

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

October 28, 2003

PRESENT: Andres, Aronson, Bettencourt, Brown, Carroll, Cunha, Dauwalder, Everett, Feldman, Ferriz, Filling, Floyd, Garcia, Helzer, Jensen, Katsma, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Peterson, Poole, Riedmann, Rios-Bustamante, Sarraille, Shipley, Stessman, Tan, Watkins, Weddle, Young, Zarling

PROXIES: Janey Youngblom (Jim Youngblom)

ABSENT: Andres, A., Gackowski, Paterson, Rumayor, Senior, Thompson

GUESTS: Bernardo, Demetrulias, Trustee Huffman, President Hughes, Jaasma, Pugh

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

INTRODUCTION OF TRUSTEE HUFFMAN

16/AS/03/FAC--Review of Interdisciplinary Chairs, FIRST READING/REFER TO FAC

ADD/DROP QUESTIONS

15/AS/03/FAC--Amendment to URPTC Procedures/GF Constitution, RECONSIDER

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, November 18, 2003
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 pm. The agenda was approved. Oppenheim noted on page 3 of the October 14 minutes, he was quoted as saying that directors and coordinators are lower than assistant dean. He clarified it should read 'are a lower classification than assistant dean.' The minutes were then approved as amended.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Speaker Aronson welcomed President Hughes. President Hughes introduced newly appointed Board of Trustees member Alice Huffman and her husband Mr. Davis. Trustee Huffman has had an illustrious career in politics and education. This is her first visit to our campus. She wanted CSUS to be the first campus she will visit because she was told we were kind and understanding. The trustee has been to only two Board of Trustee meetings since being appointed, but she has already been very persuasive. She takes her duties very seriously. She serves as President of the California NAACP.

Trustee Huffman expressed she was very glad to be here, and noted she chose this campus purposely for her

first campus visit. She stated she does not have experience in the CSU system, but does have a lot of experience in public policy. She thanked CFA for supporting her at the Rules Committee meeting where her confirmation started. She notes she has worked around higher education and has received faculty support, has the support of CFA, but has not been a college faculty member. She has learned the buck stops here. What students get from teachers at all levels is important. While a trustee, she has learned that the CSU is the main engine in California that keeps things going. It has over a number of years provided students of all diversity an opportunity to participate in the economy of California. She noted our beautiful campus, team spirit, unity the campus has and she plans on telling others about our campus. She has learned there are issues with workload and pay and hopes these can be resolved when the economy starts to improve. She stated she will try to learn the campus's issues, and she intends to work with the faculty and CFA. Her job, she stated, is to figure out how to do this. She stated she will always look out for what is best for the University and take care of its' people.

O'Brien questioned what she sees as special problems that will come about as a result of the change in Governor. Trustee Huffman replied that she worked for Prop 98 and is worried about statements that have been made about doing so much with so little. Perhaps they will find some creative ways out of the fiscal situation. But, she is nervous about the Governor who ran on a platform of reducing government. We cannot afford to take more cuts next year. And, we need to protect all elements of education. The new Governor will not be able to fix it by himself. He will have to reach out, bridge and listen and protect what people care about.

Sarraille asked what her thoughts are on the composition of the Board of Trustees and what changes it may need to undergo. Trustee Huffman replied that most of the Board is new and she doesn't know the others so well. She does not know the direction that was taken by the previous Board, but assumes the Board should be our cheerleader. The Board needs to respect the Chancellor and get much of its input from the Chancellor. There should be unity between the Chancellor and Board, and then there should be agreement on what is said in Sacramento. The idea is to fight among ourselves in private, settle it, and then go to Sacramento united. She would like the CFA and CSU to say the same thing in Sacramento. She said you can't win in Sacramento when your house is divided.

Filling asked her advice on how to speak together when the Chancellor has disdain for the faculty. Unity requires movement from both ends. Filling gave examples saying the Chancellor started taking names when he was on this campus when people acted like they did not agree with him. He also told a group of business persons that faculty do not work hard: that they only work between 10-2 M-TH. Huffman replied that if this characterization of the Chancellor is true, it is a very serious concern and she will discuss this with the him. This is the first she has heard of the problem. Filling remarked that about 3 years ago 20 of the campuses passed a no confidence vote on the Chancellor. Trustee Huffman then asked the faculty present if their sentiments were similar to those of Filling and there was significant nodding in the affirmative.

Aronson noted that we are not only a beautiful campus, we are also an honest campus.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Brown reported that at the last Senate meeting, it was announced that Diana Bowman would climb Mt. Whitney. He is here to say she made it to the top (14,460 ft, an elevation change of over 6,000 ft.). Joining her on the hike was Neil Jacklin (Biology), Jeanne Elliott (Academic Programs) and himself. The hike took 23 grueling hours (that's Diana's comment). He noted that often times faculty have no idea what interesting things their staff are doing, and he encouraged them to find out.
2. Nagel advised that it is Campus Equity Week. He encouraged Senators to let your lecturers know that he and Bratten will be touring the campus with a petition to preserve instruction.
3. Morgan-Foster reported the Graduation Initiative Task Force and Advising Task Force are producing good work. The Graduation Initiative Task Force has produced its first draft and it will come to the Senate. If there are any questions, please contact any member of the task force. Boffman chairs the GITF and Renner chairs the ATF.
4. Everett reported that 'Anything Goes' is playing this week.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 16/AS/03/FAC—Review of Interdisciplinary Chairs

It was MS Floyd/Feldman

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Review of Interdisciplinary Chairs Policy be effective upon approval by the President.

REVIEW OF INTERDISCIPLINARY CHAIRS

In the case of interdisciplinary chairs, the School Dean must consult with the tenured and probationary faculty of the relevant departments initiating the performance review. Each department will select a minimum of one faculty member to participate in the review. Any tenured or probationary faculty member may submit evaluative information to the dean. Specific to the Honors Program, the dean will select tenured or probationary faculty that have taught in that program.

RATIONALE: The College of ALS currently houses three interdisciplinary programs with Directors in leadership role—Agricultural Studies, Honors, and the School of Fine and Performing Arts. Because these programs cross disciplinary and college boundaries, the department chair review process, as stated below, does not provide the most appropriate format for review of these positions. This policy and procedure provides a process to review leadership on these and similar positions.

Concerns and questions:

- some have directors and coordinators rather than chairs. The title should be changed.
- There is no rationale for specific treatment of the Honors Program Director. Why is an exception made? It should be clarified.
- We might want to look at the structure, how one chooses faculty, what is the role of directors, coordinators, chairs? This is a larger issue than just a review.
- The first paragraph should say 'college' rather than 'school.'

- Does interdisciplinary cross colleges? Reply, yes.
- How would you decide which dean would choose?

Floyd advised that when FAC was asked to look at this issue, the Department Chair Policy was reviewed and did not address how a review could be done. FAC did discuss the possibility of this being a larger issue, but decided to just address the question of review.

Aronson suggested this be sent back to FAC to address the issue of expanding the document to be more inclusive. Send input to Chair Floyd or Bowman.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Add/drop questions (Pugh/Bernardo)

Pugh reported he and Bernardo have reviewed the questions from the last Senate meeting and are ready to answer them. He advised that students can add up to 10 days after the first day of class without a fee. The majority of students add with an add slip.

Problems and Concerns:

- When a faculty member receives their roster with a wait list, they take attendance, drop those not in attendance and if room, will add students that showed up for class. But at the same time, unbeknownst to faculty, STAN is also adding students. This is the problem, and the class can be overenrolled because of this.
- If a student calls STAN to drop a class, only STAN knows this, not the faculty member.
- Students can call STAN to add, but if there are students on the wait list, there has to be enough spots for all on the wait list for STAN to add. This is done manually. Sarraille asked if this process is done only during the summer and Bernardo replied yes, and until two weeks before school starts.
- It should be up to the faculty member to add so they have the option to take a senior before a freshman on the wait list. Bernardo advised one way to do this would be to allow signature priority.
- Not every class has a wait list. It is up to the faculty member. On the proof, you state your maximum enrollment and have the option to say you want a wait list and what max size.
- Maybe we should not add students after the first day of class without approval by instructor.

Bernardo advised of a couple of options: 1) students would have to add a class in person or 2) STAN or Banner has an option for faculty to give students a magic number for priority, so when they call up STAN, they would have approval ahead of time. It controls who gets into a class. This has not been used, but we can.

Pugh noted that if you make the decision to only have adds/drops in person, there are a number of classes not full, so you would have many students running around looking for faculty to sign their add/drop card.

FURTHER QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS:

- Should not be a problem for faculty to sign add/drop cards.
- Some problems when student has a registration date to call STAN and they can't get through.
- Feldman prepared a resolution which he distributed to Senators. Consensus to continue discussion before

looking at motion.

--The instructor should be the only one that has the right to add students to their class after the first day of class. The instructor is the only one that can evaluate if the person can take the class if he/she has missed one or two classes, not STAN.

--It was noted at San Jose State, their system prevents students from enrolling a few days before classes start. Then once classes start, they can only enroll with the permission of the instructor. The student gets a sticker with a number, and then the student goes on line to enter the number. It is the student's responsibility to do this. Bernardo replied we can do something similar to this, but the process is a bit different.

--Important to have a drop box for students to turn in add/drop forms at night or weekends. Pugh advised there is a drop by MSR. It was suggested to have a drop box by DBH with a sign specifically indicating that it is a box for Add/Drop.

--What is the purpose of a wait list? Is the problem really that we are allowing use of STAN and signed add forms simultaneously? Bernardo advised that the waitlist is used by A & R to move students into classes (by hand) over the summer. They are sent notice that they have been moved from waitlist into the class. At one time, the wait list was used to see if we needed to add additional sections (such as in Liberal Studies).

--Can't we let instructors set the limits of all their classes? Reply, there are department limits for classes.

-- Can software be configured so that the instructor could decide whether adds will require the instructor's signature and the reply was that it would require re-programming of Banner.

--Can faculty be allowed to do the adding by accessing Banner? Reply, do we really want to do that?

--What A & R does over the summer to resolve who gets in from waitlist may prevent students from signing up for two courses hoping to get one favored one but willing to settle for a second if a slot opens.

--We should cut off the STAN registration once the semester starts.

--There is no way to make a setting on a course in STAN that says only majors can get into a course, but you can set up a course to be registration by consent of instructor only.

--Should put information on the roster that tells how large the wait list is for that class.

--Complaint by graduate students they could not read the registration information that was mailed to them.

--The first resolve of the Feldman motion says that a department may designate any of its courses to be for department discipline majors only but that doesn't seem possible for Banner to do. Pugh asked for time to look at this and respond later.

--It could be a problem for staff in A & R if the system doesn't allow students to add a class on STAN after the first day of class. All adds would be on an Add form to be handed in. Bernardo replied that closing STAN is not a huge ordeal.

--It was noted that there is not a majority of students using STAN after the first day of class so it's not a huge problem.

--It doesn't seem fair to the student showing up on campus to add a class that a student at home can pick up the phone to call STAN to add a class.

--Students waitlist themselves on many class lists. It is not uncommon to find a student on the same course but different sections.

The Provost wondered if it might be wise to refer this issue to UEPC and ask them to work with Pugh, review the current policy and return here. Poole replied that UEPC deals with undergraduate issues. Aronson suggested maybe Graduate Council and UEPC look at this issue. Poole suggested the Academic Senate at large might be more appropriate to deal with this. Aronson stated this issue will be taken up at the next SEC meeting. We might want to set up a task force with members representing both bodies.

Feldman agreed to let SEC look at this issue before presenting his motion.

b. Motion to Reconsider 15/AS/03/FAC

Aronson advised that at the last Senate meeting, 15/AS/03/FAC was approved. But there was some discussion there were unresolved issues and that a motion to reconsider might be appropriate. This can be done with a member on the prevailing side making the motion to reconsider.

It was MS Sarraille/Zarling move to reconsider 15/AS/03/FAC.

Aronson noted we are talking about only those changes underlined or have strikeouts, not the entire document. If it is approved here, it will then go to a faculty vote and action by the President.

Zarling stated that he has misgivings about this resolution. He thinks it ambiguous and the Senate seems divided about it. His interpretation of the resolution is that a faculty member in any administrative position, even part time, would not be eligible to serve on the URPTC. But tying it to the MOU leaves it wide open for a faculty member serving part time as an administrator serving on the URPTC.

Melissa shares an email from Savini to Bowman which states "While the vote was decisive in favor of the amendment, it is likely that the key concerns, initially addressed by Sam and especially those articulated by Ray, were 'not' resolved by the final language. If I am correct about it, the wording contradicted the intent, and the second reading arrived at a premature conclusion.

In brief: By using the contract language, the amendment wording defined 'faculty' in terms of 'appointment classification' rather than actual 'work assignment', which is really what defines the career track. This seems to leave us with the same initial concerns that both Sam & Ray presented. I think it's likely those very problems are actually reinforced. The appointment classification as defined by the union contract is simply "not" a rigorous way to assure 'faculty' participation, and this is where the Academic Senate defines policy apart from the contract process.

When it involves the integrity of URPT, I would agree with Ray that members with faculty classification but serving as administrators are not eligible. Sam's concern to have 'teaching' faculty on RPT is what initiated the matter, but the suggestion of half time teaching and half time administration seems a rather ineffectual standard, which is ultimately rather pointless and self-defeating. Faculty should be unequivocal and more decisive in these core definitions.

If the essential RPT & faculty governance structure still stands, then administration approve or disapprove (in writing) "following upon" peer review "by faculty". This separation of 'peer' review is the essential core of faculty governance and the amendment may encourage significant compromise on that fundamental principle. In recent years we have often forgotten that administration has regularly expressed a belief at odds with that principle and its established process. The same principle is still the central issue in the denial of the post-tenure review policy...."

Oppenheim stated he raised the issue that there were not enough senior faculty to serve on this committee and this was an effort to address this. But, his concern is that there are faculty serving in interim part time administrative positions that should be able to serve. But the amendment leaves out counselors and librarians. Keep in mind, this does not mean the person will be elected, but only eligible.

It was MS Nagel/ Poole under General Faculty Constitution, Article IV, Section 1.1 a) second sentence to

amend by changing the sentence to read "Faculty members whose work assignment includes any administrative duties, as defined in Article 2.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the CFA and the Board of Trustees of the CSU dated May 14, 2002-June 30, 2004, shall be ineligible to serve on the URPTC." The same amendment would be inserted the URPTC Procedures in Article V. b) second sentence.

Nagel expressed his sense of the Senate was to exclude any faculty member with any of administrative duties, and this wording takes care of that concern.

Vote to reconsider passed by voice vote.

It was MSP Oppenheim/Nagel to table until the next Senate meeting.

4:32 adjourned.

Acronyms used:

CSUS: California State University, Stanislaus
NAACP: National Association of the Advancement of Colored People
CSU: California State University
CFA: California Faculty Association
M-TH: Monday through Thursday
GITF: Graduation Initiative Task Force
ATF: Advising Task Force
FAC: Faculty Affairs Committee
ALS: Arts, Letters and Sciences
MSR: Mary Stuart Rogers
DBH: Demergasso-Bava Hall
A & R: Admissions and Records
UEPC: University Educational Policies Committee
SEC: Senate Executive Committee
URPTC: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee
MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
URPT: University Retention, Promotion and Tenure
RPT: Retention, Promotion and Tenure
MS: Motion Second
MSP: Motion Second Passed