

Marcia Woolf

From: Marcia Woolf
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2003 12:32 PM
To: Zulmara Cline; Ann Fiegen; Carmen Nava; Glen Brodowsky; Jack Leu; Jacqueline Trischman; Janet Powell; John R (Dick) Montanari; Katherine Hayden; Marcy Boyle; Mtafiti Imara; Patty Seleski; Richard Serpe; Robert Sheath; Roy McTarnaghan; Susie Quon; Valerie Callanan
Subject: EC: NEAC Referral -- List of items to be considered

Dear members of the Executive Committee,

At your request, I am providing a list of the items discussed yesterday to be included in a referral to NEAC. The issues I recorded are:

- 1) ways to encourage people to fulfill their committee duties once appointed/elected, and to volunteer for vacant seats;
- 2) whether/how to evaluate committee service and where to direct such an evaluation;
- 3) whether the representation structure should be revisited, given the number of committees and the number of faculty available to serve; and
- 4) whether to develop a mechanism for unseating committee members.

It is expected that the EC will take action on this item at the 12/3 meeting. Please bring any suggested amendments to the meeting, or forward them to the Chair or myself if you are unable to attend (<mailto:montanri@csusm.edu>; <mailto:mwoolf@csusm.edu>).

Thank you.

Marcia
Marcia Woolf
Academic Senate Coordinator
CSU San Marcos
San Marcos CA 92096
760-750-4058/fax 760-750-3041
www.csusm.edu/academic_senate/

RANGE ELEVATION POLICY FOR TEMPORARY UNIT 3 EMPLOYEES

PROCEDURE

Implementation Date: 01/01/03

Revised: 00/00/00

1 Purpose

2
3 This policy describes the intent and procedures involved in range elevation for temporary faculty
4 (part time or full time). Range elevation is an increase in salary subject to meeting the criteria
5 defined below.¹

6 Eligibility

7
8
9 Temporary faculty who are eligible for range elevation shall be limited to those who have served
10 at least five calendar years, not necessarily consecutive, in their current range and are not eligible
11 for additional Service Salary Increases in their current range. The one exception to the five-year
12 eligibility criterion is if an employee attains a higher degree appropriate to her/his work
13 assignment before completing five years of service.

14 Criteria

15
16
17 To be considered for range elevation under this policy, an applicant shall:

18
19 Attain a higher degree appropriate to her/his work assignment;

20
21 OR

22
23 1) Hold additional accreditation or suitable professional experience or present evidence of
24 professional development in her/his field appropriate for her/his work assignment(s); and 2)
25 present evidence of excellence in teaching and/or professional duties; and 3) present evidence
26 of sustained contribution to the instructional mission of the University.

27
28 Longevity alone is an insufficient basis for range elevation.

29
30 Examples of contributions to the instructional mission of the University include, but are not
31 limited to: 1) activities enhancing the effective teaching of the discipline; 2) research and/or
32 creative activity involving the campus or the community; and 3) contributions to improving the
33 learning climate of the University. Evidence of sustained contributions in any one of these areas
34 would be sufficient to meet this requirement.

35 Application

36
37
38 A temporary faculty member who wishes to be considered for range elevation shall provide the
39 following materials:

¹ This policy is mandated by language in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 12) stipulating that each CSU campus establish appropriate range elevation procedures.

- 40 1) Memorandum stating the applicant's request
41 2) Current vitae
42 3) a) Faculty with teaching assignments:
43 Documentation supporting excellence in teaching, including the following:
44 i) List of all courses taught over the past 5 academic years
45 ii) Assigned grade distribution and summary of student evaluation of teaching
46 for all courses taught in the last academic year and at least one course per
47 academic year for the previous 5 academic years.
48 iii) Narrative describing teaching philosophy and development as a teacher over
49 the past 5 years (2 pages maximum).
50
51 b) Faculty with non-instructional assignments:
52 Documentation supporting excellence in professional duties, including the
53 following:
54 i) Job description
55 ii) List of professional development activities
56 iii) Narrative describing development as a professional over the past 5 years (2
57 pages maximum).
58

59 Procedures

- 60
61 1. The deadline for application is on or before October 15.
62
63 2. Applications shall be submitted to the appropriate Center Director/Program
64 Director/Department Chair with a copy to the Dean. Where departments, programs, or
65 centers do not exist, the employee shall submit the application directly to the Dean. The
66 Director/Chair shall make his/her recommendation, and forward both the application and
67 the recommendation to the Dean no later than November 15. The Director/Chair shall
68 provide the applicant with a copy of the recommendation. The applicant may submit a
69 rebuttal to the Dean no later than November 22.
70
71 3. The Dean shall provide written notification to the applicant of the decision no later than
72 December 5. The award will become effective the first semester after the final decision.
73
74 4. Denial of range elevations shall be subject to the peer review process. If a temporary
75 faculty member wishes to appeal a negative decision, he/she should submit in writing the
76 rationale of the appeal. The President will then establish a panel, within the unit,
77 consisting of all full-time tenured employees who have served on committees that made
78 recommendations on matters of appointment, reappointment, promotion or tenure and
79 who have attained the rank of full professor or equivalent. The membership of the Range
80 Elevation Appeals Committee shall be selected by lot from that panel and will consist of
81 three members and one alternate.
82 Appeals shall be submitted to the Office of Academic Resources by December 15. The
83 temporary faculty member will be notified of the decision by February 15. Pursuant to
84 CBA Article 12, the Range Elevation Appeals Committee decision is final.
85

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE**

Resolution in Response to the Withdrawal of Professor Susan Meisenhelder's Nomination to the CSU Board of Trustees

The following is a response to Chancellor Charles Reed's perceived interference with Professor Susan Meisenhelder's nomination to the California State University's Board of Trustees.

WHEREAS, the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 stipulated that among its other duties, the CSU Board of Trustees was to appoint the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors for the CSU system, but did not offer a reciprocal arrangement (i.e., that a Chancellor choose his/her own Trustees); and

WHEREAS, Section 66607 of the California Education Code stipulates that "The California State University shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Trustees and in the administration of its affairs"; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Reed's outspoken personal criticisms of Professor Meisenhelder violates spirit and letter of Section 66607 of the California Education Code; and

WHEREAS, the Chancellor's attempt to unduly influence the appointment of a Trustee effectively negates the principles of shared governance upon which the CSU system works and implies that membership in the faculty union carries grave professional consequences in the CSU system; and

WHEREAS, in response to the Chancellor's stated concerns that her current position as a member of the California Faculty Association's political action and legislative committees would lead to a conflict of interest were she appointed to the Board of Trustees, Professor Meisenhelder offered to recuse herself from the CSU bargaining committee; and

WHEREAS, in response to Professor Meisenhelder's offer, the Chancellor's office continued its campaign of personal criticism, with CSU Spokesperson Clara Potes-Fellow saying that Meisenhelder had "used her position to discredit the university" and implying that Meisenhelder was not a friend of the university (*San Bernardino County Sun* 7 Nov 2003); and

WHEREAS, as the recipient of three Fulbright Fellowships and as a leader of projects and organizations such as the Inland Area Writing Project, the California Faculty Association, and the American Association of University Professors, Professor Meisenhelder has earned the respect of her colleagues at both state and national levels; and

WHEREAS, in over two decades of service to the CSU system, Professor Meisenhelder has worked tirelessly as an educator, scholar, and advocate for students and faculty, most recently through her four-year tenure as statewide president of the California Faculty Association; be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of the California State University, San Bernardino condemn the withdrawal of Susan Meisenhelder's nomination to the CSU Board of Trustees; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of the California State University, San Bernardino object to Chancellor Reed's perceived interference in the Trustee selection process; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the CSUSB Faculty Senate express its appreciation to Professor Meisenhelder for her exemplary commitment to the CSU system and its acknowledgment that she is, in fact, a great "friend of the university"; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of California State University, San Bernardino forward this resolution to the CSU Academic Senate, the Chancellor's Office, the Board of Trustees, the Governor's Office, and academic senates throughout the CSU system.




Received

NOV 10 2003

**CSUSM
Academic Senate**

Date: 6 November 2003

To: Executive Committee
CSUSM Academic Senate

From: Richard Karas, Chair 
Student Grade Appeals Committee

Subject: Annual Report on Student Grade Appeals, AY 2002-2003

Summary of AY 2002-2003 Student Grade Appeals

During AY 2002-2003, the Student Grade Appeals Committee received 10 appeals. Appeals came from all three colleges:

College	Number
Arts and Sciences	5
Education	1
Business Administration	4

According to the CSUSM *Student Grade Appeals Policy and Procedure*, students may file grade appeals on the following bases:

- An instructor refuses to (or cannot) assign a grade
- The instructor is not available to review possible computational error.
- The student believes the grade assigned is inequitable or capricious, unreflective of course performance, or inconsistent with other grade assignments in the course.

All of the student appellants in AY 2002-2003 claimed the last of these as the basis for their appeals.

Student appellants did not prevail in any of the appeals filed. Three cases were rejected on technical grounds (e.g., the student failed to file in a timely fashion, based his or her appeal on grounds not permitted under the *Policy and Procedure*, or sought a remedy beyond the powers granted to the SGAC). The remaining seven appeals were reviewed by the Committee - in each case the Committee found that the evidence did not sufficiently support the students' claim to merit a change of grade.

While most grade appeals were easily decided, a few were not. In the narrowly decided cases, two opposing factors weighed heavily: (a) the student did not fully understand the Policy and Procedures - he or she did not effectively argue and document his or her claims, and (b) the instructor had either neglected to keep thorough, accurate records or had departed from the course syllabus and had done a marginal job of adequately and promptly notifying all students in the class. In these cases, the "Presumption" provision of the *Policy and Procedure* dictated that the Committee must find in favor of the instructor.

Analysis and Suggestions

A student's filing of a formal appeal against a grade he or she has assigned is a troubling, unpleasant experience for any instructor. Responding to the appeal and participating in the appeal process demands time, patience, and diligence.

Faculty members can take steps to lessen the likelihood of grade appeals arising in their classes by:

- Publishing a clear syllabus and following the *Policy and Procedure* it specifies. [It is worth noting that exceptions to the syllabus granted by instructors (e.g., letting a student turn in an assignment after its deadline) have frequently been the basis for grade appeals (inequitable treatment).]
- If circumstances dictate that the instructor must depart from the syllabus specifications, precisely defining the departure(s) and distributing and discussing them in a timely manner with all members of the class.
- Keeping timely, accurate records of students' work and informing students of the grades on the work they submit, as promptly as possible.

As currently written, the *Student Grade Appeals Policy and Procedure* is difficult to apply and its implementation, particularly during the period leading up to the filing of a grade appeal, appears to disadvantage students:

- Most of the language covering Informal Resolution is written in permissive language ("should") instead of mandatory language ("shall" or "must"). As a result, it is rarely clear whether or not the student has, in fact, complete the informal process.
- Students either cannot or choose not to avail themselves of competent advice and assistance in preparing their Formal Notice of Student Grade Appeal.
- Faculty, staff, and administrators involved in the grade appeal process at the informal and formal stages of the process sometimes lack knowledge of and experience with the provisions of the *Policy and Procedure* - there have been instances in which individuals gave poor advice or took inappropriate actions.
- The Formal Notice of Student Grade Appeal provides neither an effective means for the stating the basis of a student's appeal nor adequate guidance and structure for arguing and documenting his or her claims.

Recommendation: Revise the *Policy and Procedure*

In view of the challenges posed by the current *Policy and Procedure*, the Student Grade Appeals Committee respectfully requests that the Academic Senate, in consultation with appropriate administrators and student organizations, consider adopting a revised version that addresses the problems cited above. A copy of the draft is attached.

c: President Roy McTarnaghan
Provost Robert Sheath
Vice President Francine Martinez
ASI President Honey Folk

attch: *Student Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure – Draft Revision*

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

4

AS-2628-03/FA
November 13-14, 2003

2003-04 Supplemental Report Language

Passed
11/14/03

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU)
2 reaffirm its commitment to primacy of high quality instruction in
3 academic programs as the fundamental mission of the CSU; and be it
4 further
- 5
6 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that the California Legislature
7 has adopted *2003-2004 Supplemental Report Language*; and be it further
- 8
9 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage the CSU administration to
10 implement these budgetary principles and reporting procedures on a
11 systemwide level, and direct local administrators to follow these
12 principles and procedures on individual campuses; and be it further
- 13
14 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU transmit copies of this resolution to the
15 Chancellor of the CSU, campus presidents and chairs of campus
16 academic senates.
- 17
18 RATIONALE: To protect, to the greatest extent possible, the CSU's
19 primary educational mission of undergraduate and graduate instruction,

1 the *2003-2004 Supplemental Report Language* sets important principles and
2 guidelines for the CSU administration to follow. The Chancellor's Office
3 has already accepted these principles, and has agreed to the reporting
4 procedures set by the legislature.

5
6 Since these principles will have to be implemented by campus
7 administrators, their commitment to these principles and the reporting
8 process is essential in successful implementation of the document.

9

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

5

AS-2629-03/FGA
November 13-14, 2003

Passed
EC

Privacy and Right to Read

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge
2 Congress to move expeditiously to correct defects in the U.S.A. Patriot
3 Act which threaten the civil liberties of students and faculty who use
4 libraries and computers. Specifically, we recommend passage of
5 HR.1157: "Freedom to Read Protection Act," and S.436: "Domestic
6 Surveillance Oversight Act." (Attached)
7

8 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU support the resolution of the California
9 Library Association in Support of User Privacy and Freedom of
10 Information (Feb. 12, 2003—attached) and the resolution of the
11 American Library Association entitled "On the U.S. Patriot Act and
12 Related Measures that Infringe on the Rights of Library Users."
13 (Attached)
14

15 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU forward this resolution to the CSU
16 campus academic senates, the California congressional delegation, and
17 California's two U.S. Senators.

18

19

RATIONALE: The U.S.A. Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act

20

have been interpreted by the Attorney General in a manner that many

21

believe allows investigators to violate First and Fourth Amendment

22

rights of library users. Since our democratic republic is premised on an

23

educated public, the right to read should be sacrosanct.

24

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

8

AS-2632-03/FGA/AA
November 13-14, 2003

Enrollment, Budget and Educational Quality in the CSU

*Passed
EC*

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU)
2 reaffirm its support of the principles contained in its unanimously
3 adopted resolution AS-2612, *Recommended CSU Budget Priority for 2003-*
4 *2004* (attached), and endorse the remarks of Senate Chair Robert Cherny
5 that were given at the hearing of the Assembly Higher Education
6 Committee on September 23, 2003 (attached); and be it further
7
- 8 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to limit the
9 enrollment targets for the CSU for 2004-2005 to the number of students
10 fully supported in the Governor's January Budget; and be it further
11
- 12 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor's Office to work
13 with the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst to redefine
14 "marginal cost" for enrollment growth in the CSU in a manner which
15 reflects the actual costs of additional students; and be it further
16
- 17 RESOLVED: That the CSU not increase any enrollment unless such an increase is
18 funded at an appropriate level based on the new marginal cost; and be it
19 further
20
- 21 RESOLVED: That the CSU devise an admission policy that allows for adjustments in
22 enrollment that reflect the final state budget for that year.
23

24 RATIONALE: For the last decade, the CSU has not received adequate
25 funding from State revenues and student fees to maintain the quality of
26 education that should be provided to those attending the CSU. The
27 Chancellor's Office calculated that for 2003-2004, under the Partnership
28 Agreement with the State, the CSU should have received \$12,051 per
29 student. In fact, the CSU received only \$10,355 per student— a shortfall
30 of \$1,696 per student. Even the \$12,051 represents only a minimum
31 funding agreement. This shortfall in funding has resulted in
32 overcrowded classes and laboratories, a decline in the number of
33 tenure/tenure-track faculty, obsolete or broken lab equipment, eroded
34 library collections and services, deteriorating facilities and faculty
35 salaries that fall further and further behind those at comparable
36 institutions. This has been documented in the *CSU at the Beginning of the*
37 *21st Century* report.

38
39 Much of this shortfall has been due to using a calculation of marginal
40 cost that is woefully outdated. Again refer to the 21st Century document,
41 specifically pages 47-49.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Item 9

AS-2634-03/FA

November 13-14, 2003

Faculty Role in Academic Restructuring and Program Discontinuance

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge campus senates to review or develop, as appropriate, policy recommendations related to discontinuance and suspension of academic and academic support programs, academic reorganization, and dissolution or merger of departments, schools, colleges, and similar academic units; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge that any such policies embody the principles of joint decision-making and shared governance in the procedures they describe.

RATIONALE: The discontinuance or suspension of an academic program or the reorganization of academic units (departments, schools, colleges) bears directly on curriculum and affects the configuration of course offerings. For this reason, as indicated in numerous documents, faculty bear primary responsibility for the process by which any such action occurs and for the policy language affecting it. Appended are examples of such policies from several CSU campuses.

APPROVED – November 13-14, 2003