline of the plan that focuses on the issues that must be resolved and finally combined all of this into the proposed plan presented on the following pages.

[\(back to top\)](#)

Proposed Plan

These pages are currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

jensena@csus.edu
California State University, Sacramento

California State University, Sacramento

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 24-HOUR ACCESS

FRAMEWORK

Twenty-four hour access to a personal computer, networking, and the information technology resources at the California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) requires both appropriate physical facilities and a strong University commitment to provide the services necessary to support student learning in an information-rich environment. In both cases the goal is well within reach. CSUS has numerous laboratory facilities which can be reconfigured in accordance with the objectives of this plan. The division of Computing, Communications, and Media Services (CCMS) already operates around the clock, providing University computing and high-speed data network facilities, central servers for the campus, and support for a number of local-area servers. CCMS also maintains a 230-line modem pool offering remote dial-in services and access to University resources and the Internet to off-campus users. The University is fully committed to enhancing its facilities and services to accomplish the goal of providing all CSUS students with 24-hour access to a personal computer and to the network even before the fall of the year 2000.

The Goal

The goal of the CSUS 24-hour access policy is:

to provide for broad and enriching opportunities by which students gain access to information resources, 24 hours a day, to further their educational goals.

The needs of the CSUS student body with respect to information resources and technology are diverse. No single approach can satisfy all students. Accordingly, the CSUS plan consists of four components which, taken together, should ensure that all students will be able to take advantage of the information resources offered by the campus:

- student acquisition of personal computers;
- 24-hour student access to a computer laboratory environment;
- 24-hour student access to University networking and information resources; and
- student access to user support.

This plan is being implemented for the benefit of our students. The involvement of the students and their organization, Associated Students, Inc. (ASI), is pivotal to the project's overall acceptance and success. A final key is the University's commitment to faculty development to ensure that students, throughout their course work and university experience, benefit from the opportunities, tools, materials, and resources available through universal information technology access.

Each of the plan's components is discussed below, in terms of the rationale for including it in the plan, the expected outcomes from such an approach, and the necessary implementation steps for achieving the outcomes.

The 24-Hour Access Plan Components

- Individual Student Acquisition of Computers
- 24-Hour Access to General Purpose Laboratory
- Provide Access to the University's Network Resources
- Student User Support
as well as a necessary key
- Support Faculty Efforts to Promote an Information-Rich Environment

These pages are currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

jensena@csus.edu
California State University, Sacramento

California State University, Sacramento

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 24-HOUR ACCESS

Individual Student Acquisition of Computers

Rationale

Recent surveys indicate that 31% of adults in this country have a personal computer in their home (*Advertising Age*, August 5, 1996, p.21) and 35 million United States residents, age 16 and over, accessed the Internet or "on-line" computer information services between April and May, 1996 (*Advertising Age*, July 22, 1996, p.30). Like the radio, television and the videotape machine before it, the personal computer has now taken its place as standard durable good in many homes. The development of the Internet and related computer communications opportunities have dramatically broadened the availability of data and the transfer of information while, at the same time, providing at amazing speed new paradigms for knowledge sharing, and expanding options for interaction and collaboration. Many of the adults identified by these national studies fit the profile of the CSUS student community.

Students enrolling at CSUS in the Fall, 1996 semester were surveyed by the University to determine the extent to which they have off-campus access to the Internet. Fifty-four percent of the 1,827 randomly selected respondents indicated that they "have access to a computer, other than at the University, that is capable of Internet service." Another 19% indicated that they had access but did not know if it was capable of Internet service. Together, these results indicate that nearly three-quarters of the CSUS student body have positioned themselves to access at least some portion of the campus information resources. The remaining two response categories accounted for the remaining one-quarter of students: 25.2% reported they did not have access to a computer with Internet access because it was too expensive; 0.8% reported they did not have access to a computer because they do not need one. This last statistic underscores the obligation the University has to facilitate student access to computers--almost no students see computer access as unnecessary.

With recorded information growing at such a rapid rate, it is no longer possible for students to have sufficient access to available information using traditional tools. In view of the computer workstation becoming a household commodity, the expectations by students for more productivity and convenience in the learning environment, and the infeasibility of providing open access laboratories to meet the universal demands of the entire student population of CSUS, it is incumbent upon the University to encourage students to acquire or gain some assured access to general purpose mobile or permanent computers.

Outcomes

The purpose of this component is to ensure that all students, regardless of their financial circumstances, will have reasonable means to acquire and/or upgrade computer equipment that will provide access to University information resources. Accordingly, the following outcomes are proposed:

- The campus will establish, regularly update and publish both universal and discipline-specific

standards for hardware, software and network connectivity.

- A student program will be established to provide some or all of the following options for computer acquisition:
 1. Purchasing/upgrade programs -- multiple vendor alliance or partnerships supported.
 2. Purchasing/upgrade programs -- CSU, CSUS or CSUS Foundation developed.
 3. Leasing/loan programs -- multiple vendor alliance or partnerships supported.
 4. Leasing/loan programs -- CSU, CSUS or CSUS Foundation developed.
 5. Resale programs -- multiple vendor alliance or partnership.
 6. Resale programs -- CSUS or CSUS Foundation developed.
 7. Scholarship programs -- multiple vendor, CSUS, CSUS Foundation, Schools and/or Program Center developed.

- A student program will be developed by the University, in collaboration with the CSU, CSU campuses and/or the CSUS Foundation, to provide opportunities for discipline specific and universal software licensing, and more convenient access to the Internet from third party Information Service Providers.

- By the year 2000, at least 90 percent of the student body should report access to computers other than on campus.

Implementation

- CCMS will develop minimum baseline standards for hardware, software, and connectivity for approval through the telecommunications consultative processes. Such standards will be revised as necessary, but certainly no less than annually to coincide with the start of the new academic year. Migration and upgrade pathways will be considered in the development of these standards. The initial set of standards must be approved by the President by the time the buying/leasing/loan programs are in place -- January 1998.

- The Vice President for Administration and the Executive Director of the CSUS Foundation will collaborate with ASI in developing and publicizing a plan for student acquisition of computers, to be implemented no later than January 1998.

- The Vice President for Administration will take the lead in working with ASI to develop the student program to provide opportunities for discipline specific and universal software licensing, and more convenient access to the Internet from third party Information Service Providers, in collaboration with the CSU, CSU campuses and/or the CSUS Foundation, no later than June 1998.

- The Vice President for Administration, with support from the Budget Allocation Group, will develop funding strategies for this component, beginning with the 1997/98 academic year, including investigating the advisability of instituting a technology fee, redirection of existing funds, product sales, re-engineering of faculty and administrative work.

California State University, Sacramento

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 24-HOUR ACCESS

24-Hour Access to General Purpose Laboratory

Rationale

The Chancellor's mandate is that all students can access networked computers 24-hours-a-day. CSUS has chosen not to require student computer ownership as the principal means of complying with this mandate. Accordingly, it becomes necessary to provide a physical location, on campus, where computer workstations and network access are available to students around the clock. Currently, the University maintains several computer laboratories that are "open" to various degrees, depending on the frequency with which classes may be scheduled in the facilities. This arrangement has not fully met the objectives of the schools or of students seeking a general purpose computing environment. With the widespread incorporation of technology across the curriculum, schools and their departments face an increasing demand for discipline specific computer laboratory environments to serve their major programs. But the more the University allows "open" labs to be scheduled, the less convenient it is for students to find a general purpose computing environment. The solution proposed in this plan is to identify one general purpose self-instructional laboratory, open 24-hours, that cannot be scheduled for classes or demonstrations. All other laboratories on campus will be school-based, with schools and departments assigned the responsibility to design, equip, and support the labs to meet their discipline specific program requirements.

Outcomes

- One University general purpose laboratory will be available 24-hours-a-day to students, with no allowance for all or part of the lab to be reserved for classes, demonstrations, or training.
- The general purpose lab will be equipped with a minimum of 100 workstations (an appropriate mix of DOS/Windows and Mac work stations, docking stations, Internet terminals, and network connections) that will be maintained by CCMS so as to be in total compliance with University standards for hardware, software, and connectivity. The lab shall also include appropriate peripherals. The design of the universal lab environment shall encompass an architectural design to meet limited student needs during late hours, on weekends and holidays.
- The general purpose lab will be located in a secure, handicapped accessible area of the campus, reasonably close to rest room facilities, parking and food service.
- The schools of the University will operate school-based labs to meet the needs of their academic programs. The hours of operations of school-based labs would be at the discretion of the Schools.
- Additional general purpose laboratories, not necessarily open 24 hours, will be maintained as demand requires.

Implementation

- The Space Planning and Allocation Group (SPAG) will recommend the location for the general purpose laboratory by March 1, 1997.
- CCMS will establish standards for the hardware, software, connectivity, and staffing of the general purpose laboratory and will recommend an architectural configuration and budget to meet those standards beginning in the 1997/98 academic year. Included in the facility and program design are provisions for security, virus protection, file serving and access to centralized and distributed servers, print and non-print documentation, and a suite of software.
- The Provost will, in consultation with the academic Deans and the Vice President for Administration:
 1. assign other laboratories to individual schools by the end of the 1996/97 academic year;
 2. identify, in the development of the 1997/98 budget, the resources that will be allocated to the schools to support the school-based labs; and
 3. clarify the relative responsibilities of CCMS and the schools for the maintenance and operation of school-based labs.
- The Vice President for Administration, with support from the Budget Allocation Group, will develop funding strategies for this component beginning with the 1997/98 academic year, including investigating the advisability of instituting a technology fee, redirection of existing funds, product sales, re-engineering of faculty and administrative work.

These pages are currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

[Back to the First Page of Plan](#)

jensena@csus.edu
California State University, Sacramento

California State University, Sacramento

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 24-HOUR ACCESS

Provide Access to the University's Network Resources

Rationale

The University Strategic Plan sets forth the advantages to students of using information technology to enhance communications among students and faculty and to access the vast and dynamic stores of information available in electronic form. Network resources are essential to the achievement of these enhancements to teaching and learning, as well as to advancements in research and scholarship and in personal and institutional productivity. Meeting the Chancellor's mandate requires not only providing student access to computers but a concomitant commitment to maintain the CSUS inter- and intra-campus voice, data, and video backbone. Access to this network must be widely available throughout the campus, for students, faculty, and staff, and from off-campus sites. Barriers of space and time must no longer limit University users access to real world data, tools, and information resources.

Outcomes

- All enrolled students, whether full-time, part-time, or enrolled in Regional and Continuing Education, will have an account that supports e-mail and Internet access.
- All faculty and staff will have an account that supports e-mail and Internet access.
- University network capability will be extended, as provided for under the CSU Minimum Baseline requirements, to all campus buildings, including residence halls. Network "docking" connections will be provided in locations of convenience for students, e.g., Library, Student Union.
- Network capability will meet or exceed CSU guidelines, and will support academic and administrative priorities of the campus.
- Network access to information resources will be available from the general purpose lab, 24 hours per day, as well as from school-specific laboratories.
- Communication and interaction between students and faculty, between students and staff, and among students will improve.

Implementation

- CCMS and Facilities Management will develop plans for the expansion of the inter-campus and

intra-building infrastructure to support minimum baseline requirements for faculty and staff offices, classroom and laboratories, the Library, specialized instructional spaces, and public areas. The following time line should be used:

- preliminary design and schematic drawings by January 31, 1997.
 - final working drawings and construction specifications by February 1998.
 - contract awarded by July 1, 1998.
 - construction and installation completed by June 30, 1999.
-
- CCMS and the CSUS Foundation will develop a joint RFI/RFP to invite a public-private partnership to provide student residence hall network functionality by June 1997.
 - CCMS will propose, by June, 1997, policies governing the use of, and payment for, University e-mail and Internet access, by persons who are not regularly matriculated students, or faculty, or staff of CSUS, including RCE students.
 - CCMS, in consultation with the Office of Admissions and Records and ASI will, by June 1998, develop a system whereby (1) students obtain computer accounts during the enrollment process and (2) the class lists of accounts are automatically generated for distribution to faculty.
 - CCMS, in collaboration with Support Services, will develop a joint RFI/RFP with sister campuses and/or the CSU to support enhanced student, faculty, and staff access to University network resources via alternate Internet providers by June 1998.
 - The Vice President for Administration, with support from the Budget Allocation Group, will develop funding strategies for this component beginning with the 1997/98 academic year, including investigating the advisability of instituting a technology fee, redirection of existing funds, product sales, re-engineering of faculty and administrative work.

These pages are currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

Back to [the First Page of Plan](#)

jensena@csus.edu
California State University, Sacramento

California State University, Sacramento

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 24-HOUR ACCESS

Student User Support

Rationale

The University has the responsibility to provide basic information, training and support services that facilitate the students use of the standard hardware, software, and network infrastructure established by the 24-hour program. A prerequisite to successful implementation of universal 24-hour student access is a provision for and recognition of basic computer literacy. Although CCMS, the Library, and several academic departments offer some fragmented and comprehensive training and courseware, many students do not get the exposure required to successfully prepare them to succeed in an information technology environment. This suggest that the University needs a more comprehensive approach to ensure information competency across the entire student community.

In addition, the campus must also satisfy two other requirements. First, the environment in the 24-hour self-instructional computer laboratory must be user-friendly and conducive to productive and efficient use of the hardware and software resources in the lab. To achieve this goal, the user environment must be designed so that all students, regardless of level of expertise, can determine what software is obtainable, simply access the available software, and easily operate the hardware facilities. Second, entry to the University s vast information resources, whether on-campus or off-campus, must be as readily and widely available to all student users, 24 hours a day, as technology, security, licensing, and funding will allow.

To achieve the above requirements, the University must not only empower the student, but provide them with a depth and breadth of on-line documentation, automated help desk systems, and human intervention and services that do not exist today.

Outcomes

- An institutional policy will be developed declaring whether student training is mandatory or voluntary, credit-bearing or not-for-credit, topics and competencies required, and the department or units assigned to develop and offer the training.
- Qualified lab assistants will be available to students 24 hours each day in the general purpose laboratory to assist in solving standard hardware and software problems.
- Students will report a high level of satisfaction with the physical computing environment and user support.
- Phone and/or on-line consultation will be available to students, faculty, and staff during extended hours of operation.

Implementation

- The Provost, in consultation with the Academic Senate, will develop the framework for introducing computer literacy and information resources into the University's academic program during the 1997/98 academic year.
- The schools, the Library and CCMS will work collectively on developing a computer literacy and information resource curriculum during the 1997/1998 academic year.
- CCMS will establish the qualifications and training standards for the laboratory assistants who will serve in the general purpose laboratory, and support phone and/or on-line consultation, no later than the end of the 1996 year.
- CCMS will develop the general documentation, automated help desk systems, and human intervention functions and services for the new "student user services" program no later than June 1998. Similar efforts will be undertaken by the schools when applications require course related support.
- The Vice President for Administration, with support from the Budget Allocation Group, will develop funding strategies for this component beginning with the 1997/98 academic year, including investigating the advisability of instituting a technology fee, redirection of existing funds, product sales, re-engineering of faculty and administrative work.

These pages are currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

Back to [the First Page of Plan](#)

jensena@csus.edu

California State University, Sacramento

California State University, Sacramento

Warning: This page is currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft

PROPOSED PLAN FOR 24-HOUR ACCESS

Support Faculty Efforts to Promote an Information-rich Environment

Rationale

Faculty roles and responsibilities have traditionally included those of content specialist, scholar, and teacher, i.e., transmitter of knowledge. There is growing consensus that, in today's information-rich environment, the roles and responsibilities are changing or at least expanding. Faculty will be increasingly expected to mentor students in "knowledge navigation", helping students, more than ever before, to discover and integrate information to achieve their educational goals. Information technology opens up to students and faculty vast and dynamic information resources. Faculty can be of tremendous value in the teaching and learning process by helping students learn how to access this information. Further, as information technology expands options for the structure and delivery of curricula, faculty can play a vital role in designing the curriculum and selecting the pedagogical approaches that will promote learning. Finally, as emphasis on learning outcomes comes to replace emphasis on "seat time" and credits taken, faculty will be increasingly expected to perform an evaluative role, assessing the degree to which students have acquired the necessary skills as well as mastery of specified topics. All of these expanded aspects to faculty roles and responsibilities involve understanding and use of information technologies.

It must be a shared responsibility of the faculty and the administration to ensure that faculty are committed and prepared to fulfill their responsibilities. Instructional technology is not an end in itself; it is important only as it contributes to educational objectives. Faculty, therefore, have an ongoing responsibility to be aware of the impact that information technology can have in their disciplines, on the teaching-learning process, and on their scholarly and creative activities. The University has the responsibility to provide an environment that fosters and supports faculty professional development related to the use of information technology. This includes providing adequate facilities, equipment, staff support, and professional development opportunities, as well as addressing faculty development implications when making information technology enhancements throughout the campus.

Outcomes

- A comprehensive program of faculty professional development, managed by the Center for Teaching and Learning, will include programs to promote the use of instructional technologies in teaching and scholarship.
- Training and support for faculty in instructional technologies will be available from CCMS and School resources.
- Faculty offices, computing laboratories, the library, and selected classrooms will be equipped with workstations and connected to the campus high-speed backbone, as provided for under the CSU

minimum baseline requirements.

- Appropriate rewards will be available to faculty (through RTP and/or other processes) to recognize the contributions to learning and scholarship that faculty make via investments in instructional technology.

Implementation

- The Provost, in consultation with the Academic Senate, will develop the framework for collaboratively managing the various campus professional development and faculty training initiatives offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning, CCMS, the Library, the schools, and other units, by June 1998.
- The Provost, in consultation with CCMS and the Vice President for Administration, will develop a multi-phase plan by December, 1997, for the expansion of the inter- and intra-building infrastructure, in compliance with the CSU's Minimum Baseline for an Intra-campus Infrastructure policy, to ensure that faculty offices, laboratories, the library and classrooms will be connected to the campus high-speed backbone and equipped with suitable workstations, presentation systems, and software. The plan will include provisions for funding.
- The Provost and the deans will develop a plan for incorporation into the budget process beginning 1997/98, for ensuring appropriate funding, through reallocation, for annual upgrading of 25% of faculty workstations.
- The University will begin in the 1997/98 academic year to clarify issues of intellectual property rights and copyright so as to encourage multimedia production, collaborative development, and the creative use and adaptation of other creative works.
- The Provost, Deans, and Academic Senate will work together to determine how campus RTP processes can recognize innovative pedagogy and the integration of information technology into the curriculum as it contributes to teaching, scholarship, and service, and to develop other appropriate rewards and recognition for these activities. Any changes resulting from this effort will be in place by June, 1999.
- The Vice President for Administration, with support from the Budget Allocation Group, will develop funding strategies for this component beginning with the 1997/98 academic year, including investigating the advisability of instituting a technology fee, redirection of existing funds, product sales, re-engineering of faculty and administrative work.

These pages are currently (October 29, 1996) the task group's final draft.

[Back to the First Page of Plan](#)

jensena@csus.edu
California State University, Sacramento

THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSES

President Gerth, at long last, has gotten around to making his response to the Coalition's first fifteen questions. After a month in preparation, the disappointingly sketchy document was finally released. Since the President promised in the *State Hornet* a week after our questions were distributed to have his staff prepare a reply, we assumed it would be a prompt and detailed response. Since the questions were put in a Senate meeting, we were expecting a response in that venue. We find it odd that he chose to reply, after a month's preparation, in a closed meeting of the *State Hornet* editorial staff. The elephant labored, then--quietly--delivered a mouse. Not wishing to take a month to respond (we are, after all, working faculty--teaching, publishing, researching), and interested more in what the President didn't say than what he said, we will limit ourselves to a few serious points:

- What is the dollar-equivalent of the time of President Gerth, Administrative Vice President Jones, Associate Vice Presidents Freund and Reed, Ms. Helen Dykman, and various technicians and clerical staff involved both with the IAUP installation and the ongoing affairs of the organization? The President estimates 10% of his time is devoted to the IAUP; that's about \$15,000 in round numbers. V.P. Jones is Treasurer of the organization--at a guess, at least 5% of his time: roughly \$5,800. AVP's Freund and Reed probably spend only about 2 or 3% of their time, at a conservative estimate: maybe \$5,000 between them. Then, as far as we can tell, Ms Dykman must be wholly employed in IAUP business, as she is not listed in our Campus Directory, although she occupies an office in the Library which, we are told, was once a Student Study Room, but is now the IAUP Office. There is, one would think, some cost for both Ms Dykman and the Office. We assume that the total investment of time, space, equipment and supplies, and the like (possibly travel--the figures are hard to decipher) is well in excess of the \$25,000-\$26,000 in salaries for the four administrators--at least \$50,000 to \$75,000. That's a not inconsiderable sum of money.
- President Gerth mentioned his President's Associates Fund, but omitted reference to the CSUS Foundation Discretionary Account, and the Campus Reserve Fund ("Gerth's Discretionary Accounts Top \$1 Million," *The State Hornet*, Nov. 11, 1994). What were the annual amounts expended from these accounts, and for what purposes?
- Given the prior relationships between the President and three of the four members of his evaluation panel last year (Pettigrew, Hauck, and Kirschner), was this committee packed with friends and long-standing associates capable of rendering an impartial review of President Gerth's performance?
- We understand the President's reference to the difficulty of making comparisons of individual administrative salaries between campuses. That's why we used nation-wide median figures drawn from *The Chronicle of Higher Education* for our comparison figures. Inductively, that's a pretty valid sampling. And so, among the high-paid administrators about whom the President is silent, we would still like some clarification: is the position "Chief of Staff" a common one in the CSU or elsewhere? What, in contradistinction to, say, an "Assistant to the President," does a Chief of Staff do? Is it deserving of Vice President's rank and pay? And do all of the other CSUs have a Dean of Faculty and Staff Affairs, and are they paid at the Vice-President level? Same question about the Foundation Director?
- We trust that the President is not taking credit for the high ranking of CSUS faculty salaries in the CSU system. One reason for that misleading phenomenon is that this is an aging faculty, with very few recent hires at the traditional junior faculty salary levels. (For example, of the relatively few hires this year, two were negotiated by the Academic Affairs office at full Professor levels as part of the "hiring package" for two new deans.) A more serious consideration, however, is the stagnation of faculty salaries throughout the CSU system, while administrative salaries have risen steadily. Thus, while CSU faculty salaries are somewhere in the middle range for faculty in "Comprehensive Universities" nationally, administrators' are at the top of the scale for such universities. In that respect, this Administration is no worse than most CSU administrations. The fact remains, however, that our senior administrators make roughly two to three times as much, when allowances are counted, as all but a few "Hard-to-Hire" full Professors in professional schools. The President, counting salary and percs, makes nearly five times as much as an Assistant Professor.

More Questions for President Gerth

16. On the heels of the fee hike for athletics in 1995, what is the magnitude of the next fee hike for sports that the students will be expected to support?
17. Were the academic appointments given to the spouses of two new deans at CSUS examples of favoritism based on family ties (i.e. nepotism)?
18. Funding for these two full professor faculty positions, according to the Provost, came from an Academic Affairs reserve "to help respond to circumstances of individual schools, student demand, or unanticipated events." If this money was already committed before the 1996-1997 academic year began, how were other *circumstances* or *student demand* given equal review?
19. Why didn't the need for a new faculty hire in the Bio Medical Engineering Program receive favorable consideration for funding from the Provost's reserve discretionary fund? Survival of this nationally celebrated program depended on approval of a retirement replacement faculty position.
20. When will you release the IRS form disclosing the \$25,000 donation made by the Foundation to the "Yes on Prop. 203" campaign?
21. You have stated that you devote 10% of your work week to the IAUP. What percentage of the workloads of Robert Jones, Spencer Freund and Ann Reed are devoted to IAUP business? What is the total amount of administrative salaries at CSUS devoted to IAUP?
22. In the Sacramento Bee (10/4/96), you stated that "The only CSU funds spent on (the Int'l Asso of Univ Presidents) were for *clerical* work." Have Vice President Robert Jones, Treasurer of the IAUP, and other CSUS administrators to whom you refer, been demoted to clerical positions?
23. How much is Helen Dykman paid from CSUS and Foundation sources to help you with IAUP business? How many years has Ms. Dykman worked for you on IAUP affairs?
24. When you and Mrs. Gerth, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Jones, Helen Dykman and possibly others visited Buenos Aires in 1994, what were the precise sources of the funding for the journey?
25. You have stated that you had long-standing relationships with three (Hauck, Kerschner & Pettigrew) of the four members of your evaluation team last year. How could their evaluation of you be balanced and impartial?
26. How many campuses have a position entitled Chief of Staff? What is the salary range for persons who occupy equivalent positions?
27. What are the duties of the Chief of Staff? What specific staff members at CSUS are under the supervision of this highly-paid officer?
28. For the past five years, what have been the annual costs of the development effort at CSUS and the annual amounts raised for CSUS? How much do you project that you will spend on the 50th anniversary celebration?
29. How much is the firm paid that conducts telephone solicitation on behalf of CSUS?
30. Have deans been instructed to purchase life insurance policies with the beneficiary being CSUS development accounts?

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE - NOT ADMINISTRATIVE EXCESS