

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

December 5, 2000

**PRESENT:** Akwabi-Ameyaw, Almy, Alvarez-Palma, Anderson, Buell, Carroll, Chu, Costa, Cross, Cruz, Curry, Dunbar, Farrar, Floyd, Gackowski, Gerstenfeld, Johnson, Kimyai, MacDonald, Mayer, J., Mayer, M., McLaughlin, Nagel, Oppenheim, Pandell, Peterson, Russ, Souza, Sundar, Thompson, Yang, Zarling

**PROXIES:** Souza (Clark)

**ABSENT:** Burroughs, Finley, Hernandez, Hilpert, Kohlhaas, Nelson, Olivant, Thomas

**GUESTS:** Brown, Klein, Sarraille, Towell

**Recording Secretary:** Diana Saugstad

22/AS/00/FAC--Policies and Procedures for Post Tenure Review, **FIRST READING**

23/AS/00/FAC--Resolution to include/not include FAR in PAF, **FIRST READING**

Recommendation to Allow Student Choice for Terms of Enrollment, **DISCUSSED**

---

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, January 30, 2001  
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

---

Minutes submitted by:

Christine Hamlow Souza, Clerk

Speaker Pandell called the Academic Senate meeting to order at 2:35 PM. The agenda was approved as presented. The minutes of November 21, 2000 were approved with the following corrections: On page 3, change 6th resolve to 4th resolve. The two sentences would then read "Pandell pointed out that in the 4th resolve there are specific dates for graduation application. Johnson recommended that the word 'graduation' be included in the 4th resolve after Spring 2001/Summer 2001 for clarity."

**REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS****a. Speaker/SEC (Pandell)**

Pandell received a letter from Sonoma State University commending the Academic Senate for our resolution on the FMI process. SSU passed the identical resolution on their campus.

Pandell reported that Thompson represented the Speaker at the CSU Chairs meeting in Long Beach. Thompson reported that Vice Chancellor Spence agreed to a shared governance accountability indicator based on HEERA.

**b. University Educational Policies Committee (Thompson)**

Thompson distributed a written report. He further reported:

1. UEPC discussed MAP II.

2. Friday, March 30 is being proposed as the Cesar Chavez holiday to be started Spring 2001. Peterson requested that UEPC distribute a calendar before it is finalized in the traditional calendar format so faculty can have input. Thompson stated that it is not clear how UEPC will handle the holiday recommendation. Pandell stated that the recommendation would probably come to SEC and then the Senate.

3. Gackowski reported that there is no student representative on the APR Subcommittee. Oppenheim stated that there is no student representative on FBAC either. They both stressed the importance of student representation.

**c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Anderson)**

No report

**d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Oppenheim)**

1. Oppenheim reported that FBAC is continuing to work on the material received from University Development and Vice President Stephens.

2. FBAC reapproved a resolution on budget priorities which was approved by last year's FBAC. SEC will probably discuss it in January.

**e. Graduate Council (Dunbar)**

No report

**f. Statewide Academic Senate (Hilpert/Thompson)**

No report

**g. Foundation Board (Dunbar)**

Dunbar reported that the Foundation Board meets next week.

**h. Associated Students (Alvarez-Palma/Cross)**

Alvarez-Palma reported that homecoming week is this week, and on Friday there will be a parade in the quad. This is the second annual homecoming. Elections are also taking place.

**i. Other**

1. Curry advised that Trustee Stanley Wang will be on campus this Friday. An open forum is scheduled in

DBH 166, from 2:45-3:30 PM. Curry presented the background on Trustee Wang.

2. Akwabi-Ameyaw voiced concern that student representatives are not attending faculty committee meetings. Faculty need the students input.

3. Mayer asked about the status of the 120-unit requirement for graduation. Pandell stated that it is effective once the President signs the resolution. Mayer also asked about summer session rates for students. Provost Curry stated that he would forward the information to Mayer.

4. Mayer announced that there are three performances of Turn of the Screw this weekend. There are still seats available.

## **FIRST READING ITEMS**

### **a. 22/AS/00/SEC–Policies and Procedures for Post Tenure Review**

It was MS Anderson/Russ:

WHEREAS: Sections 15.29-15.31 of the MOU mandate "Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Unit Employees"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That every five years tenured professors, counselors and librarians be evaluated in accordance with the process outlined in the following document entitled "Post Tenure Review"; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the policies and procedures contained therein be implemented beginning Fall 2001.

Anderson reported that after discussion from the last Senate meeting, FAC made changes to the document. As a result of the poll, FAC omitted the PIP plan. The calendar was also adjusted. The passages referring to the MOU are paraphrased. 3.2.1 was changed slightly to allow departments to address this issue.

Zarling asked what happened to Oppenheim's counter proposal. The proposal went out over FACNET. Oppenheim also questioned why his document was not attached to the agenda. Saugstad clarified that the SEC did not instruct her to attach this proposal to the agenda. She will be happy to provide it for the next Senate meeting if the Senators decide it is necessary. Zarling further stated that although the possibility of funds is a positive aspect of the proposal, he voiced concern that the proposed policy is very detailed. Further, allowing departments to use the department RPTC as their department committee seems negative. RPT should not be mentioned in the document. Procedures for committee structure should be left up to departments. Anderson replied that FAC tried to provide as many options as possible. Also, the department chair can be selected as the department committee.

Farrar asked what is the definition of a peer. Definitions would be helpful. Further, we could bring someone from another institution into the process if they had the appropriate background.

Pandell asked about 4.1, the first line. What will be done with faculty who have been here for over 5 years. They would have a huge history, much more than five years. Shouldn't faculty be reviewed on their past 15 to 20 years? Anderson replied that FAC did not address this. Pandell asked if this issue could be discussed with FAC and Anderson replied that might be possible.

Farrar questioned the words "performance evaluation." Maybe "assessment" might be more accurate. This could cause problems when deans and chairs change. Anderson replied that FAC doesn't mention the FAR to allow for flexibility for the faculty. FAC wanted to make it easy for the faculty. Farrar added that departments should determine how many years are included in the review. Anderson replied that the MOU states the review is the last five years.

Sarraille advised that the MOU says that it be no greater than five years. It doesn't say that it has to be the last five years.

Thompson asked what the committee did with the information that he sent for review. He further stated that the main pieces in the information he sent to FAC gave more control to the faculty and was more of a positive review. Anderson replied that he brought the information to FAC but the committee felt that the faculty did not want the information in the development plan. Thompson stated that there were other parts of the information sent that gave faculty more control over the process. Anderson replied that based on the feedback received from AS, FAC decided to leave the document at the recommendation level only and not include PIP.

Oppenheim suggested that the first time a person is reviewed, they are given the option to choose their past review period (for example 5-20 years). After the first review, then make it every five years.

Zarling asked about 3.2.1, is there one committee or multiple committees? Does the faculty member select his/her own peer view committee? Anderson said that there would probably be more than one committee because there will be a lot of work to be done, and faculty to be reviewed.

Johnson raised a question of whether faculty could choose the areas they want to be reviewed. Anderson stated that we should not set a lower standard for tenured faculty than we do for non-tenured faculty. Oppenheim stated that people who FERP do not serve on committees--they only teach, so they should not be reviewed in all areas. They should only be reviewed under teaching. Plus, FERP only extends to five years anyway.

MacDonald stated that her department is wondering if the dean is receiving the review or whether the dean is performing a review. Anderson replied that the MOU states that reviews are done by the department and an administrator. FAC defined the administrator as the dean. But, FAC also put in AAUP language "Except for rare and compelling reasons," the Dean's Summary Report shall reflect the views of the Peer Review Committee as expressed in the committee's report.

Nagel stated that the Philosophy Department is concerned about the evaluative terms under 3.3.

Thompson questioned if the MOU says the dean has to make an evaluation or submit a report. Anderson replied the MOU states the appropriate administrator makes a summary report and suggestions or recommendations.

Thompson questioned if 3.3, fifth line states "and note satisfactory performance" and 3.4 states "Except for rare and compelling reasons, the Dean's Summary Report shall reflect the views of the Peer Review Committee as expressed in the committee's report," does not that say that the dean makes an evaluation of performance on the faculty member?

Pandell read 15.29 of the MOU that states "...Such periodic evaluations shall be conducted by a peer review committee of the department or equivalent unit, and the appropriate administrator..." so, it clearly states an appropriate administrator is involved in the evaluation. Thompson inquired if the dean is required per the MOU to make an evaluative statement? Pandell replied that the dean participates with the peer review committee. So, it is interpreted that the dean makes an evaluation.

Anderson stated that FAC wanted to emphasize the positives.

Pandell suggested that we use neutral wording that one meets a reasonable level of expectations.

Peterson raised her concern about small departments. The peer committee could consist of no one from the department. Maybe the peer committee could consist of all peers from the department and not just those of the same rank. Anderson replied that that is also a problem in RPT reviews. There is no way to solve it. Oppenheim's idea for a local department system might work, he stated.

Farrar stated that it is not a good idea to be reviewed by junior faculty.

Dunbar shared that in her department they had very few tenured faculty and the faculty members up for review chose the RPT committee members. It is important that faculty be able to choose.

Zarling reminded the AS that this review should not be compared to RPT. This is not an RPT type of review process. The faculty member should choose their peer group.

Sundar agrees with the formation of the committee chosen by the faculty up for post tenure review.

Sarraille stated that the MOU directs that only tenured faculty and administrators may conduct reviews. Also, the MOU directs the review toward teaching only. Why are we including the other areas?

Oppenheim stated that we would like this to be developmental, but the fact is unless we put teeth into it, it would do no good. There is really not a lot we can do about bad faculty. Zarling replied that that is why it should be developmental and not punitive. It should be locally structured.

Farrar asked about the rewards for this review. What will be the benefits for faculty going through this process? Carroll agreed, asking what do we want to accomplish. This seems confusing.

Pandell tabled the discussion until January 30, 2001. At that meeting, this document can be amended, we can review the Oppenheim document, or a new policy can be prepared.

#### **b. 23/AS/00/FAC-Resolution to include/not include FAR in PAF**

It was MS Anderson/Russ:

WHEREAS: There has been confusion by faculty about the necessity of inserting the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in the Personnel Action File (PAF); and

WHEREAS: The MOU does not require the FAR be placed in the PAF; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following sentence appear on the FAR application immediately above the sentence that reads "I attest that the information provided..."

I do / do not (please circle one) wish to have my Faculty Activity Report inserted into my Personnel Action File.

Anderson introduced the resolution referring to the language in the MOU. Under 31.30 of the MOU it states that the faculty member may place the FAR in the PAF, but there is no opportunity for the faculty member to say yes or no. Current practice is that unless the faculty member advises the Human Resources Office, the FAR goes into the PAF. FAC has come up with the above statement to be added on the application form.

Thompson clarified if the FAR form could be altered. The response was yes.

Sundar questioned why a faculty member would not want the FAR put into their PAF. Anderson replied that faculty should have a choice. If faculty were unaware of the current practice, it would automatically go into their PAF. That is why FAC has made this statement.

A discussion ensued regarding faculty members who don't mark a preference box. Pandell replied that the faculty member would probably get a call from Associate Vice President Bowers Office asking that they circle one. Carroll commented that if there is default language regarding faculty members who do not mark whether they want the FAR included in the PAF or not, then it needs to be included in the form. Pandell stated that no one but the faculty member can put the FAR in their PAF.

This will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **a. Recommendation to Allow Student Choice for Terms of Enrollment**

Resolution from UEPC to be discussed:

RESOLVED: That the University not require students to enroll in any particular semester; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University remove the Winter Term residency requirement effective Winter Term 2001; and be it further

RESOLVED: That no students, regardless of previous enrollment or status, be held to the Winter Term residency requirement in order to graduate.

RATIONALE: The University has not required students to enroll in fall or spring terms and currently questions whether winter-term residency is a valid or enforceable requirement; further, with the advent of year-round operation/offerings (YRO), there is concern that students may be forced to attend summer sessions.

Thompson reported that UEPC is looking at the residency requirement for Winter Term. The questions raised were: 1) Is there still a strong rationale for requiring Winter Term and 2) Could we enforce this

requirement and hold a student up from graduating if they had met all requirements except this requirement? Another question raised by UEPC was if we were under YRO, would students be required to take a Summer term to ensure enrollments in summer session? There was unanimous support to move this resolution out of UEPC to SEC/AS. UEPC decided to make the language broad because there might be something about lengthening the semester system.

Pandell stated that the timing of this is inappropriate if there is a proposal to change to a semester system. But, in SEC, a member stated that he signs a lot of petitions to waive Winter Term. It costs the students \$10 per waiver and it is pretty much always approved.

Oppenheim stated that there has never been an administration that has wanted Winter Term. If the administration wants to go to a semester system, they should come up with a plan at the same time. Provost Curry stated that he has not seen a plan to go to a semester system. But, the issue of doing away with the Winter Term requirement came up last year. It is not connected to anything else. There are a lot of petitions signed each year, and the requirement is really not enforceable. Maybe Enrollment Services could give a brief report to the Senate on this issue.

Oppenheim stated that it really is cheaper for students to take Winter Term.

Russ stated that it is her understanding that Chancellor Reed wants all campuses to be on a semester system. Further, if we do talk about going YRO, where does Winter Term fit? Curry stated that a group looked at the impact of YRO on our current calendar. There are survey results.

Souza stated that in the Nursing Department, students ask for waivers all the time. Why are we requiring students to take a particular term? Why not allow students to choose if they want to take Winter Term. It is beneficial to some students and economical.

Pandell stated that it is normal for an institution to require students to attend Fall and Spring. So this resolution is opening it up completely. It says students will not be required to take Fall, Winter or Spring. It is a far-reaching resolution.

Thompson stated that this concern came from the Chancellor stating we could require students to attend Summer Session. If we get YRO funded appropriately, we could require students to attend Summer Session.

Farrar stated that small departments have a difficult time staffing Winter Term.

Nagel presented an argument opposing lifting the Winter Term requirement because of its original intent. Nagel clarified that one of his faculty members feels that if the requirement is taken away, it will kill Winter Term.

Costa suggested that we poll the students if they like Winter Term.

Curry stated that the issue is really the Winter Term requirement. Are we going to enforce the requirement?

Gackowski stated that he feels that Winter Term courses short change students. It is difficult to cover all the material over a 4-week period. Students need time to absorb, reflect, and think. The requirement should be abandoned.

Sarraille stated that the Winter Term experience is not the same now. Courses are ordinary courses and they are not the intensive creative type courses that were originally presented. If faculty want to solve this problem, they will have to change what is being offered during Winter Term.

Thompson stated that he likes Winter Term, but the big part of the discussion in UEPC is the original rationale. Does it still exist? It is not clear whether Winter Term has that special nature in the majority of classes. It can be a benefit, but also a deterrent.

Anderson stated that Winter Term has enhanced his faculty development. We can emphasize globalization of the curriculum. Winter Term is the only time faculty can take students to another country. These opportunities will not be available if the Winter session is done away with. Further, faculty will also have to teach four classes per semester if Winter Term is abandon.

Farrar is concerned about graduate students who are coming to the campus and work full time. Winter Term does not work for this type of student.

Pandell asked if the senators want this to come as a first reading at the next Senate meeting. A straw vote was taken: Yes 8/No 14.

Adjourned at 4:10 PM.