

**California State University, Sacramento**  
**Ad Hoc Goals Committee**  
**Working Committee Charge**  
**Summer 2007**

**Background:**

During Spring 2007, the CSUS faculty approved a vote of No Confidence in President Gonzalez that expressed the following (boxed material in quotes):

- 1) a lack of confidence in the President's leadership, interest in and willingness to preserve the quality of the academic program of the University,
- 2) their dismay over his efforts to promote the University through means that are inconsistent with or detract from the core values of the academy, and
- 3) its outrage over his placement of the interests of management, publicity, and cultivation of community favor over the needs of the instructional program

To move forward, pursuant to FS 07-39, the Faculty Senate created the ad hoc Goals Committee (The Committee) to draft a list of potential remedies establishing university wide commitment to the enhancement of instructional program quality and faculty confidence in President Gonzalez' leadership.

**Deliverables:**

Draft list of remedies/particulars addressing faculty concerns articulated in the faculty referendum for discussion at the Fall 2007 faculty Senate Retreat leading to subsequent action at Senate meetings. To address these concerns, The Committee will focus on:

- A. reaffirmation of academic issues as the *top priority* of faculty and administration, and the
- B. establishment of *open and respectful communication* between faculty and university administration.

Specifically, The Committee will *consider* the:

1. *Urgency* of making tenure-track hires on an ongoing basis
2. *Desirability of ceasing* MPP hires until a sufficient number of tenure-track hires is made, and the
3. *Desirability of* Advancement Office becoming *self-supporting*.

While these items listed above will be the initial focus of The Committee, other issues addressed in the referendum that support (A) and (B) may be considered.

**Ad Hoc Goals Committee Recommendations  
Fall 2007  
Report to Faculty Senate**

**Recommendation #1**

Establish a permanent committee to work with the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) and any other required parties to gather, interpret, and disseminate information regarding class size, number of faculty, student-faculty ratio, and number of administrative personnel. This committee would help to overcome the problems associated with multiple numbers for the same definition and establish a way for concerned faculty to access accurate information about the university.

**Recommendation #2**

Senate, faculty, and administration collaborate on a mechanism that permanently guarantees that the budget at all levels be transparent. A clear budget process goes hand-in-hand with building trust between faculty and administration.

**Recommendation #3**

The ad hoc Goals Committee recommends that the University make the hiring of tenure-track faculty a priority over the hiring of part-time instructors in light of the following:

- assembly Bill 1343, currently in committee, mandates the CSU reach a 75/25 ratio of tenured and tenure-track faculty to part time faculty by 2014-2015<sup>1</sup>;
- according the Budget Task Force Report, in Fall 2005, the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty to total faculty at Sacramento State was 63%, and;
- data provided by the Chancellor’s Office on CSU campuses with enrollment greater than 20,000 indicated the following trends:

| Year | Average, CSU > 20,000    |               | Sacramento State         |               |
|------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|
|      | Tenured and Tenure-Track | Other Faculty | Tenured and Tenure-Track | Other Faculty |
| 2004 | 727                      | 452           | 784                      | 365           |
| 2005 | 728                      | 510           | 748                      | 393           |
| 2006 | 737                      | 542           | 726                      | 453           |

<sup>1</sup><http://www.assembly.ca.gov/acs/acsframeset2text.htm>

**Recommendation #4**

The ad hoc Goals Committee recommends that the University also make the hiring of tenure-track faculty a priority over the hiring of MPPs. In light of the following:

- there has been a decrease of tenure/tenure-track (TTT) faculty since 2002 (from 762 to 726);
- there has been an increase of MPPs since 2002 (from 135 to 145); and
- while the CSU ratio of TTT/MPP has remained lower than the Sacramento State average, the Sacramento State ratio has been decreasing.

However, the Committee cannot recommend ceasing MPP hires until a sufficient number of tenure-track hires is made because of the variables involved in making MPP hiring decisions. For instance, in 2006, of the new MPPs, 70% were a result of reassignment, reclassification, and reorganization.

**Recommendation #5**

The ad hoc Goals Committee suggests that the University establish a formalized and uniform exit interview for non-retiring tenured and tenure-track faculty who leave the institution to better understand the circumstances that surround such departures. Current data is not collected in a uniform and rigorous manner as to the reasons for separations from the institution. Understanding the issues surrounding such separations may better enable the institution to recruit and retain full-time faculty.

**Recommendation #6**

The ad hoc Goals Committee was asked to consider requiring the office of advancement to be self-supporting. The Board of Trustees and the Chancellor's office expect each campus to raise 10% of its budget externally. Given this, it is understandable that the University needs to have a successful Office of Advancement.

In this light, the ad hoc Goals Committee recommends:

- the Office of Advancement not be funded at the detriment of academic endeavors;
- the President direct the Office of Advancement to redouble its efforts at raising funds with directly recognizable academic contributions, and;
- as part of the annual budget report, the Office of Advancement produce an annual report to the campus community that clearly describes the sources of funds and the academic benefits of both development and advancement.