

<p>Academic Senate April 26, 2011</p> <p>Present: Akwabi-Ameyaw, Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Broadwater, Burroughs, Cotten, Davis, De Cocker, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, Marshall, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Pahal, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Rogers, Sarraille, Seong Soo Oh, Silverman, Stessman, Stone, Strahm, Strong, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: Kurt Baker for Stephen Black, Chad Stessman for Michael Drake, Elki Issa for Dawn McCulley, Eric Karlstrom for Richard Wallace, Elaine Peterson for Mark Bender</p> <p>Guests: President Shirvani, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, Halyna Kornuta, Daryl Moore, Tom Carter, Brian Duggan, Gina Leguria, Lauren Byerly, Gabe Bolton, Ashour Badal, Bret Carroll, Elizabeth Breshears, Robin Ringstad, Bill Foreman, Mark Thompson, Diana Bowman, Valerie Leyva, and Dieter Renning.</p> <p>Isabel Silveira Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>4/AS/11/FAC/SEC—Editorial Amendments to the GF Constitution, SECOND READING ITEM, passed unanimously.</p> <p>5/AS/11/Athletics/FAC—Amendment to Article V, Section 2.0 of the GF Constitution (adding coach rep), SECOND READING ITEM, passed unanimously.</p> <p>7/AS/11/Regalado/Carroll—Motion of Censure Resolution President Shirvani, SECOND READING ITEM, Tabled indefinitely.</p> <p>3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC- Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs (revised version) SECOND READING ITEM, Tabled to 5/10/11 Senate meeting.</p> <p>6/AS/11/CIS/SEC Recommendation for suspension of the CIS Program FIRST READING ITEM.</p> <p>9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl/K. Stone/D. Shimek Recommendation of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee FIRST READING ITEM</p> <p>8/AS/11/Sociology/Gerontology/SEC Condemnation of the Suspension of the Faculty Senate at Idaho State University, FIRST & SECOND READING ITEM, passed unanimously as Sense of the Senate.</p> <p>10/AS/11/FAC/SEC Retired Faculty Parking FIRST & SECOND READING passed unanimously.</p> <p>DISCUSSION ITEM: UBAC DISCUSSION ITEM: GE Goals</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, May 10, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	--

1. Call to order
2:05pm

2. Approval of Agenda
President making remarks added between 5 and 6.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 12, 2011
Approved as presented.

4. Announcements
Sarraille announced that there will be an SEIU press conference on May 3rd in the Quad, from 10:30 to 11:00 a.m. The purpose is to persuade local legislators to help secure adequate funding for the CSU. There will be an opportunity for participants to call or petition legislators.

Sarraille also shared the following CFA Chapter President's Announcement:

In February of 2011, in settlement of grievances filed by individual faculty and the CSU Stanislaus CFA chapter, the CSU Stanislaus administration signed an agreement stating that it would adhere to the RPT procedures outlined in the following documents:

- 1) *The CSU Stanislaus Faculty Handbook, Appendix C, entitled: "Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review," and*
- 2) *8/AS/09/FAC-URPTC - "Amendment to Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure Review"*

Today it is scarcely more than two months since the signing of the agreement, and CFA has now, in the course of the current round of RPT evaluations, received evidence of very significant non-compliance with the above mentioned policy documents.

As president of the campus CFA chapter, Sarraille announced that, if the problems we perceive are not rectified very soon, the chapter will grieve the conduct of the current RPT process. Furthermore, in the absence of correction of the conduct of the process, we expect to subsequently assist several faculty in the filing and pursuance of individual grievances.

He sincerely hopes that confrontation between the faculty and administration can be avoided through mutual agreement to respect established policy and procedures. Ovation.

Duggan announced that on May 9th they will have a best practices Clicker/Student Response System forum organized by Pillsbury and Eudey. Stanislaw, Gerson, Hesse and Grobner will discuss use of clickers in their classes. The use of student response systems, otherwise known as "clickers," offers the potential for engaging students in lecture courses in new ways. In this forum, four CSU Stanislaus faculty members will talk about the pedagogical nuts and bolts of clickers and share their ideas and best practices for successfully using them in class. He encourages all to attend from 2-3pm, in FDC 103.

Marcell spoke on behalf of ASI Health and Wellness. The annual Health and Wellness week will be next week. It will include a lake walk on Tuesday, May 3rd from 10am-12pm, and you can win prizes. On Wednesday, May 4th there will be various health and wellness assessments on the quad. Please encourage students to attend.

Filling spoke on behalf of the faculty serving on UBAC. He echoed that there is a public forum from 9:30-11:30 on Wednesday in the South Dining Hall. He appreciates and needs comments on budget challenges. Please send an email to budgetsuggestionbox@csustan.edu. He hopes to see you there.

Eudey noted that there will be a notice sent announcing the first Annual Assessment Spotlight which will be held on Friday, May 13, 8:30am-Noon in MSR 130. Members from across the CSU Stanislaus community will share their assessment and continuous improvement stories. The program agenda will be distributed prior to the event, so please watch for the announcement.

Regalado noted that on Wednesday a panel will be meeting at 10am discussing the internment of Japanese Americans, including those who experienced concentration camps in the US. They will discuss their experiences. Contact the Department of History for more information.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that runoff ballots will be delivered tomorrow to department offices. We have some resolutions today that if passed will be inserted into the election. Also, the IDEA evaluation period begins on Monday, May 2nd and lasts for two weeks. Please calendar the Spring General Faculty meeting which is scheduled for Thursday May 12, from 2-4pm in this room.

Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed the guests as President Shirvani, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, Halyna Kornuta, Daryl Moore, Tom Carter, Brian Duggan, Gina Leguria, Lauren Byerly, Gabe Bolton, Ashour Badal, Bret

Carroll, Elizabeth Breshears, Robin Ringstad, Bill Foreman, Mark Thompson, Diana Bowman, Valerie Leyva, and Dieter Renning.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that Sarraille sent a report about UBAC, and he encourages that we hold off on those questions until we get to that item.

Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that SEC and the Provost discussed whether or not the President should stay after he makes remarks. It was decided that the President will read his remarks and then leave to give us time for discussion.

President Shirvani wishes to address the Senate about the earlier incident and the impact it had on the members of the Senate. He regrets that the incident occurred and apologized to the Senate. The President read the following apology:

*It is clear that I made a mistake in how I handled the situation. I fully support the need for and importance of open discussion and debate in the Senate and that the incident may have had a chilling effect on such discussion and the importance of using appropriate protocol to protect open discussion and debate in the Senate. This is essential to effective shared governance. **Thank you.***

6. Action Items

Jasek-Rysdahl gave instructions for action items. The Standing Rules allow us to limit discussion to a half an hour on any discussion item. The Standing Rules also allow us to go for a two-minute time limit instead of the three minutes we've been using. We will watch that a bit. The Standing Rules also state that when speaking to action items, we have two opportunities to speak. These are action items, and we're not asking to change them. We can only make an amendment to the resolution but not to the content of the changes to the next document. For example, we are speaking for or against the resolutions in front of us. Please indicate if you are speaking for or against these resolutions.

a. 7/AS/11/Regalado/Carroll Recommendation to Censure President Shirvani

Regalado moved that the Senate table resolution 7/AS/11/Regalado/Carroll Censure of President Shirvani indefinitely. Seconded by Strahm.

The considerations prompting Regalado and Carroll to make this motion are:

- 1) The president, acknowledging that his actions affect the entire Senate, and anticipating Senate action in response to his behavior after the Senate meeting of March 8th, has offered the in-person apology to the whole Senate that the resolution requests.
- 2) Discussion of this resolution prompted several members of the Senate to go on record at the last Senate meeting as affirming that the president's behavior after the March 8th Senate meeting was unacceptable in and detrimental to an environment of civil discourse and open discussion.
- 3) Discussion of this resolution prompted some members of the Senate at the last Senate meeting to suggest that the Senate will closely monitor the president's future conduct for signs of actions unacceptable in and detrimental to an environment of civil discourse and open discussion.
- 4) An indefinite tabling of the resolution keeps open the possibility that a future Senate may revisit it if that Senate deems it necessary to do so.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted discussion is now open and on the table. The motion is not amendable, and we need a majority vote to table this item or not.

O'Brien thanked our colleagues in the History Department for pulling the Resolution of Censure back. He listened to the debate and was quiet because he was not here when the incident occurred at the March 8th

Senate meeting. To show some human compassion is good. Passed unanimously.

b. 4/AS/11/FAC/SEC Editorial Amendments to the Constitution

No one wished to comment. Passed by voice vote. This will be sent to the General Faculty for a vote.

c. 5/AS/11/Athletics/FAC Amendment to Article V, Section 2.0 of the General Faculty Constitution (adding a Coach Representative)

Eudey spoke in support of this resolution. The resolution passed unanimously by voice vote. This item will be sent to the General Faculty for a vote.

d. 3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC- Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs (revised version)

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that we can identify issues you have with the policy, but we can only revise the resolution.

Stessman noted they got feedback at the last meeting. Mostly the issues were about item 3.2, and he solicited feedback and made changes to item 3.2 that describes what the consultation will include. The only other change was to item 3.7 to say that it does not exceed approved course caps. Hopefully, this revised resolution will meet the valid concerns that people had that things might occur that wouldn't be done in non-technology based classes. The following is the new language on item 3.7: *Class size and faculty workload will be determined by the ~~college dean~~ department chair after consultation with the faculty member and the ~~department chair~~ college dean, shall be consistent with not exceed approved course caps, and must take into account the level of expected interaction between faculty and students.*

Shimek is concerned that item 3.7 may affect a major article on workload in the union contract, and he wanted to make sure that the language in the proposal is consistent with language that exists within the union contract. There may be several major items in the contract that may not be captured here.

Held noted the library had minor wording changes to item 5.5, and asked how it would be possible to have these changes made. Eudey noted that the option is to put this on the table for second reading for another meeting and defer the resolution back to UEPC. Held said that it's not so important.

Provost Strong is concerned that Shimek indicated that this might not be consistent with the contract. That is problematic for him as well.

Peterson is wondering if there can be clarification about how it conflicts with the contract. Breshears asked if Shimek could specify the discrepancy. Shimek would be happy to provide the information in the contract, but doesn't have it with him now.

Thompson wanted to raise a question about item 3.3 perhaps about the intent of it as noted here: *Because OTM teaching may involve the use of technologies and pedagogical methods that require specialized training, the faculty member engaged in online and technology-mediated learning is responsible for making use of the University-provided resources and training where as appropriate.*

Thompson would like to know what was the determination of what is appropriate, and who would enforce that responsibility.

Duggan addressed Thompson's point. WASC requires specifics related to several areas of university and faculty responsibility, and our language was modeled on that of several other CSU campus policies for information on faculty training. It is not meant to be mandated but agreed upon by a faculty member and the

department to determine what was needed to successfully teach the course. For example, the MBA faculty have chosen to take Sloan-C training to be prepared to teach their upcoming online courses.

Nainby said that the Assessment Leadership Team had a discussion about the possibility that we have lecturers who come from outside and are part of the process of offering courses. In describing compliance with WASC expectations for online course offerings, we might have a different time potential for ensuring consistency because it could be used to characterize a lecturer's instruction as deficient. Enforcement may especially be an issue with lecturers.

Thompson doesn't know if at 7 other universities, it says that this falls to the dept. level or if it's someone in OIT who says to faculty you need to have this kind of training in order to teach a course. He doesn't know the answer to that. He appreciates Duggan's comment that this is a dept. level matter, but it's not noted in the language.

Duggan has been remiss in pointing out that as many know the CBA is undergoing preparation for a WASC substantive change review for an Online MBA program. In the CPR in 2008, we were dinged for not having a university policy, direction, and plan for online programs happening in the future. The document said we should have one. The concern is that the online MBA program is scheduled for WASC review and approval this summer, and we may not have a policy – and this could adversely or negatively affect the CBA faculty and their ability to put courses forward.

Nagel said, hypothetically, if we passed it and the President rejected it on the advice of the provost and VPHR, there would be no policy. If it's tabled and we give UEPC a chance to address item 3.7 and the librarian's concerns, maybe we'd avoid this adversely affecting faculty. He moved to table this to the next meeting, seconded by O'Brien. Nagel apologized to Stessman and UEPC for the additional work on the OTM policy.

By voice vote this item was unanimously tabled until the May 10, 2011 Senate meeting. Jasek-Rysdahl noted the specific issues to consider. Held will get the library information to UEPC.

7. First Reading Items:

a. 6/AS/11/CIS/SEC Recommendation for suspension of the CIS Program

Petratos moved the resolution, seconded by Strahm as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED: *That the CIS Program be suspended for up to five years; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That the CBA Faculty Speaker initiates a reevaluation process to begin no later than Fall 2014; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That the CIS Concentration will be offered; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That Teach out provisions will be provided for students currently majoring in CIS, and appropriate notifications and changes will be made to program materials regarding the suspension; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate recommend that this take effect upon approval by the President*

RATIONALE: *On April 6, 2011, the CIS Department sent the following statement to Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl: We, hereby, would like to re-affirm the position regarding the CIS degree program which was proposed and approved by the entire CIS Department on November 12, 2010: "Suspending the CIS major for up to five years; meanwhile, the CIS Concentration will be offered. If demand for CIS professionals*

increases, the CIS major will be re-evaluated.” This recommendation was then submitted to the College of Business Administration Executive Board on November 12, 2010, and was approved unanimously. This letter was then submitted to UEPC for approval; however, it was not approved by the UEPC.

On top of those concerns mentioned in the letter to the CBA Executive Board and UEPC, there is a new critical concern facing the College of Business Administration and the University as a whole: AACSB, in addition to concerns about processes and procedures for assurance of learning. There are also serious concerns regarding the ability of only 3 faculty to deliver a quality degree program to 76 students. A concentration, as part of the Business Administration degree, ensures the continued delivery of a top quality curriculum with the support of the other members of the College faculty in accreditation program review, documentation, and assurance of learning.

No formal policy exists on our campus regarding suspension of a program currently; however, the policy for program discontinuance is well established on our campus with the most recent version of the formal policy 19/AS/03/UEPC Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs approved by the Academic Senate and the University President in the Spring of 2004. There is past precedent in the suspension of the French program and language in the discontinuance policy that mentions both discontinuance and “curtailment” in portions of the policy which has led to the application of the discontinuance policy to this suspension. Although, the request of the faculty and concerns of potential loss of accreditation are not legitimate criteria for “curtailment”, according to the policy, a financial benefit, which is a listed criterion, of approximately \$17,000 per year should be realized by suspension.

Discussion:

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that a few weeks ago we had a UEPC resolution that UEPC does not support the discontinuance or suspension of the CIS program. The Senate broke that into two resolutions. One to accept UEPC’s position to not discontinue the CIS program and that was supported. The second resolution was that the Senate supports UEPC’s position to not suspend the CIS program, and that failed. A motion was made that SEC bring forward a resolution of suspension, and that’s where this comes from.

Petratos says everyone knows the budget situation. CIS faculty has recommended the suspension for no more than 5 years, when they can review the budget situation.

Strahm thinks this is a useful way to deal with a budgetary situation, and the lack of ability to hire new faculty. We need to make sure that this University has the ability to bring this program back if it chooses to do so at a time when it’s necessary and important for our society to continue to be on the cutting edge.

Sarraille said that he will vote against the CIS Resolution because he thinks that the CIS department is acting under duress, and because he feels that the proposal is part of an effort to privatize the University. He's seeing self-support programs about to displace the CIS program.

Garcia added to Sarraille’s comments, and he finds it curious and hopes we don’t lose our history in this discussion. The last time we discussed this there were a number of reasons provided regarding why we should discontinue the CIC Program: accreditation (too many concentrations/programs), a better way to deliver the courses, it is what faculty want. Now we are being told that it is purely a budget issue. After all of this, he’s skeptical regarding the true rationale for discontinuing the program.

Dean Nowak said Petratos summarized the reasons well, and that the other reasons haven’t disappeared. They’re still concerned about accreditation, and the workload of the remaining faculty. A concentration is a strong and high quality substitute. Those issues are not gone.

Eudey is also not going to support this resolution, as she doesn’t think the criteria we are using to evaluate suspension was met. She understands that there may be some that don’t want to continue, but we didn’t meet

the standards for suspension. She is especially concerned if some of this was done under duress. One thing she likes is that unlike the previous resolution this one does directly state in the resolved when it will occur and who is responsible. We need to be aware of the 5 yr. review period of the French program, and that no one was responsible for following up on that. But due to a lack of comfort about meeting the criteria for suspension/curtailment and the possibility of duress, she is going to vote against passing this resolution.

Provost Strong directed a question to Dean Nowak. He asked if the motion for suspension of the CIS major was because it was replaced by a UEE Program.

Dean Nowak said that it has nothing to do with the Special Sessions Program, and it was a very well thought out concentration that CIS developed last spring and implemented this fall. There are parallel classes in the major but its focus is on the concentration, and it will be an easier workload for CIS faculty. It will also help ensure reaccreditation because the AACSB will look at three faculty trying to manage a major and do assurance of learning in program review.

Filling will vote against the CIS resolution in part because of the ex post creation of the history of the process. It's interesting that we are ex-post crafting legitimation of actions from years ago. When this came out, initially there were no discussions of accreditation or workload. We have carefully crafted ourselves a story, and it may be believable, but it's not the one we told ourselves when the CIS Program was threatened. The workload issue has an easy solution, replace the faculty who left.

Akwabi-Ameyaw supported the sentiments against suspension of the CIS program. Have we heard from the students? We are a teaching and learning institution. He hears comments about workload, but is waiting to hear what the students are saying and the impact of this decision if we were to suspend the CIS program. Absence of that, he will not support this resolution.

Sarraille addressed self-support. The fact is that CIS predates the EMBA and at least one other program. Members of the College of Business Administration were told that they have too many programs. The CBA had a mock accreditation visit and the person who conducted it told them that the college has too many programs to be supported by too few faculty members. Now, the factors being as they are, the suggestion was made to suspend the CIS Program, yet another program, which is a new self-support program, is to be retained. That is a slide, a shift, a translation from state support to self-support that he views as a move toward privatization of the College. People can have different points of view toward this. He will vote against the resolution because he views this as privatization, and stands by that.

Carroll seconded Eudey's concern. It appears now that the question is about viability and process, and passing this regardless of the merits sets a problematic precedent. This will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

b. 9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl/K. Stone/D. Shimek Recommendation of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that SEC had a discussion about the appropriate procedure since he is an author of this resolution and authors get asked questions. He thought the safest way to deal with this is to pass the turkey leg to the next in line, which is K. Stone, but she is also an author, so the turkey leg will be passed to Eudey.

Stone noted that this is what TRPC has been doing for the last few months. They came up with this plan to address the trust issues on campus. The following is the resolution:

9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl/K. Stone/D. Shimek Recommendation of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate supports the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee, and, be it further

Resolved: That the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee present these recommendations to the President's Senior Staff for approval, and, be it further

Resolved: that the Senate Executive Committee will update the Academic Senate at least once a semester regarding progress made in implementing these recommendations, and, be it further

Resolved: that upon the approval by both, faculty leadership and administration collaborate in order to implement the recommendations.

Rationale:

The members of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee are Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker, Koni Stone, Speaker-elect, James Strong, Provost/VP of Academic Affairs, and Dennis Shimek, Interim VP of Human Resources and Faculty Affairs. The members of this ad hoc committee met on a regular basis since November of 2010.

The group was charged to develop a plan of specific actions to address campus morale, improve communication between faculty and upper administration, and rebuild a productive working environment. The Ad Hoc TRPC will present draft proposals to various campus groups for input and eventual approval.

The charge also indicated that the ad hoc committee will also present draft proposals and seek eventual approvals of the recommendations from the Academic Senate and the President's Senior Staff.

The members of the ad hoc committee regularly referred to a survey of faculty conducted in September of 2010. Respondents to the survey indicated that respect for shared governance which included following existing policies and procedures was critical to rebuilding trust. When there are disagreements between faculty and administration, the structures of shared governance that are in place need to be used to resolve issues.

Improving communication and the quality of the dialogue between faculty and administration was another theme of the responses to the survey. The university's statement on shared governance states clearly that there should be "early inclusion of faculty in identifying issues and in agenda setting, ongoing consultation, much of it face-to-face, as an iterative process between faculty and administration to reach understanding, and substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreement cannot be reached."

The following recommendations are meant to address these issues through actions that respect shared governance and productive communication between faculty and administration.

Recommendation 1

The TRPC should continue to meet to address issues of trust, leadership and governance. The continuation and membership of this committee will be evaluated at least once a year.

The TRPC should continue to meet with a slightly different charge. Specifically, TRPC will be charged to:

- Have regular, ongoing, face-to-face interaction
- Identify areas of conflict
- Discuss concerns regarding university issues

- *Continue to develop ways to address issues of trust, leadership, and governance*

Rationale:

The committee has worked hard to increase communication between faculty governance and upper administration. One benefit of this is that faculty and administrators have been able to address issues directly as issues have come up. While there has been more communication and the group has been able to address some issues, much more work needs to be completed.

Recommendation 2

SEC and COC will be responsible for recruiting faculty for all faculty appointments to university committees.

SEC and COC will work with the administration to recruit and appoint faculty members to university related boards.

SEC will work with these faculty members to develop more consistent communication regarding the activities of the committees and boards.

Rationale:

There have been faculty appointments to some university related committees and boards without consultation with appropriate governance committees. This has resulted in a lack of trust of the activities of those entities.

Faculty governance and the rest of the university community often hear about the activities of these boards or committees when they are published for the whole community. This also contributes to a lack of trust when community members contact people at the university and they know less about the action than the person who is contacting them.

Recommendation 3

Administration will work with the Academic Senate to develop University Extended Education policies regarding special programs and special sessions.

Rationale:

University Extended Education is an area of great importance for all at the university. It is also an area where there are many concerns and issues.

We need better policies as more emphasis is being put on revenue generation in special sessions. There does not seem to be much policy regarding special sessions making it appear that things are just being made up as we go along.

Recommendation 4

The President will share his proposal for Endowed Professorships with faculty governance and will submit it for review and revision.

Until a policy is developed, the administration will consult with deans and academic departments when endowed professorship opportunities arise.

Searches to fill endowed professorships will not begin or continue until a policy has been approved by the Academic Senate.

Rationale:

There is a long and well established principle that faculty control the curriculum. Faculty appointments are a critical element of curriculum delivery and design. Colleges and departments must follow well established procedures when requesting new faculty lines. Currently, the practice for creating and filling endowed professorships is not aligned with these procedures.

The absence of policy regarding this leads to inconsistent processes that result in questions regarding the purpose of these positions.

Recommendation 5

Committee on Committees will work with appropriate administrators and committees to examine the membership of some administration and faculty governance committees to increase communication between faculty and administration. Any recommendations will go through the regular governance processes for review.

Committees to examine first should be the Provost's Deans Council, President's Senior Staff, University Budget Advisory Committee, Enrollment Planning Committee, and Leaves and Awards.

Rationale:

Continue to expand the joint communication and consultation process on issues that are of joint interest to both the senate and the administration.

Recommendation 6

The Speaker, URPTC, and FAC will work with administration to develop a process to gather information regarding RPT from the provost, deans, department RPT committees, department chairs, and candidates who are going through the review cycle or have just completed the review cycle.

The goal will be to gather information about the perceptions people have about the RPT policy and procedures. This information will be used to examine our policies and procedures to determine if any steps can be taken to reduce the conflict that is created every year on this campus. Any recommendations will go through the normal faculty governance evaluation process.

Rationale:

Faculty members perceive that administrators want to increase research expectations and that administrators are applying their own criteria and definitions for acceptable research when evaluating faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. There have been questions from deans and other administrators regarding elaborations and their role in reviewing the elaborations.

Revised 4/25/11

TRPC Resolution Discussion:

Provost Strong thinks these recommendations reflect the opinion of the ad hoc TRPC and are very appropriate items to continue to work on, and he thinks it deserves the support of the Senate.

Regalado queried page 2, of the TRPC resolution. Recommendation 3 at the bottom reads as follows: *Administration will work with the Academic Senate to develop University Extended Education policies regarding special programs and special sessions.* He doesn't know who wrote that, but wonders if that could be explained.

Jasek-Rysdahl said he had something to do with it. This is specifically referring to the summer session, and winter intersession in terms of how money is allocated. Speaking from his perspective on this; every year

we're wondering how much is going back to the departments and colleges, and what is the minimum number of students for a class to make enrollment etc. That's what this is in reference to. They discussed the money from last summer, how much we expect to receive this summer, and the division of revenues. That's what we hear a lot of faculty questioning, specifically to special sessions as well as to special programs.

Regalado is curious because in certain respects of UEE, summer and winter are different animals in format and other areas. He wonders if it would be wise to separate the two sessions. It appears that the TRPC evaluated the development of these two sessions while still under UEE, but not as two separate programs. He thinks that it would be helpful to separate these two issues, and recommends that the committee will do that to address this concern.

Petrosky has a question about recommendation #4. Will we be hearing a definition of what an endowed professor is? His naïve understanding of an endowed chair is a position that is funded either fully or in large part by some endowment from an external source agency. He's heard of descriptions of current proposed "endowments" being considered that are funded primarily by vacated position lines with less than 5% of the salary funded externally. He's also heard that these "endowed" professorships propose substituting full professors teaching a normal load with one teaching a half load, and that in his opinion doesn't conform to the mission of the University.

Nainby is here as the Communication Studies proxy. He'd like to support Regalado's recommendation for clarification of item 3 to look at distinctions between winter and summer under UEE, especially with respect to winter. There are questions about how the winter term course offerings have happened.

Thompson noted the same on item 3, and he thinks that the first line implies that we would follow normal governance processes. There was a UEE Policy recommended by the Senate, and it was rejected by the President, changed by the President and the Provost and then presented as policy. He wants to ensure that we're addressing process.

Regarding Recommendation 2, Thompson thinks it's saying different things, so which is the functional language.

Eudey clarified the meaning of the language. One is about University committees and one is about related boards. There is distinction between them per Eudey.

Thompson said that the second sentence appears to mean that faculty will be making the appointment. It's not clear who would be making the appointment to the boards. Does the language allow it to vary for some, or will that be worked out in process?

Provost Strong thinks that CoC makes recommendations to appointing administrators for various committees, at least for search committees. There is specific language depending on the committee. The intent of the second sentence means that there will be additional consultation between SEC and CoC when it comes to making appointments to boards.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the first refers to search committees or other things. There has been tension between administration and CoC when CoC provides faculty names. Sometimes the faculty are or aren't appointed. Sometimes the President has selected people for the committees. The first is saying we have policies, SEC and CoC is responsible. The second one, from what he can tell, mostly refers to the Foundation Board. At the moment, the Foundation Board bylaws increase that the Foundation selects faculty members to the board. This is our attempt to get faculty more involved in selecting faculty members. Administration is coming to SEC and CoC for criteria for someone to serve, which is what we have in

policies already. Then we go to SEC and CoC for names. The appointing authority is the President or the Foundation Board administrator,

Nagel is experiencing cognitive dissonance. One is that the recommendations don't specify a way for us to be able to tell whether these activities are successes or failures. For example, item 3, says one group will work with another group. What is a proper measure of "*will work with?*" The other dissonance is that this is to restore trust, and he's not sure how "*will work with*" and "*restore trust successfully*" work together.

Silverman does not see anything talking about Financial Affairs which seems to be some of our problems. Can we have some recommendation about getting certain kinds of information in a timely and comprehensive fashion from the VP of Business & Finance so that we can make recommendations? We are supposed to send recommendations and don't have the data to do so.

Provost Strong responded to Thompson regarding whether the normal process will be used for recommendation 3, yes current process will be used. He also responded to how we would know that trust was restored by the fact that the policy was passed.

Jasek-Rysdahl said for measuring success, in his mind, that's the job of the WASC research team. He's passing this off to them. These are things we might do; but we leave it to others to measure it.

Peterson understands that as a first reading we can make suggestions. She suggested for item 3, rather than saying working with the Senate, it makes more sense to work with UEPC to develop these policies and bring them to the Senate. In terms of recommendation 4, she thinks it would be good if in the development, the administration will take into the account the needs identified in the APR's when these opportunities come available. It's usually in the APR's when people discuss long term needs.

Regalado asked if we are not amending the language. Regalado's suggestion was to separate the UEE programs, but he assumes these will be separated and he can make comments. He would like the rationale be more definitive. He would change "*things are being made up as we go along.*"

Garcia would like to return to assessment and strongly encourages this group not to pass the buck. If an ad hoc committee is looking at trust, that group will be looking at questions broader than this particular committee. Such research may not capture the day-to-day activities that this group is doing. The group needs to think about their recommendations and how they will know if they're making progress. A larger scale research study won't get to the details. We could think about strategies for assessing the smaller things that are contributing to trust on campus. He's been told that this isn't the only group addressing trust; it's bigger than this group.

Thompson should have clarified earlier that the Provost who signed the document that was called the Special Sessions policy, he was speaking about Interim Provost Lujan. The last time special sessions was discussed at committees it went to FBAC as well, and it was discussed for an entire year. FBAC needs to weigh in.

Poole wants to point out the charge of the TRPC and why this document is being discussed in the Senate. It's clear that the issues are identified and the ad hoc committee was charged to bring forth recommendations, but not to resolve the issues. The first resolution on the document was for the committee to continue to meet. This document outlines a starting point, and there are issues that have been identified as those that suggest there is lack of trust between faculty and administration, but this document can evolve. There are things committee members agreed upon as being problematic; that is progress. If no new endowed chairs are added prior to policy being established, then that's progress. This committee can assesses whether things are moving forward and can determine if continued meetings are fruitful.

Nagel said that this document also communicates to the broader campus community. This committee has an opportunity, with this document, to say something about how as a community the University would know that progress was made for trust. Part of recommendation 2 says SEC and COC will work with administration, but doesn't say what that means, it doesn't operationalize it. What did working together achieve? That piece is missing.

Provost Strong said that earlier someone mentioned tensions between CoC and administration for naming faculty to search committees. His sense is that while it's not perfect, he thinks that has improved, and he hopes that CoC would agree that the relationship between CoC and administration is better than it was last year, and tensions have been reduced. He hoped that's an example of progress even if it's not perfect. We have had problems, but are trying to resolve those issues. He thinks that things are better.

As an inheritor of the current policy, Jaasma looks forward to a policy resolved between UEE and the Senate rather than one that is imposed on us.

Filling said that the Provost's point is well taken, but there is a considerable bit of tension concerning the propriety of administration seeking out and encouraging faculty to apply to be members on the WASC Research team to write a report. Things are not quite as rosy as one might think. There are still differences between what we understand about the recommendation and the appointment processes.

Eudey reminded all to provide feedback to the committee by next Tuesday if possible. This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

c. 8/AS/11/Sociology/Gerontology/SEC Condemnation of the Suspension of the Faculty Senate at Idaho State University

The resolution was moved by O'Brien and seconded by Eudey.

8/AS/11/Sociology/Gerontology/SEC Condemnation of the Suspension of the Faculty Senate at Idaho State University

BE IT RESOLVED: *That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus express solidarity with and support of the faculty of Idaho State University; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus condemn the suspension of the Idaho State University Faculty Senate after a vote of no-confidence in its President; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus support the right of Idaho State University faculty to express potentially unpopular opinions using their professional judgments; and be it further*

RESOLVED: *That this resolution be distributed to the Idaho State Board of Education; the Idaho State Legislature; the Faculty Senate at Idaho State University; Idaho newspapers, including the Idaho State Journal, The Idaho Statesman, and Moscow-Pullman Daily News; the CSU Board of Trustees; the CSU campus senate chairs; the Academic Senate of California; the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges; and the California State University, Stanislaus Academic Senate.*

RATIONALE: *On February 17, 2011, the Idaho State Board of Education suspended the Faculty Senate at Idaho State University and replaced it with an interim faculty advisory structure. A week earlier, the Faculty Senate had conducted a vote of no-confidence in*

President Arthur C. Vailas, which passed by 72% to 18%, with a voters' turnout of 77%. The no-confidence vote was a culmination of on-going disagreements between the faculty Senate and the President over the restructuring of the university, including faculty Representation in shared governance. Such a retaliatory act is deplorable, since it violates both the principle of shared governance and of academic freedom. Furthermore, it creates fear among the faculty and runs contrary to the mission statement of the university, which aims "to develop citizens who will learn from the past, think critically about the present, and provide leadership to enrich the future in a diverse, global society" (<http://www.isu.edu/presidentfstatement.shtml>). Faculty governance is essential to the very nature of an institution of higher learning. Especially in times of budgetary and political crises, the voice of faculty is absolutely critical in maintaining and forwarding the mission and goals of higher education. The full voice of the faculty cannot be represented by a governance model imposed by the administration, as suggested by the Idaho State Board of Education. Credible representation can only be achieved by a representative body elected by the entire faculty, a body that essentially reports only to the faculty and one which can act without fear of retaliatory repercussions. (Excerpted from the ASCSU)

Discussion:

O'Brien distributed a handout #13 which is two-sided. This is a resolution passed by SWAS in March. The Academic Senate in Idaho State University was suspended. There was considerable discussion at SWAS, and this resolution passed with a waiver, and was sent to various entities. The Resolved #4 asked local Senates to pass similar resolutions, and this is why it is being brought to this body. He brought this to his colleagues in the Sociology/Gerontology Dept. and they thought they wanted to support this. People felt strongly in his dept. that we needed to be in solidarity with Idaho faculty. When it came to the Speaker, he had the Sociology/Gerontology resolution and that's why it says Sociology/Gerontology on it. He's not naïve enough to think this will restore the Idaho State University Senate, but it must have been devastating for faculty there and for the cost of some stamps it's a worthwhile thing to support.

Eudey encouraged support of this resolution, as we need to stand up for shared governance.

Petrosky moved to move the resolution to a second reading. Strahm seconded. Petrosky felt the decision to move to a second reading seemed obvious. By voice vote it was unanimous to move to a second reading.

O'Brien received an email from Silverman who had suggested changes. In the third resolved Silverman noted that we should add an "s" to support and suggested adding sending this to AAUP and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Sarraille pointed out that the subjunctive is to be used in these clauses and it should read recognize and support. The "s" does not belong. O'Brien agreed not to include the "s."

Davis indicated that it is correct as is.

By voice vote the resolution passed unanimously. O'Brien will share addresses with I. Pierce to ensure appropriate distribution.

c. 10/AS/11/FAC/SEC Retired Faculty Parking

The resolution was moved by Baker, seconded by Manrique.

10/AS/11/FAC/SEC Retired Faculty Parking

Be it Resolved: *That the Academic Senate supports and encourages active participation in campus activities by retired faculty; and be it further*

Resolved: *That retired faculty are a valuable resource to the university; and be it further*

Resolved: *That all retired faculty be granted permission to park on campus without paying a fee for such parking.*

Rationale:

Retired faculty members contribute in multiple ways to the quality of our university. The experience they possess and their history with this institution make them make them a valuable asset. They frequently contribute their time, energy, and money for the benefit the university. Coming to and participating in campus activities should not be hampered by issues related to parking fees. Of the 18 CSU campuses responding to a survey in the fall of 2010, only two (Stanislaus and Humboldt) do not offer free parking for retired faculty.

Discussion:

Baker said that this resolution speaks for itself, and we've been working on this for years. The objections have been on the part of the Chief of Police to request to do this via other means. We're hoping to gain some leverage by having this body approve such a policy; which will then need to be approved by the President. The Chief of Police believes he needs that kind of approval to have authority to enforce such a policy.

Manrique noted from the ERFA meeting that an emeritus faculty from San Francisco said that any retiree from San Francisco State University just has to ask for a permit and s/he receives it. On this campus the parking spaces are limited, and the reality is that very few emeritus faculty will be on the campus at any one time. Data shows that retirees contribute more when they feel appreciated. At a luncheon today, Drs. Jim Hanson and Lola Johnson, original faculty members in 1960, had to pay to park on campus. Some retirees cannot park at a distance from some locations because of their age and disabilities. A friendlier campus is helpful to the campus. Their small group of retirees increased this year's scholarship money from \$800 to \$900. We can ask Dr. Renning for comments, as he has been the statewide President for two years.

Renning is here as a CSU Stanislaus Emeritus professor and statewide President of the CSU ERFA. He found out quite a long time ago that a majority of campuses at this system provide free parking to faculty members. He's aware of only two campuses that don't, CSU Humboldt and CSU Stanislaus. There are some more recent campuses that don't have policy but they don't have retirees yet. There have been campuses in the system with this policy for decades. Sacramento State provided free parking for retired faculty since the early 1970's, but we don't do anything of that sort. It behooves us to show a little gratitude to retired faculty for their many years of service by letting them park on this beautiful campus for free. It doesn't cost us any money, and it won't forgo parking fees. Most who are interested in visiting the campus park on the street, or they simply don't come to the campus and don't pay the parking fees. As Manrique said, retired faculty contribute to the campus after they retire. That's another reason why it shouldn't be too difficult to honor them in this small fashion. Let them park for free. Several campuses provide parking privileges to retired faculty from other campuses as well. There are plenty of reasons to provide this to retired faculty, and he can't think of valid argument to reject it.

Sarraille said that he just did a Google search for retired faculty parking policies, and he found three in CSU while participating in this meeting. CSU San Diego, CSU San Bernardino, and now CSU Humboldt allows the retired faculty to park for free. In the words of Benny Hill, it's not inconceivable.

McGhee said that the point was raised about retired faculty being seniors in nature and having mobility problems. If we do grant them privileges, the location of the handicapped parking is not well suited. It's not a problem near FDC, but if you're going to DBH it's a problem. If this presents a problem if we do allow this resolution, we may want to look for spots with those who do have trouble getting around. There are also difficulties with handicapped spots at MSR. There should be some provisions looked at to see that we have adequate spots to accommodate these needs.

Regalado supports this resolution. He parks in a lot behind DBH and sees reserved spots empty. It's probably the same elsewhere. As a matter of respect for those who retired, we should support this resolution.

Provost Strong supports the motion and thinks it's a small amount of respect to show our retired faculty.

Renning added that there aren't that many retired faculty who are around often enough to take advantage of that privilege.

Eudey moved to second reading, Filling seconded.

Baker is not in favor of moving to a second reading because Police Chief Jaureguay and Russ Giambelluca need to be aware of it in case they want to provide a counter argument.

McGhee says we're making a recommendation to the President to make this a policy. He speaks in favor of it, since the Police Chief and VP of Business and Finance will have the chance to make their concerns known to the President.

Baker thought that would be a good place for us to hear their points of view rather than behind closed doors of the President.

Filling added that to date, the only arguments from Russ Giambelluca and Police Chief Jaureguay are that CSU policy prevents this, which doesn't reflect practice at other campuses.

Sarraille thinks that, if we move to a second reading and pass this resolution, it doesn't prevent Jaureguay and Giambelluca from explaining their point of view. We're voicing a desire that a policy be put in place. He is in favor of a second reading.

Voice vote for second reading. Passed by voice vote.

Akwabi-Ameyaw wants to clean up typos in the rationale, but supports this strongly. Two weeks ago he invited a retiree to speak to a class, and the retiree parked far away and had to carry his laptop a far distance to the class. It's not good for us to make these retired, older faculty members have to go through that pain. He strongly believes that we should appreciate the service others have provided, and many of us are on our way there and can eventually enjoy the outcome of this recommendation. He urged all to support this resolution.

Baker says the resolution lacks language that says excluding FERPing faculty. He realized that was an error that we should discuss.

Strahm said that these folks who in addition to coming to our classrooms are also ambassadors to our community, and she endorses giving that respect to those who show the value to the community of what we do.

Filling said that the contract speaks to FERPing issues, and FERP'S are members of the faculty while teaching. They are not retired during that period in time, so we can leave it out and follow the rules.

McGhee said by giving a retired faculty a parking permit, it may increase the chance of us finding a place to park since all the spots on the streets are taken. We see so many students parking on the streets, and they may find more parking available.

By voice vote this resolution passed unanimously. Ovation. This item will be sent to the President for action.

8. Discussion Items

a. UBAC

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that Sarraille sent out a report today. He reminded everyone of the forum on Wednesday. No comments were offered.

b. GE Goals (Susan Marshall)

Marshall distributed a new iteration of the GE Goals. She noted that these goals have been under discussion through the GE APR over the last three years and many people have worked on it. The single sheet indicates the alignment between the current and revised CSU Stanislaus GE Goals. One concern from the last Senate meeting was how the new goals incorporate into the old goals. Erin Littlepage and Susan Marshall created a chart to indicate where the old goals are incorporated. The areas in pink are the new suggestions from the Library on information literacy, and in item # 3 integrative goals discussed with faculty in the learning community. She hopes this helps clarify matters.

For example, the old Goal one (subject knowledge) is rewritten and incorporated into the revised goal two. Underneath each proposed revised program goal are learning objectives indicated by bullets. We can see they are more specific and relate to the actual objectives you will be achieving in individual classes.

Kornuta would like to acknowledge the work going on before this. We are trying to align with LEAP outcomes as well. The curriculum matrix is an attempt to show that there has been carry forward and an opportunity to be more straightforward in what we are doing. When you first look at the chart it may seem overwhelming to complete it for your course, but this is an opportunity to indicate that we don't need to cover all learning outcomes in a single course. By the end of a student's general education program, all goals will be accomplished.

Marshall noted that in the matrix we have a sense of the big picture: how we will assess the new learning goals, and how to figure out how the outcomes are covered in the GE program. The 3 page matrix gives us a place where each dept. can enter information for the general education courses they teach. For example, ENGL 1001 introduces the goal of written communication; the same goal will be covered in subsequent courses at the practicing and demonstrating level. Again, by the end of their program, a student will show, through assessment in individual courses, their mastery of the outcomes.

Marshall will send an electronic copy to I. Pierce for distribution to ASnet.

Nagel asked if we will have dept. faculty think about how our current GE courses map onto the revised goals and vice versa. The GE goals are used in determining if a new GE course will be approved, so he's

wondering if for goals 5-7, the changed language leaves certain ideas out. The phrase multicultural perspectives was left off. The new version speaks to culture but not multicultural perspectives; similarly, the new version does not include the phrase interdisciplinary relationships. From goal seven, complexity about judgments; he's not sure if there is a lot at stake in these phrases for others, but it's fairly meaningful to him.

Marshall said a working group talked about that a lot and thought that "an understanding of human cultural endeavors" was broad enough to include multicultural perspectives. They did talk about including a fourth goal on global/multicultural perspectives.

9. Open Forum

Jasek-Rysdahl handed over the turkey leg to K. Stone so he could speak.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that SEC held a couple of sessions to get input on RPT, and in these two sessions he and SEC listened to a number of issues coming up regularly by several people. The concerns were whether the review is favorable or unfavorable. Noted was an implied "university standard." Teaching proficiency is the primary qualification, and people are getting the sense that this is not coming out in the Provost's recommendations. People are telling us there appears to be an emphasis on a narrow band of research dissemination. Jasek-Rysdahl wants to get these statements into the record as follows:

Department Chairs and Department RPT Committee members,

Quite a few people have shared concerns regarding the Provost's RPT letters. Specific concerns are:

- 1. The Provost has introduced a ranking system that was never communicated to the faculty prior to the evaluation cycle. Even when they are used, there are no criteria explaining the rankings are applied.*
- 2. The Provost has implied that he is using a "university standard" to develop his recommendations. Our university has no such standard and it is a grievable policy violation to base decisions on criteria other than those approved by faculty and accepted by candidates [i.e., departmental elaborations].*
- 3. There is no evidence to suggest that teaching proficiency was the primary qualification in the Provost's review of candidates. The Provost devotes the most attention in letters to candidates to describing research outcomes.*
- 4. There appears to be a bias in the Provost's review to privilege a narrow band of research dissemination over all other areas of evaluation. The Provost repeatedly pulls out publication in high level refereed journals as notable while ignoring other types of scholarship. This occurs whether the review is favorable or unfavorable.*
- 5. The Provost skipped the scheduled Conference Committee that is expected by policy. The purpose of the Conference Committee is to discuss areas of disagreement between the Provost and URTPC before tentative letters from either go out to candidates.*
- 6. There are a number of cases where the Provost's recommendation contradicts the recommendations of all other levels of review. In these cases, there should be compelling reasons that clearly explain why every other level of review is wrong.*

Please work with your colleagues who were evaluated by your departmental RPT committee to ensure that the evaluation conducted by the Provost follows our policies and procedures. We encourage you to support your candidates who intend to write a rebuttal. There are a number of ways you may do this so that your support for the candidate becomes part of the WPAF. You can help your candidate write the letter and then all sign the letter as supporters. You can write a letter to the other levels of review stating your support and your candidate can quote the whole letter in her/his rebuttal letter.

Department chairs, DRPTC's, and candidates are encouraged to work together to determine whether a

rebuttal addressing portions of the content is advisable even if the “decision” is a favorable one. Please advise your candidates with positive recommendations from the Provost to carefully review their recommendation letter for accuracy and to ensure that there is not language setting unreasonable expectations for future years. For example, a number of letters include recommendations that candidates provide “objective, quantitative evidence concerning the quality of publishing venues,” and some contain references to “external review of the value of research outcomes,”

We encourage you to stress that the members of the discipline are in the best position to evaluate your candidates and that all of the candidate’s work must be valued in a manner that is consistent with your department’s elaborations.

*Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl
Speaker of the Faculty*

*Steven Filling
Chair, URPT Committee*

Sarraille noted there were also factual errors in a number of the files as well.

10. Adjournment
3:58pm.