

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 23, 2004

PRESENT: Andres A., Andres C., Aronson, Bettencourt, Brown, Dauwalder, Feldman, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Garcia, Jensen, Karlstrom, Luo, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Peterson, Poole, Regalado, Riedmann, Rios-Bustamante, Rumyaor, Sarraille, Senior, Shipley, Stessman, Sumser, Tan, Thompson, Watkins, Weddle, Youngblom

PROXIES: Edmondson (Morgan-Foster), Sarraille (Zarling)

ABSENT: Cunha, Everett, Ferriz, Katsma, Paterson

GUESTS: Boffman, Demetrulias, Doraz, Hughes, Jaasma, Mayer, Paulsen, Stephens, Stone, Wendt, Young

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

2/AS/04/UEPC--Summit Program Proposal,
APPROVED

19/AS/03/UEPC--Policy for the
Discontinuance of Academic Programs,
APPROVED

3/AS/04/FAC--Access to Faculty Offices,
FIRST READING

INFORMATION ITEMS: Use of Electronic
Fund Transfers for Travel, Transfer Issues
and Carryover Funds for 03-04 to 04-05

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, April 6, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. The agenda was reordered under Action Items moving b) to a). The agenda was approved as amended. The minutes of March 9, 2004 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Speaker thanked Provost Dauwalder for providing refreshments.
2. Speaker-Elect Filling was thanked for chairing the March 9 Senate meeting.
3. Speaker Aronson, ASI President Rumayor and President Hughes attended a budget summit in Long Beach on March 9.
4. There will be discussions at the Bio Ag Center Dome every Tuesday and Friday, between 11:30-1:00 to talk about the direction of Bio Ag and how to get involved.
5. John Mayer, faculty representative on the Parking Committee, advised of tentative plans to enforce parking 24/7 starting July 1. Parking fees are also to be increased. He is basically the lone dissenter on the committee against these proposals. We need to get the word out about these proposed changes. If faculty

have comments or suggestions, please send them to him. It appears that the CSU has mandated increased enforcement and we are said to be one of only 3 campuses that are not enforcing 24/7. He suggests if this is approved, a grace period with a PR campaign is needed to alert people.

Aronson stated that if this is a policy change, it should come to the SEC. Mayer to contact Bowman for a time certain to attend the next SEC meeting.

Koni Stone pointed out that 4th July and Graduation day have to be considered.

Mayer stated that the committee did discuss waivers for some days.

6. Mayer urged Senators to attend the show "Five Women Wearing the Same Dress."

7. There will be a faculty and family outing Sunday, May 9 to see "You Can't Take It With You."

8. CFA - Announcement - Salary calculator was distributed for Summer Session. Filling also announced a grievance has been filed on behalf of the College of ALS and College of Education. Faculty will be getting a list of nominations for CFA chapter offices. Please return to Hilpert or Filling.

9. President Hughes reported that she, Aronson and Rumayor attended the LB budget meeting. She stated that she wanted to bring the same type of forum here. So, she has scheduled a budget summit for April 19.

10. The President and Vice President Ruud met with our Legislators yesterday during Legislative Day in Sacramento. Also along were strong members from our community (from the Foundation Board). It was a positive day. It is hard to know what passage of 57 and 58 will bring. Some items that were discussed: We requested the Governor's January budget be protected and we asked for support for a regularized fee policy.

11. The Board of Trustees approved the naming of the Classroom Building to the Dorothy and Bill Bizzini Hall. The Bizzini's were honored for their continued support. The President's Office received \$900,000 from the Cronkite estate. They are attracted to the 8th grade initiative, so there is a possibility of using \$400,000 for this.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None

ACTION ITEMS

a. 2/AS/04/UEPC-Summit Program Proposal

Watkins stated that the UEPC read the entire Summit Report and strongly supports continuing the pilot program.

Stone stated that she is the GE Subcommittee Chair and the subcommittee supports continuation of the program. Further, she has taught in the program and states the comments she received from her students indicate they benefited from it. Also, her student evaluation ratings were better than her regular Chemistry classes.

Student comments:

Student #1 - Tiffany - liked the group dynamic - fun - learned a lot - got to know people - did community service - likens the experience to practice working a job - you have to get along in a group.

Student #2 - Lori - came here at age 45 and had fears - signed up for Business and Drama - found three dedicated teachers - started with Chem - had not taken it before and had fears of failing - Stone helped her get through - Filling taught how to do accounting on computer - Mayer encouraged her in Drama - she got a part in a play - did a production called "A Cluster of Nuts" -- her son came -- he was inspired to go try out for a production - class was diverse - many ages and stages of life - they "gelled" -- made fast friends with classmates and instructors -- bonded -- got some medical advice from faculty that led to her getting help for her son.

Filling stated that maybe the increase in satisfaction is due to smaller classes. He notes that his students are still studying together after a couple of years.

Oppenheim stated that one of the things he likes here is we are willing to make changes. When innovation is done, it is with the expectation that the new thing is as good or better. But, once a program is in place, it is almost impossible to eliminate. Maybe faculty are afraid their own program will be discontinued if they participate in eliminating another program. He compared it to trying to get rid of the Cog Studies Program. He spoke against the resolution. Student speakers have given only one side. No one talked to students that dropped out of the program. And there is no evidence that students in the regular GE classes don't benefit. Figures presented to the Senate last time showed that overall the students were not as satisfied by this program as "regular" classes, and that it had a higher drop-out rate. Any amount of money spent on a program should be at least as successful as what we have. Further, the program being put up for approval is not the same as the one that was assessed. He requested a secret ballot.

Thompson voiced that we are going to approve this resolution. But, he hopes students weren't told to come to the meeting "because someone is against the Summit Program." It is important we ask difficult questions. Also, must everything have the assessment stamp on it? What should we be looking at in the assessment data? What kind of assessment should be done with the program in the future?

Shipleigh gave her perspective as Chair of the Liberal Studies Program. Summit has become a program for transfers. Jaasma put together a Summit cluster for Liberal Studies Students and it is said to be well-received - it meets the needs of transfers into the Liberal Studies Program.

Sumser stated that he taught in the program. His students were more conversational in starting his class, it is a really good GE experience for students and instructors, and students still come by his office

O'Brien voiced his support. He did not like the 3 course sequence, but likes the proposed 2 course model. Younger students seem to like it, so why not have different options for students? He felt it unfair to link the Summit Program with Cog Studies. They are on different trajectories.

A. Young agreed with Stone that students see it as an alternative and thinks data on the program shows it is meeting the GE goals. Retention does not seem to be out of line with university-wide rate. Amount of money involved does not seem to be too much. It is a lot of work but beneficial. Comments from faculty in the program indicate that they find it beneficial and enriching. They value the student interaction and think the experience is different from what one gets if one take 3 separate classes. It seems wrong for us to stand in the way of students who want to take the course. It costs so little to continue it. It would be ironic if faculty nit-pick assessment data to kill a program.

Another of the guests stated that many of the things that happened in the program cannot be measured. His discussions with faculty indicate it was rewarding for them to teach in the program.

Regalado stated that recently we have heard a lot about cuts. It seems odd that we are talking about starting up another program. It seems doubtful we will have faculty to cover courses for faculty getting into the Summit program. It is hard to support the program while trying to meet other course needs. It is important we look out for majors in our departments.

Oppenheim voiced that the comments are not convincing. There are lots of anecdotal information and speculation.

Nagel does not find the difference in approval significant. People teaching courses for the first time were developing new courses and so they need more time to develop them. It is worth an investment of \$1,300.

Watkins stated her support for the program, but suggested leaving out comparative data. Innovation is a good thing and should be encouraged.

It was MS Watkins/Filling to call the question. Vote was 19 yes and 14 no. Vote to call the question failed.

R. Brown asked about the size of the budget. It indicates \$1,300 but further down it lists \$6,000 and 6 units of release time. What amounts are we voting on? Jaasma explained the budget was reduced in reaction to the University fiscal crisis. \$1,300 for two years will sustain it. If the budget improves, we can increase it.

Thompson voiced concern about the tone of the discussion. It is not proper to accuse people who speak against the motion as nit-pickers or being anti-student or anti-innovation. He stated his concern is assessment. To what end is the assessment? If we are not going to base adoption of the program on assessment, then why do it?

Jaasma replied that the assessment plan was developed with advice of Barbara Cambridge. She did a comparison to see if the Summit Program met the goals of GE. Qualitative data is in the report to get sense of opinions of students and faculty in the program. She stated she wanted to know if the program did as well as regular GE and if not, she would not want to do it. She would like it if a faculty committee would work with her to develop an alternative plan for assessment.

Garcia stated that he advocates assessment, but we don't really do that here. The study did not have the proper depth due to lack of resources or funding.

Nelson questioned what additions are there to the \$1,300 and Jaasma replied that departments do not have to participate. There is no additional cost.

Feldman stated that he was troubled by discussion of 'significance' of differences in satisfaction. It is more important how much learning is achieved.

O'Brien & R. Brown questioned if there is a problem with the date of assessment? Jaasma replied that we can maintain at the same level if the budget is not better. We can change the budget page to reflect keeping the same budget. The University will have to determine if they want to institutionalize the program. Filling stated that assessment is done after the fact, so the date of Fall 2007 is correct.

Vote by secret ballot: 31 YES, 5 NO, resolution passed. It will be sent to the President for approval.

b. 19/AS/03/UEPC-Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs

Watkins stated at the last Senate meeting the body voted to strike 1 e). The UEPC would like to put forth a friendly amendment as follows: 1 e) by a majority vote of the college committee constitutionally charged with academic program review. In addition, a request for review to discontinue an academic program may be as a result of a regular or ad hoc academic program review (EP &R 79-10: CSU System Executive Order of Program Discontinuance).

Thompson asked about the old program discontinuance document from years past. Was there a provision for departmental request for program discontinuance? Watkins replied yes. It was possible it could come from the department as a result of 5 year review.

Reidmann asked for clarification to d) by the academic administration. Watkins replied it was probably the Dean or Provost.

Boffman stressed the importance of college review in the process.

The maker and seconder (Watkins/Poole) of the resolution accepted the friendly amendment.

Vote on the resolution as amended passed by voice vote. This will be sent to the President for approval.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 3/AS/04/FAC-Access to Faculty Offices

It was MS Floyd/Thompson:

BE IT RESOLVED: That with the exception of maintenance staff, access to faculty offices by Public Safety be denied, except in cases of emergency, without the written or immediate oral permission of the faculty member who occupies the office space.

RATIONALE: When 3/AS/84/FAC was passed, faculty members had expressed concern about Public Safety opening any faculty office at the request of any other faculty member. Under current policy, it is relatively simple to gain access to a faculty member's office. It has come to FAC's attention that students, staff and faculty are able to gain access to faculty offices merely by requesting the Department Secretary to open the office. It is noted that students and faculty have gained access to faculty offices in the aforesaid manner without the knowledge or permission of the faculty member who occupies the office. It is acknowledged that maintenance staff require routine access to faculty offices, and that policy language related to their access is unnecessary.

Floyd explained that there has been concern recently where a faculty's office was entered and searched without permission. This resolution would deny casual access without express permission.

Wendt voiced concerns about what is implied, especially the strike-out of the name of Public Safety. There

are many who have good cause to have access. Seems that you are excluding OIT, Department chairs, etc. He wonders if it needs to be vetted by General Counsel. Further, a Public Safety officer might need to go in. Floyd replied that an urgent need by Public Safety might be considered an emergency so would be allowed in the Policy.

Sumser questioned if access to an office mean access to the computer too?

FAC will consider the questions and confer with Wendt.

Please send concerns to cfloyd@csustan.edu

INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Use of Electronic Fund Transfers for Travel (Paulsen/Stephens)

Paulsen explained that a pilot for electronic funds transfer has started up. (see handout) The process includes the person getting an e-mail telling you when the transfer is about to happen. Feedback has been positive. They are encouraging faculty to sign up.

Feldman asked if we could just say to do it like the pay check, and Paulsen replied no because the pay checks are processed by the State of California and our campus processes these funds.

Any questions should be referred to Paulsen or Stephens.

b. Transfer Issues (Thompson)

Thompson reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee of SWAS is the sponsor of the following resolutions: 1) Support for Systemwide Core/Campus Specific Transfer Pattern by Degree Program in the CSU, 2) Definition of Sanctionable Units and 3) Principles for Reaching Consensus on Regional and Statewide Program Alignments in the CSU. He would like Senators feedback. These resolutions will be discussed again on April 4 and as Action Items in May.

Background for 1): Spence says the legislature wanted to pass a bill regulating transfer policy in the CSU. Since then the CSU has created many transfer programs trying to head off legislation. If the 45/15 initiative passes, then people will have to agree on 45 common units they would accept from CCC's as transfer units into their program. Each local campus would specify 15 more units that it would (individually) accept.

Shiplee stated, regarding 1), it is important to know who will be overseeing this. She explained that the blended teacher preparation were created previously in a similar manner. A representative was chosen from each campus and things were carefully laid out. They were directed to come up with common units. Campuses had very complex issues to resolve and the people pushing this wound up asking faculty to standardize curriculum across institutions.

Aronson asked what the benefits are of this change. Thompson thinks this will be a lot of work and not do much good. The major part of this is forcing CSU programs to come to agreement. How do you force people to reach consensus?

Regarding 2), Thompson said it seems we can overenroll, but we can't keep the money. How about sanctions on students? If you reach a certain number of units, you are penalized. We would have to define 'excess units.'

Please send comments & questions to Thompson.

c. Carryover Funds, 03-04 to 04-05 (Dauwalder/Stephens)

Provost Dauwalder stated that the process will probably be the same as last year. He has asked the deans to identify proposed uses of funds. Then judgments will be made. There will be some carry-over money to be set aside for contingency. There will be talks with Deans Council and the Speaker about what funds should be use for. He urges departments not to spend needlessly but to go ahead with necessary purchases.

Spending process — it requires approval by the Provost of expenditures from \$1,500-4,900 and over \$4,900 approval by the President. There is a similar process for hires.

Stephens added that all divisions go through a similar process. There will be significant cuts, and it makes sense to discuss redistribution because there may be severe needs in some departments. The fact that we had reserves set aside meant we were able to handle cuts that were handed down in December. Fees are being recalculated.

Regalado questioned what administrative cuts are being made. Provost Dauwalder stated that the Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research position is not going to be replaced with the same classification nor with an MPP. The Dean of University Extended Education position is not going to be renewed, so that position is also going to be reorganized. Sarraille stated it would be good to know if this will bring the administrative growth to the same level as faculty growth.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.