Select Committee Feedback: in order as received.:

(August 25, 2011, from Kristin VanGaasbeck, APC Chair)

I agree with the substance of the report and believe that it accurately portrays the issues with workload imbalance across the policy committees. Moreover, I think the report makes a compelling argument for restructuring the policy committees in a way that more accurately reflects the organization of the University. While others may feel differently, I believe that condensing the committees will likely increase collaboration across them by making us less compartmentalized. In the shared governance process, issues are brought forward from these three basic groups, besides by the faculty at large: reps from Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and HR. Since it is the job of the policy committees to recommend policy changes/new policy, it makes sense that at the grass roots level, it is clear which policy committee is the starting point for staff and faculty working in each of these divisions. Right now, people are left to guess what constitutes an academic policy versus a graduation requirement versus a curriculum issue. Under this structure, it doesn't really matter – the Student Affairs folks (who now come to APC anyway) know where they should go and where they should send reps to voice concerns.

Moreover, as is often the case with group work, because APC has been exceedingly efficient out of necessity, when in doubt, people from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs seem to come knocking on our door in the case policy recommendations that require joint referral. At the very least, these individuals now know where to start, rather than having to worry about stepping on someone's toes. While we were very efficient last year, I suspect that the members of the committee felt somewhat steamrolled, such that issues that the members brought forward were sidelined because constituents from the Executive Committee, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs had issues that were deemed to be more pressing. I know that I felt this way. I can think of at least three instances where to me, as an individual, it really would have made sense to begin the discussion of a given proposal at another committee (indeed, in all three cases these involved committees that are to be collapsed into a single committee). I suspected, and in fact was even told in one instance, that APC was the place to start because we were able to get policies sent forward to the Faculty Senate in a timely manner.

Finally, the report recommended the establishment of a new subcommittee to be housed under the new Student Affairs Committee. Per the Faculty Senate's charge in FS11-60, I expect that the Select Committee will be drafting a charge for said subcommittee. In the interest of strengthening support for the Select Committee's recommended language, it might be useful to send said draft to the existing Academic Policies Committee for suggestions and endorsement. I realize this may slow things down a bit, but it might shut down such a suggestion from the floor. After the discussion that played out last spring, I am disappointed by the tactics being employed to block even the consideration of productive changes. So, if there is anything that I can do, or that the APC can do to keep the discussion on point, we are glad to assist. I should also mention that I think the establishment of this committee is necessary in any case, but it is something that I will be against housing within APC unless the policy committees are reorganized at the higher level. The APC simply cannot take on the work of another subcommittee within the current structure.

Please note, the comments above are my own personal opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the individual committee members or the committee as a whole.

September 2, 2010

Hi Janet, I was the Chair of the Academic Policy sub-committee. Sorry this is a little late. I have no objection to the re-organization.

Mark A. Rodriguez
Associate Professor
Department of Teacher Education
California State University, Sacramento 95819
916-278-4084
Eureka Hall 218

September 8, 2011 (Tony Sheppard)

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE

SENATE STRUCTURE: COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND EXECUTIVE STATUS

SENATE CHAIR FEEDBACK, AS REQUESTED

(Typed on an iPad, on a plane - so apologies in advance for errors!)

_____

Membership on the Executive Committee (Exec)

In the context of the question regarding Exec membership of Standing Policy Committee Chairs, to some extend I think we are pondering how best to fix a problem that doesn't exist. But this is perhaps best considered in multiple steps.

Size of the Exec

Part of the basic question is what is the ideal size for the Exec. But even this is a two-part question as both the total size of the Exec and also its quorum are important. For example, if one favors an Exec of seven voting members (however many others are in the room for assorted reasons), then you might typically expect a qourum of only four. For most of the year, that might work. However, at times that the Senate doesn't meet, the Exec can act on behalf of the full Senate, making decisions that are equally binding. In my opinion, the size of the quorum beomes critical, because summer meetings often struggle to make a quorum and I personally become uncomfortable when that number drops below five - even at five (when the Exec was nine) it seemed like a lot of authority in very few hands, with a vote of 3-2 (for example) within a quorum

2

of five being decisive (i.e., a decision based on only three similar votes). An Exec of seven would have a quorum of only four, and five would similarly become three. I actually find the current balance of eleven voting members and a quorum of six to work quite well.

Remember that with a State Senate rep, a student rep, the Provost, another member of the Cabinet, the Parliamentarian, the Senate Secretary, and occasional visits by Chairs of either CODE or UARTP, the number in the room is often in the high teens, before including guests interested in a specific topic. So there doesn't seem to be much of a reason to get bigger, as the actual size of the discussion group tends to include at least six more people (as listed) - and getting smaller leaves the problem of very small quorums who can take action.

So I'm going to suggest that a comfortable/successful number for the voting membership is either nine or eleven. I have seen both work well. The dynamics in the conversation in that size range is defined more by who those people are than by how many of them there are.

The Standing Policy Committee Chairs (SPCC)

The next question is whether or not the SPCC should be members and/or whether they should vote. In the past, there have been periods of time during which they have not been members and have not regularly attended meetings. The example is often given of the UARTP committee and its Chair, who is very good at reviewing agendas and attending when there is business that affects or is affected by the business of that committee. But I don't think that's either a good or a relevant model for comparison.

I think times have changed significantly and the kinds of items of business being discussed in Exec are also different. I've served in Exec multiple times and over a period of approx. eight years - certainly not as long as some. But even in that time, things have changed. There used to be more items to consider that might be described as single-issue items - items that focused on a specific topic and which often did not have broad ramifications across other areas or units. I don't think that's the case anymore - or at least not as the vast bulk of the business.

I think we now see a relative abundance of sweeping changes and budgetary constraints that cause multiple issues to cross boundaries that used to be far better defined. We also see an increase in urgency, whether real or imagined as these items arrive on the Exec's agenda with relatively little time to react, compared to the past. Items like the Graduation Initiative, SB1440, and program impaction, are the new norm not the exception - all arrived in a rush with initial responses needed urgently. And even more routine topics like curricular pressure to downsize programs, reduce opportunities and redundancies, and upsize classes for budgetary reasons have cross program and cross topic implications as we saw when we tried to implement a coherent repeat policy that worked across campus (and that continues to affect program impaction proposals). Many topics, such as the Academic Priorities document have worked their way into multiple conversations on an almost weekly basis. And effective discussion of all of these topics often does require multiple (if not always all) SPCC in the room.

To not have them present would simply delay discussions until subsequent meetings and would also risk missing scheduled meetings of those individual Policy Committees where deeper discussions are often held, with broader constituencies. In short, even if they're not voting or

members of the Exec, most of them probably need to be in the room most of the time. I am convinced that multiple pieces of business would have been slowed significantly during the last couple of years if we had not had access to that input during routine Exec meetings and without having to wait a week to summon an individual Chair, or to progress multiple referrals, perhaps resulting in a wait of another week to get somebody else's opinion on a ripple effect of some potential decision.

In my opinion, they need to be in the room currently, whether or not they have always consistently needed to be in the room in the past and whether or not they will always need to be in the room in the future (if things ever return to a sense of sustainable normalcy and/or abundant resources).

That said, if they are in the room but not voting, and based on an Exec of nine or eleven for reasons stated earlier, the total number of people in the room would most likely be twenty or more, counting regular ex-officio members but without counting irregular guests, and I believe that becomes unduly cumbersome for discussions of that type.

So, not for reasons of philosophy of representation but simply for reasons of facilitation and logistics, it seems reasonable to have them in the room and voting. They need to be there, in my opinion, as experts and conduits for that information, and to have them there as extras makes the group too large. As stated, it's purely logistical and an opinion arrived at from a somewhat backwards direction but, having seen it work that way through multiple Senates and through two sizes of Exec, I don't find much, or perhaps any, cause for change.

The Standing Policy Committees

<u>The number of committees</u>

I don't think there's a magic number of policy committees. We see significantly different structures around the system and we increased our own from four to five a few years ago, without an increase in funding, leading to a structural deficit in our own Senate Budget. However, that isn't necessarily insurmountable and consideration of this matter should not be dominated by a simple desire to reduce committees and chairships in order to save money. It would also be possible to end up with fewer parent committees but more sub-committees with charges that might justify assigned time for sub-committee chairs.

<u>The number of committees and workload</u>

I have watched the work of the existing five committees and the four that existed prior to that time. As Senate Chair, I have to track the work of all of the committees to some extent, to gauge the workflow as recommendations make their way through to the Exec. The only one I have served on directly, for multiple years, has been GE/GRPC. But I have seen that committee and several others go through periods during which their workloads have been unmanageably large, with long wait periods for policy proposals to see the light of day. Much of the sense of urgency in the call for forming the GSPC was that graduate issues rarely made it out of committee as the undergraduate issues dominated the calendars. As a graduate coordinator and department chair before that committee existed, it was extremely frustrating. As another example, the recent

update of the grade appeal policy took years to make it through committee because the committee had so much else on its plate.

In summary, APC almost always has a full plate, CPC is often as busy and is currently overloaded, FPC is probably traditionally the lightest although they are in the midst of a surge of activity, GE/GRPC is somewhat cyclical in its load depending on the GE Program review cycle - but when it gets busy it gets very busy and calls extra meetings to meet deadlines, and GSPC has gone through a busy infancy without too much ability to predict where they will be in a few years time, largely depending on whether we want logical parallel policies for grad and undergrad programs.

But, in my opinion, setting aside FPC, taking any two or three of the others and simply combining them into a super committee of some kind seems problematic - unless there is significant reallocation of charges and reporting sub-committees. Something or somebody is going to end up so overloaded that things just won't get addressed in a timely fashion. And going back to the context of short deadlines and perceived urgencies sent down by the Chancellor's Office, I don't think we have the luxury of slowing anything down. In practical terms, I think you would see a future Exec making fewer referrals to an underwater committee and simply juggling some of the workload internally, as best it could at the time.

Committee structure

That doesn't, however, mean that I don't think there could be a meaningful realignment of committees. Whereas there are frequent and increasing overlaps across academic and curricular policy issues, including GE at the undergraduate level, there are (relatively) rarely issues that perfectly and interchangeably straddle the line between undergraduate and graduate education. The curricula are different, many if not all of the policies are different, the graduation requirements are different, the expectations of performance are different etc. - some topics may be parallel, but with different scales and different parameters.

For example, a different division of responsibility would be between a parent grad committee and a parent undergrad committee, with each having parallel sub-committees (perhaps smaller at the grad level) dealing with academic, curricular, and graduation requirement topics. Obviously the undergrad committee would have to deal with GE but the grad committee has its own list of specific graduation requirements and issues in higher level writing requirements, projects, comprehensive exams, theses, and dissertations. With neither group having much practical interest in the other. An alignment like this would still see FPC on its own, serving faculty interest at all levels and in all settings.

So a realignment is certainly possible, but simply combining charges of existing policy committees seems like it would produce an unmanageable workload for some larger, combined group.

Budget

This may be a surprising comment - but the Senate has a strong relationship at this time with the administration. I think if the rationale is strong and supportable, a Senate Chair can potentially

negotiate with the Provost and President for supporting funds. Obviously not a vast increase during a time of hardship, but if the desired structure increases or decreases funding marginally, and can be reasonably expected to make the work of the Senate more effective and efficient, I think the response would be positive. And if we can't reasonably expect to achieve those outcomes, we probably shouldn't be fixing something that is currently working quite well.

Hi Janet,

The attached document includes my comments on the recommendations from the Senate Select Committee. To summarize them, I have no problem with specifics mentioned, though how to operationalize them and whether they'll have the desired effect are at the heart of my concerns. Please let me know if the Steering Committee needs further input from me. As evidenced by the GE meeting on Monday, some may be concerned about their efforts in this year's committee work because of the possibility. Any advice the Senate Select Committee would have for me, or can do, to mitigate those concerns would be great appreciated.
   Thank you,
rp

DATE: September 21, 2011
TO: Janet Hecsh, Vice Chair Faculty Senate
FROM: Reza Peigahi, Chair General Education/Graduation Requirements Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Senate Select Committee Final Report and Proposals for Action

In regard to recommendation one: *The Select Committee recommends amendment of the Faculty Constitution to provide that chairs of certain policy committees of the Faculty Senate (as specified in the committee's charge) shall henceforth be ex-officio non-voting members of the Senate, unless serving simultaneously as a member for a department or other electing unit as defined in the Faculty Constitution.*
I agree with the Select Committee. This is a reasonable suggestion and one that the rationale provided supports.
In regard to recommendation two: *The Select Committee recommends retaining the Chairs of certain Senate policy committees as ex-officio voting members of the Senate's Executive Committee to be selected annually in the manner currently specified in the Senate's By-Laws.*
I agree with the Select Committee. Withdrawing the vote of Committee Chairs does not enhance the work of the Executive Committee. Instead the removal of voting rights potentially complicates that work when division arises.
In regard to recommendation three: *The Select Committee recommends that the Senate's By-Laws and the charges of the Senate's Policy Committees be amended to reorganize the Senate's committees into three policy committees to be styled (1) the Academic Affairs Policies Committee, (2) the Student Affairs Policies Committee and (3) the Faculty Affairs Policies Committee and to group the several working committees or subcommittees currently reporting to a Senate standing committee under one or another of the three new policies committees in keeping with the subject matter of each.*
I agree with hesitation.
I do not agree with the rationale that "… size of the Executive Committee itself which some believe often leads to unduly prolonged discussion of relatively inconsequential matters…" A plurality of voices and perspectives is often needed to discuss matters and to anticipate issues that may arise in the Senate body as legislation moves forward. The complaint this addresses I don't perceive to

be an external (i.e. Senate) but internal (i.e. Executive Committee) issue and the Chair has mechanisms to move discussions towards a needed end-point as the facilitator of the meeting. In addition, while each Senate Committee has "partial and…incomplete jurisdiction over the curriculum of the University" this could be seen as a checks and balances approach to the curriculum of the University. I don't see that combining the work of curriculum-related committees compels efficiency or oversight. An alternative, which has been broached in some circles, would be to split the curriculum-related committees into an Undergraduate Committee and Graduate Committee. This seems a reasonable solution in relation to content areas and could still fall under a proposed Curriculum Committee with Graduate and Undergraduate being subcommittees.

In relation to the fourth concern; structural deficits of the Senate were created when a fifth committee (Graduate Studies Policy Committee) was formed. While budgets are a justifiable concern, proposals were made by an ad hoc advisory committee and presented to the Senate (FS 10-63/Ex. SENATE BUDGET AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE - REPORT, RECEIPT OF http://www.csus.edu/acse/09-10_actions.htm#FS%2010-63) that could address some of the budgetary concerns.

I want to be clear on this: I do not oppose Senate Reform. I do not oppose the elimination of some existing policy committees (even the one I currently chair). I have reservations that the proposal as stated achieves the goals of Senate Select Committee. I understand conceptually what is being sought, but I don't see, in real terms, how they will create efficiencies, foster consultation, tie the Executive Committee to Senate, or inform Senators of the work of the Standing Policy Committees.

Hi Janet,

Following up on the email forwarded by Cheryl re committee charges, as you know the GE/GRPC has asked the subcommittee to examine its current charge and make changes as needed. I expect this will have no effect on the higher-level discussion concerning the number and nature of Senate standing committees.

Beth

Elizabeth Strasser, Ph.D.
Professor   Dept. of Anthropology   CSUS   6000 J Street   Sacramento, CA   95819-6106   Office: 916-278-5446   Fax: 916-278-6339

Sept 21, 2011

September 13, 2011
Dear Members of the Senate Select Committee,
        The Graduate Studies Policies Committee (GSPC) appreciates the opportunity to comment regarding the proposed reorganization of Senate committee structure and the report on which it is based. The Committee offers comments on three fronts: discussion of the Select Committee's recommendation for Senate restructuring as it relates to graduate programs; feedback regarding conclusions in the Select Committee report; and GSPC's recommendations for Senate

restructuring. As an overview then, GSPC will remark on 1) the overall rationale for restructuring vis a vis graduate programs, 2) the report upon which the recommendations to restructure are based, and 3) recommendations for a different configuration based on the overall rationale and the data/conclusions of the report.

Recommendation for Senate Restructuring

A critical point to consider is the changing shape of the CSU mission. The recent addition of two more doctoral programs to the CSU system (DPT and DNP) to accompany the already existing Ed.D. required a legislative change at the state level. The DPT degree is in the development phase, and CSUS is the inaugural campus to receive approval to offer the degree. Additionally, DNP programs are being run on several CSU campuses, and Sacramento State may be joining those ranks. Now that these changes to the master plan have been enacted, there is currently at least one other doctoral program garnering support within its professional community, the state, and the CSU system for its creation that has the potential to affect Sacramento State: the Doctor of Audiology (AuD). It is not necessary to delineate the history of, nor the work towards development of these programs in this document, but it is necessary that the Senate Select Committee acknowledge this alteration to the charge of the California State Universities. One of the reasons for the impending visit of WASC to the Sacramento State campus is that the Commission wishes specifically to ascertain whether or not there is the development of a doctoral culture on our campus that is capable of guiding the success of the Ed.D., and by extension, the DPT, as well as future doctorates that might be offered in Nursing and/or Audiology. Given that governance structures are one indicator of a doctoral culture, this impending investigation by WASC does not support the formation of a single Senate committee that looks at '*all things curricular*', but rather the understanding by the Senate of the notion that graduate education has specific and unique requirements.

Moreover, qualitatively, a case can be made that GSPC has shaped campus policy in significant ways beyond graduate policies. Beyond providing essential feedback on the entire Instructional Program Priorities document, the precursors to that legislation (FS 09-83 and FS 10-11) uncovered significant problems with overarching campus policy dating back to 1991. Undeniably, though, several more recent Senate actions have charted new territory in doctoral program policy, and those new policies would not have been possible without the sustained focus and extensive collaboration of faculty who are specialists in graduate programs. The challenges

and lessons of our campus' experiences in inaugurating the Ed.D. program, when such efforts were ad hoc, were the impetus for the creation of GSPC. Prior to those ad hoc efforts, a subcommittee of CPC was charged with considering graduate matters, but that subcommittee was disbanded during a previous Senate reorganization. The GSPC was then reconstituted as a standing policy committee based on the recommendations of the ad hoc working group that was the driving force behind the launch of the Ed.D., and based on the establishment of the Graduate Advisory Council (GAC), which is not a Senate committee and thus has no policy making purview. In other words, a key reason for the existence of GSPC is because the prior Senate structure was incapable of properly shepherding master's and doctoral program policies, and ad hoc efforts to fill that void strained the faculty. The Select Committee report recommends that the Senate should return to such a state of affairs, and yet it seems to have reached that conclusion without acknowledging the changes to the mission of the CSU or the contributions of GSPC.

Given the certain growth of doctoral programs offered within the CSU system, graduate policy should not rely on the GAC or on potential subcommittees of the proposed AAPC. Graduate programs and degrees are, increasingly, entry level for many professions. Graduate oversight, with the addition of doctoral programs and the raising of the WASC accreditation requirements that accompany them, will require a higher profile within the Executive Committee's and the Senate's consideration, not lower. Even the statewide Academic Senate is considering a proposal to develop the rough equivalent of GSPC, a doctoral oversight committee to monitor and make recommendations regarding similarities and differences among and between the various graduate degree offerings. With more attention to graduate programs being recognized as necessary, even at the statewide level, the CSUS GSPC should not be subsumed in an overarching committee with an overflowing plate of demands on its time and its members, and a membership that will not be assured to be specialists in graduate matters. If it is assumed that the proposed AAPC might "farm out" graduate issues by virtue of a subcommittee structure, it is illogical to assume that a subcommittee would work faster and more efficiently within a larger committee structure. There is a time lag inherent in such an arrangement when a subcommittee must present its work to the larger body at a general meeting. Thus, GSPC believes the most efficient way to ensure the necessary oversight of graduate programs and policies is to maintain a structure that situates specialists in graduate programs so they are in a position to review and propose policy, maintain quality, and promote a graduate/doctoral culture on our campus.

<u>Feedback on the Report</u>

There are several conclusions reached by the report which GSPC believes should be interrogated. The first relates to supposed delays and inefficiencies in current Senate structures. The report states:

> To the extent that curricular matters are not neatly confined to the jurisdiction of a single committee, consultation among the committees or sequential action by them becomes necessary. The delay or delays in bringing such matters to the Senate occasioned by the need to consult or coordinate the action of several committees dealing with the same problem is thought to introduce an inefficiency or inefficiencies into the deliberations of the Senate that, the Select Committee believes, is curable . . . .

While it might seem intuitive that simultaneous or concurrent committee deliberation slows the progress of legislation, no evidence is offered in the report for this conclusion. Without such evidence, GSPC wonders if, on this particular matter, the "cure" is a solution in search of a problem. Indeed, there is evidence suggesting delays and inefficiencies are *not* a problem, since FS 11-15 (legislation on Second Bachelor's Degree Requirements) was forwarded for Senate action in a timely manner with unanimous votes of the membership of both the Academic Policies Committee (APC) and GSPC. Moreover, GSPC believes having both committees collaborate on the legislation improved its quality! The legislation benefitted by having specialists consider both the undergraduate (APC) and graduate (GSPC) implications of the policy change. It is also worth noting that in the last two years GE/GRPC and CPC co-sponsored two pieces of legislation: FS 09-71 and FS 10-70. Thus, the supposed inefficiencies of the current structure are not documented, and counter-documentation seems to suggest cross-committee collaboration has produced legislation in a timely manner that may be superior in quality to work done by a single committee.

Another conclusion reached by the report has to do with committee workload. There are several specific references made to inequitable workload and each reference singles out APC as inordinately overworked in comparison to the other four policy committees. The report notes: "As the Select Committee has been given to understand, something to do with this committee's charge arises at nearly every Executive Committee meeting and thus its workload is seen to be relatively heavier that (sic) that of other senate committees with seats on the Executive Committee." After another such reference to "the inequitable distribution of workload among the several standing committees," the report concludes:

As noted above, the Select Committee has found the workload of the current Academic Policies Committee to be disproportionately large simply because many policy questions raised by new or revised executive orders about grades, repeating courses, admissions standards and campus discipline require careful answering following often prolonged study and deliberation. . . . As currently constituted and charged the Committee functions efficiently and effectively . . . .

In the view of the GSPC, if "Academic Policies Committee" was changed to "Graduate Studies Policies Committee" and "campus discipline" was changed to "doctoral programs," the conclusions of the report would still be accurate and justified. The APC is not alone regarding the weight of its calendar. But again, data are not provided to substantiate the conclusions regarding workload in the report. To be sure, there are qualifiers attached to the claim (e.g., "As the Select Committee has been given to understand,"), but no concrete data beyond anecdote are offered.

Data is available, however. Appended at the end of this memo is a list of Senate actions and their committee of origin. The list dates to Spring 2009, when GSPC was inaugurated. APC is listed first with 12 items of business. However, two of those items of business relate to academic calendars, and the proposed reorganization removes that responsibility from APC. Also, one of the items of business was a joint action with GSPC, as discussed earlier. Functionally then, APC has had 9 pieces of legislation in front of the Senate in the last two years. GSPC, according to the list, had 10 pieces of legislation, not including FS 11-15 (concurrent with APC). Moreover, also excluded from the list is copious feedback to the Executive Committee on the Instructional Program Priorities document. GSPC was the only policy committee to offer meaningful and extensive amendments to drafts of the document over the course of several months. Returning to the list of Senate actions, the three remaining policy committees (CPC, GE/GRPC, and FPC) had 6 items of business each.

Quantitatively then, the reports' conclusions about APC's disproportionate workload are not sustained. One could argue, however, that both APC and GSPC were far more productive in terms of producing legislation than the other 3 policy committees, so perhaps the conclusion could be amended to acknowledge that fact.

The newly constituted AAPC would simply subsume the charges of GSPC, CPC and GE/GRPC, and presumably the same kinds of legislation as have been produced by these committees in the past could still reach the Senate. Such an assumption denies facts. Consulting the appended list and redistributing the items of business according to the proposed restructuring

reveals the new structure would create a <u>massive</u> workload imbalance. Accounting for adjustments in purview (e.g., shifting the academic calendar), and not "double-counting" (e.g, co-sponsored legislation), the new AAPC would have produced 20 items of business, the new SPC would have produced 9, and the new FCP would have produced 8. Unless the charge of the new AAPC will include weekly meetings rather than bi-monthly meetings, it is difficult to imagine how one committee will be able to produce twice as much legislation as the other two, whose charges in the new configuration are virtually unchanged.

Since workload imbalance in the current structure is a cornerstone of the report, it bears noting that simply combining CPC and GE/GR achieves the desired end. Adjusting for the two pieces of co-authored legislation, the two committees produced 10 pieces of business combined. Additionally, the track record of co-authorship between them reveals at least some measure of overlap, which is acknowledged in the recommendation that AAPC subsume them.

In justifying the formation of AAPC, the report notes, "By assigning the work of the several committees to one with a comprehensive jurisdiction over all matters curricular, one makes possible a more efficient consideration of a curriculum proposal from each point of view now isolated from the others in a separate committee." However, this argument does not acknowledge two realities: First, there are many issues related to graduate policies addressed by GSPC that are not related to curricula, such as academic policies (e.g., definition of good standing) and faculty policies (e.g., TA/GA/ISA issues, and awards programs); second, graduate policies (even curricular ones) are unique as compared to undergraduate policies, and need to be crafted and reviewed by specialists—a committee of them, not just a few who might *happen* to be appointed to serve on an overarching committee.

 GSPC Recommendations
In sum, having offered an analysis of the Select Committee report, GSPC concludes the following:
1) Need for GSPC
    a. There has been a change in the mission of the CSU system to include doctoral programs, 2 of which reside on the CSUS campus, and 2 others of which are on the horizon.
    b. The changing and expanding mission of the CSU with respect to doctoral programs, and the requirement by WASC to document the institution's doctoral culture, mandate careful and sustained attention to graduate policies.
    c. Senate history supports the need for the GSPC.
2) The purview of GSPC is not confined to curricula; academic and faculty policies as they relate to graduate students are also germane.

a. The Select Committee seeks a "comprehensive jurisdiction over all matters curricular," which makes sense as it relates to CPC and GE/GRPC, but does not acknowledge the special (often legislative) requirements of doctoral, master's, and credential programs.
   b. GSPC spans boundaries; its issues are not confined to curricula.
3) Data indicate that assertions about delays and inefficiencies attributed to the current Faculty Senate structure are not supported; to the contrary, cross-committee collaboration has worked, resulting in higher quality legislation.
4) Data indicate that assertions about inequitable workload are only partially sustained: APC did not outpace GSPC, but both committees eclipsed GE/GRPC, CPC and FPC.
5) Data also indicate that redistributing the legislative output to mirror the proposed Select Committee structure reveals an unworkable solution: AAPC would have authored 20 pieces of legislation, SPC would have produced 9, and FPC would have been responsible for 8.
   a. Unless AAPC meets weekly, it seems impossible for the legislative needs of undergraduate and graduate programs combined to be met by a single committee.
   b. Using a subcommittee structure would still serve to delay and make more inefficient the disposition of policies and other business of the AAPC.
6) Sought-after efficiencies of Senate structure may be possible by combining GE/GRPC and CPC
   a. The committees already co-sponsor legislation.
   b. Combined, the output of the two is roughly equivalent to the other four committees (if FPC assumes the Academic Calendar).
7) The new Senate structure could be comprised of a Faculty Affairs Policies Committee, a Student Affairs Policies Committee, an Academic Affairs Policies Committee, and a Graduate Affairs Policies Committee.
   a. Consistent with the philosophy that Senate structure should mirror University structure, the Division of Graduate Studies currently has close working relationships with Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Faculty Affairs, yet it is still a separate division.
   b. Such a structure balances Senate workload and achieves some resource savings.

Respectfully submitted by the GSPC

Resolutions by Committee as of Spring 2009

APC

   1) FS 09-09A/APC/Ex   Academic Calendars, 10/11 & 11/12   3/12/09
   2) FS 10-18/APC/Ex   Student Grade Appeal Process, amendment of 3/18/10
   3) FS 10-48/APC/Ex   Student Grade Policy, amendment of 4/22/10

4) FS 10-48A/APC/Ex   Academic Honesty Policy, amendment of 4/22/10
5) FS 10-55/APC/Ex   Incomplete Policy, Clarification and alignment with executive order 1037 (5/13/10)
6) FS 10-60/APC/Ex   W (Withdrawal) & WU (Withdrawal Unauthorized) Policy   (5/13/10)
7) FS 10-106/APC/Ex   Incomplete Grades-Graduating Seniors 12/02/10
8) FS 10-109/APC/Ex   Mandatory Transfer Orientation 12/16/11
9) FS 11-15/APC/Ex   Second Bachelor's Degree Requirements 2/24/11
10) FS 11-16/APC/Ex   Supplemental Admissions Criteria   3/03/11
11) FS 11-48/APC/Ex   Early Registration Maximum Unit Load 4/21/11
12) FS 11-49/APC/Ex   Academic Calendar: 2012-13 5/05/11

GSPC

1) FS 09-25/GSPC/Ex   Graduate Student Loan Deferment Policy 4/23/09
2) FS 09-58/GSPC/Ex   Graduation Writing Assessment (GWAR) for graduate students (10/01/09)
3) FS 09-59/GSPC/Ex   Writing Placement for Graduate Students (WPG) Equivalency Standards (10/01/09)
4) FS 09-83/GSPC/Ex   Criteria for Reduction or Suspension of Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Programs (12/17/09)
5) FS 10-11/GSPC/Ex   Application of a point system to criteria for reduction or suspension of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs (2/18/10)
6) FS 10-35/GSPC/Ex   Good Standing for Graduate Students of, definition of (5/20/10)
7) FS 10-110/GSPC/Ex Doctoral Programs, Policies and Procedures for, amendment of 12/16/10
8) FS 11-27/GSPC/Ex Doctorate in Physical Therapy (4/7/11)
9) FS 11-54/GSPC/Ex Assignment of "C" Grades in Graduate Programs (5/12/11)
10) FS 11-58/GSPC/Ex Doctoral Categories (5/12/11)

CPC

1) FS 09-33/CPC/Ex   Extension of Program Review Pilot Program 5/07/09
2) FS 09-71/CPC/GE/GRPC Writing Intensive Course – passing grade 11/05/09
3) FS 09-78/CPC/Ex   E-Learning Policy, amendment of   02/11/10
4) FS 10-56/CPC/Ex   New & Substantively Changed Programs, Moratorium on, Academic Year 2010-2011 (5/13/10)
5) FS 10-70/GE/GRPC/CPC G.E. Pilot   9/30/10
6) FS 11-51/CPC/Ex   Program Review Pilot Study Extension 4/28/11

GE/GRPC
1) FS 09-29/GE/GRPC/Ex   G.E. Program Review – GE/GRPC Program Review
   Response (4/23/09)
2) FS 09-40/GE/GRPC/Ex   G.E. Program Review Recommendations-Assessments
   (5/07/09)
3) FS 09-40/GE/GRPC/Ex   G.E. Program Review Recommendations-reduction of
   courses accepted as satisfying GE Requirements (5/14/09)
4) FS 09-71/CPC/GE/GRPC Writing Intensive Course – passing grade   11/05/09
5) FS 09-74/GE/GRPC Baccalaureate Learning Goals   11/19/09
6) FS 10-70/GE/GRPC/CPC G.E. Pilot   9/30/10

FPC
1) FS 09-70/FPC/Ex   Outstanding Teaching, University Service and Community
   Service Award, Inclusion of Scholarly and Creative Activity (11/05/09
2) FS 10-04/FPC/Ex   Religious Observance Policy (2/18/10)
3) FS 10-43/FPC/Ex   Faculty Awards   (4/29/10)
4) FS 10-04/FPC/Ex   Religious Observance Policy (5/06/10)
5) FS 10-115/FPC/Ex   Faculty Responsibilities and Professional ethics, addendum to
   (12/16/10)
6) FS 11-43/FPC/Ex   Outstanding Faculty Awards, amendment of (5/5/11)

(9/23) Dear Janet,

I hope this reaches you in time. I've reviewed the draft and, from my point of view as chair of
PROC, agree entirely. It would be helpful for us to be reporting to the Academic Affairs Policies
Committee with its charges to include issues involving graduate studies and GE/GR. This is the
normal mix for our work in program review.

Thank you very much for your efforts, and all the best to you and the committee.

Jeffrey

Jeffrey Brodd, PhD
Chair, Department of Humanities & Religious Studies
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6083

(9/22) Hi Janet,

Here are some responses from individual FPC members. Some are conceptual in nature, others deal with language.

a) Page 1, Sec 1 – The Statement "The Select Committee recommends amendment of the Faculty Constitution to provide that chairs of certain policy committees of the Faculty Senate..." At this point, the committees should be listed by name for clarification.

b) Page 2, Sec 2 – The Select Committee recommends retaining the Chairs of certain Senate policy committees as ex-officio voting members of the Senate's Executive Committee to be selected annually in the manner currently specified in the Senate's By-Laws." – I am not sure I agree with the logic of taking the vote away from the Committee Chairs in the Senate (where their vote should have less influence, as the Senate is a much larger group) but retaining their vote in the much smaller Exec Committee (where they would have more influence) since the stated reason their vote is being taken away in the Senate is because they were not elected by department in the first place and weren't therefore representing their department. Perhaps we can discuss this at the meeting.

c) Page 3, Sec 3 – The reference to reorganizing the "Senate's Committees" should again be followed by a listing of these committees by name.

d) Page 4, 3rd paragraph – There is a mention of a "fifth committee." I have no idea which committee they are talking about.

e) Page 6, Sec 6 – Should Academic Policies Committee now be Academic Affairs Policies Committee?

f) Page 7, Sec 9 – Should the Committee on Professional Leave be included here?

g) Page 8, End of the big paragraph – This last sentence is unduly wordy and unclear

h) The new Academic Affairs Committee seems like it will have a lot of work relative to the others.

Jana

Jana Noel, Ph.D.
Provost's Fellow for Community and Civic Engagement
Professor, Department of Teacher Education
California State University, Sacramento
noelj@csus.edu
916-278-5514