

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 1, 2001

**PRESENT:** Akwabi-Ameyaw, Alvarez-Palma, Aly, Anderson, Buell, Byrd, Carroll, Christopher, Chu, Cross, Curry, Dunbar, Farrar, Fazal, Gackowski, Hilpert, Johnson, Kimyai, Kohlhaas, Luo, MacDonald, Mayer, J., Mayer, M., Nelson, Oppenheim, Pandell, Peterson, Riedmann, Russ, Souza, Thomas, Thompson, Zarling

**PROXIES:** Souza (Clark)

**ABSENT:** Burroughs, Costa, Finley, Floyd, Keymer, Nagel, Olivant, Yang

**GUESTS:** Blodgett, Boffman, Bowers D., Entin, Erickson, Filling, Hejka-Ekins, Jasek-Rysdahl, Klein, Lindsay, Navarro (Modesto Bee), Pierce, Roe, Sarraille, Stephens, Taniguchi

## Posting Guidelines, INFORMATION

6/AS/01/FAC--Amendment Article VI, Sections 2.1 and 3.1 of the GF Constitution, APPROVED

7/AS/01/FBAC--Resolution on an Arena, FIRST READING

8/AS/01/UEPC--Proposed Agricultural Studies Major, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

9/AS/01/GC--Resolution to Name Graduate School, FIRST READING

10/AS/01/FBAC--FBAC/DUR Report, FIRST READING

11/AS/01/UEPC--Staff Support for Faculty Governance, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

12/AS/01/UEPC--Process and Criteria for Justification of Units Beyond 120 for Graduation, FIRST READING

13/AS/01/FAC--Amendment to Article VI, Section 2.3 of the GF Constitution, APPROVED

14/AS/01/FAC--Bonus Award Policy, FIRST READING

---

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, May 15, 2001  
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

---

Minutes submitted by:

Christine Hamlow Souza, Clerk

**Recording Secretary:** Diana Saugstad

---

Pandell called the Academic Senate meeting to order at 2:35 PM. The agenda was approved as presented. The minutes of April 10, 2001 were approved with the following corrections: 1) Reports and Announcements, b. University Educational Policies Committee, change effect to affect in the second paragraph, second sentence. 2) Reports and Announcements, g. Foundation Report, change: "Oppenheim asked how much money DUR would raise this year. Dunbar responded that DUR is in a 5-year campaign and the goal is being focused on" to "Oppenheim asked how much money DUR would raise this year. Dunbar responded that DUR would be raising less because they are in a 5-year campaign and that is the goal for the year."

## **REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **a. Speaker/SEC (Pandell)**

Speaker Pandell reported that the President did not sign the Post-Tenure Review Policy, therefore we will not have a PTR Policy until much later. Any new proposal will come back to the Senate for approval. The President will be meeting with SEC next week regarding the matter. Zarling asked what the objections were. Pandell responded that there were some editorial changes and the response is long. Saugstad will send Zarling and Sarraille a copy.

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

Thompson reported that UEPC dealt with the Proposal to modify the Writing Proficiency Program and came up with the following suggestions: 1) WP courses become a 4-unit course; 2) correct usage, punctuation and paragraph development are concerns of WP courses and that specification of quantity of writing is not a crucial aspect of writing program design; 3) the WPST should continue as a screening tool within the WP program.

UEPC discussed a resolution on the review of interdisciplinary program minors and consulted with the College Curriculum Committees and the Academic Program Review subcommittee. The committee advises that review of interdisciplinary program minors be suspended until the guidelines and process for such reviews are revised, but that once review resumes, the college(s) provide appropriate support for all programs under review.

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

Anderson reported that the Administrative Review Policy was submitted to the President and she responded that there were issues she could not accept in the proposal. The President claims that in her review process, there is wide feedback from faculty and campus constituents. She claims that she is following MPP Guidelines. The President will discuss this with SEC at the May 8th meeting.

Anderson reported that FAC is reviewing the voting rights of faculty. There are times in certain departments where part-time/non tenure track faculty outnumber tenure track faculty. FAC is going to propose open Faculty Fora to get feedback on this issue in the Fall 2001. If you would like to provide input before Fall, please forward to him.

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

No report

**e. Graduate Council (Dunbar)**

Dunbar reported that GC has approved a proposal to develop fee waivers for graduate students who are teaching courses. Russ asked if the fee waiver would come to the Senate. Dunbar stated it could come as an information item.

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

Sarraille reported that SWAS is discussing the possibility of changing voting and representation structure in the Senate. As he understands it, the proposal is to make SWAS more like the House of Representatives whereby the larger schools would have more votes, instead of like the Senate as it is now where there are equal votes. Thompson noted that all members of the ad hoc committee dealing with this issue are from large campuses, except one.

Hilpert advised that SWAS is discussing as a first reading item Priority of Funding. Further, one item discussed is a recommendation regarding increasing funding for faculty housing in high cost areas. This would affect the larger schools. SWAS is also discussing the option of offering the EdD. SWAS is meeting next week. .

Farrar stated that the institution should be supported before we talk about advanced degrees.

**g. Foundation Board (Dunbar)**

No report

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

Alvarez-Palma reported that the new ASI officers are taking office today. The Athletic vote passed both in Turlock and Stockton. The new officers from ASI are Andrew Johnson, President and Cesar Rumayor, Vice President.

**INFORMATION ITEM****a. Posting Guidelines**

Pandell introduced the Posting Guidelines as an Information Item. Christopher stated that she is the faculty representative for the Rainbow Group and that their posters are removed and defaced regularly and she asked if there are any consequences for taking down posters. Stephens responded that if staff are defacing and removing posters then it would lead to a disciplinary action process with due process. Stephens stated that she is unaware of what would happen to students.

Thompson asked if this policy covers faculty. He went on to ask what happens to the guidelines once they leave the AS. Stephens stated yes. Further, that she is getting feedback from a variety of groups. Once feedback is received, the guidelines will go to the President for approval and it will become policy. Thompson stated that the guidelines/policy may impede faculty rights.

Hilpert asked if this is policy or guidelines? It appears that the guidelines talked about are posting guidelines, not defacing. If this is a policy then the name needs to be changed.

Christopher stated that the restroom stalls are prohibited in the posting guidelines and it should be included.

The restrooms are an effective location for the posting of information and maybe a posting apparatus on the back of the doors could be installed.

Thomas stated that Music has a lot of daily posting that are taped to doors. This is prohibited in the guidelines.

Zarling pointed out that alcohol advertisement is the only type advertisement prohibited in the guidelines. Zarling voiced that all commercial advertisement should be prohibited. Stephens stated that the University gets requests for advertisement and students have responsibility for posting in the quad. Advertisements are not only geared to students, but faculty and staff as well.

Zarling suggested putting this on as a first reading item for the next agenda. Consensus to put this on the next Senate agenda as a first reading item.

### **ACTION ITEM**

#### **a. 6/AS/01/FAC- Amendment to General Faculty Constitution (Article VI, Section 2.1 and 3.1)**

Anderson stated the need for this amendment to the General Faculty Constitution is to make the language consistent for all General Faculty Committees. It would allow librarians and counselors under the membership of LAC and FAC.

There being no discussion, the question was called. Vote to amend Article VI, Sections 2.1 and 3.1 of the General Faculty Constitution passed with one abstention. This will go to a General Faculty vote.

### **FIRST READING ITEMS**

#### **a. 7/AS/01/FBAC-Resolution on an Arena**

It was MS Oppenheim/Hilpert:

**WHEREAS**, conceptual drawings have been prepared for an 8,000-12,000 seat arena to be situated on the Turlock campus, and

**WHEREAS**, these drawings may be presented to possible donors for construction at the Turlock campus, and

**WHEREAS**, final decisions to construct such large structures are normally arrived at after thorough feasibility studies covering their rationale, use, and cost of maintenance, and

**WHEREAS**, these decisions involve issues such as utilization of land from the limited space available to the campus, routing of utilities, traffic and parking, and the resources necessary to maintain such a structure, and

**WHEREAS**, decisions on requesting funds to build significant structures are arrived at after thorough consultation with all segments of the campus community, and

**WHEREAS**, a sizable donation necessary for this structure might have to be declined because of the unfavorable outcome of the consultation and feasibility studies, which would put the campus in a difficult

position, therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, that a thorough discussion on the rationale, justification, and feasibility of such a facility and its economic, maintenance and management implications be carried out before any funds are solicited or accepted for such a facility, and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that this discussion and recommendations for such a facility be made with the full participation of all segments of the campus community--students, staff, and faculty-- and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that these discussions include implications of such a structure on the campus's financial position, available space and adherence to its mission statement and its architectural master plan, and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the final decision to present plans to potential donors take place only after the above recommendations are presented to the President.

Oppenheim requested that any vote be by secret ballot. He reported that there has been talk for over a year to build a facility that will hold 8-12 thousand people. FBAC was made aware of concerns regarding the Arena plans from instructional faculty who sit on the Facility Planning Committee. It appears that \$73,000 was donated from an outside source for a feasibility study for the Arena. It appears that the Arena issue is moving forward without adequate evaluation/consultation.

Oppenheim presented FBAC's concerns:

1. The University is moving forward with the Arena plans without consultation with the major groups on campus, AS, SEC, FBAC, ASI.
2. There may be a large donor who is willing to give money and then it will move forward without appropriate consultation.
3. Sometimes things just get done on campus during the summer when faculty are gone.

Oppenheim continued that the arena may be a great thing for the campus, but this resolution is a step to stop movement for a couple of months and get feedback from major groups on campus in the Fall to see if this is compatible with the mission of the University. This resolution is designed to facilitate Shared Governance.

Klein stated that the Facilities Planning Committee voted to do a needs assessment on the Arena feasibility.

Alvarez-Palma voiced that she likes the resolution. Further, she wished that as much effort would take place for revamping the Student Union. An assessment would benefit everyone.

Farrar asked if this will come back to the Senate after the needs assessment. Pandell replied if the resolution is approved by the Senate and President, it will come back here.

#### **b. 8/AS/01/UEPC-Proposed Agricultural Studies Major**

It was MS Thompson/Russ:

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves a multidisciplinary B.A. degree major in Agricultural Studies, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the new degree major be submitted to the CSU Office of Academic Planning for fast track consideration, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the new degree program be implemented by the Spring 2002 semester. If systemwide consideration is delayed, the program shall be implemented in the first semester following approval.

**Rationale:** The degree major in Agricultural Studies has been developed over the past three years by faculty from a number of academic departments on campus. The design of the program has been guided by a survey of CSU Stanislaus faculty, surveys of students and faculty at community colleges in the region, and consultations with representatives of diverse agricultural and educational groups.

Students enrolling in the major will complete designated lower division prerequisites, 17 units of upper division common core courses (offered by four academic departments) and one of three concentrations: Agricultural Biology, Applied Economics, and Permaculture. Each of the concentrations will offer students experiential learning opportunities. It is anticipated that new concentrations will be added over time.

There are two sets of objectives associated with the degree program in Agricultural Studies.

The first of these can be described as **substantive and learning process objectives**:

The substantive purposes of the agricultural studies program are to provide students in the Agricultural Studies major with an understanding of:

- n basic economic principles with respect to the production and distribution of agricultural resources;
- n agricultural and environmental resource management;
- n pre- and post-production business and marketing practices;
- n physical, chemical, and biological principles of agroeco systems;
- n global perspectives on food issues;
- n restorative and sustainable agricultural practices;
- n spatial and quantitative techniques;
- n the social context of agricultural production;
- n public policy, regulatory, and land use issues.

In pursuing these objectives, the program will:

- n encourage students to critically assess agricultural issues and trends;
- n provide students with opportunities to systematically develop their communicative, analytical, quantitative, and critical thinking skills;
- n expose students to diverse teaching and learning strategies in a number of academic disciplines;
- n offer students applied experience through internships and service learning;
- n deliver a high quality academic program that prepares students for changing and emerging professional opportunities in the region;
- n provide students with an educational experience that helps prepare them for graduate studies and teaching.

Other objectives are **programmatic and institutional**. These are designed to:

- n offer an academic program not replicated elsewhere that meets educational needs in the northern San Joaquin Valley and Central Sierra Foothills;
- n provide academic departments at California State University, Stanislaus with the opportunity and

- n incentives to collaborate through the delivery of a multidisciplinary major;
- n foster the development of sustainable relationships with area community colleges through the implementation of a 2+2 program design;
- n enable California State University, Stanislaus to pursue a program that is consistent with its liberal arts learning mission;
- n strengthen ties between the University and the region's agricultural and educational communities;
- n increase student access to an academic program in the area in which they reside.

Thompson stated that this was approved unanimously by UEPC.

Entin introduced the proposed Ag Studies Major by emphasizing that this proposed major has been in the works for three years and there have been a number of faculty involved in the process. Entin acknowledged the following people: Wayne Pierce, Ed Erickson, Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Jim Klein, June Boffman, Nael Aly, Keith Johnson, Ida Bowers, Ken Schoenly, Hobart Hamilton and Michael Schmidt.

Entin stated that he has encouraged all academic departments to participate in this major. There are three different concentrations in the major: Agricultural Biology, Applied Economics, and Permaculture. Entin continued stating that surveys have been conducted at Merced, Modesto and Delta Junior Colleges. Support has been obtained from all three community colleges and HECCC. The program has been endorsed by C&R, FBAC and UEPC. This is a liberal arts program that supports the educational needs in our region.

Oppenheim stated that the committee has done a thorough job in bringing everyone together. He went on further to state that the FBAC supported this proposal and the Senate should also support it.

Anderson asked if a foreign language component was considered for the major. Entin stated that this wasn't done. There is a useful vehicle by putting this as a recommendation under GE, and would support the incorporation of this component within GE. Anderson stated he would like Spanish addressed.

It was MSP Russ/Peterson to waive the rules and move to a second reading.

Farrar stated that he is surprised that there is no genetics incorporated in the courses. Pierce stated that we are trying to link this degree with the community colleges, and genetics would require Chemistry and Math. Students would be better served if they want genetics to become a Biology major. Genetic engineering is incorporated in one of the courses.

Farrar voiced his concern that the Economic courses are 4000 numbers and not 3000. He is concerned about hidden prerequisites. Erickson stated that there are no hidden prerequisites.

Russ called the Question. Vote on the resolution passed unanimously. This will be sent to the President for action.

### **c. 9/AS/01/GC-Resolution to Name Graduate School**

It was MS Dunbar/Hilpert:

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate recommend to the President that "Graduate Studies" be renamed

"Graduate School."

**Rationale:**

A Graduate School provides for an infrastructure that has quality graduate education as an important, focused, visible goal. This structure for graduate education is common throughout the United States.

A Graduate School allows for greater advocacy for advanced learning, for research and scholarly activity across the disciplines, and for exemplary instruction for graduate studies.

A Graduate School communicates both symbolically and operationally to the external community and external funding agencies, the importance of graduate education to the university's academic mission.

A Graduate School acknowledges and respects the autonomy of the colleges, schools, and departments while recognizing the interrelationships of the faculty and administration in support of graduate education.

Throughout the state and the nation, a Graduate School serves as an important symbolic function and an effective means for serving the special needs of graduate students and for communicating to future students and donors the value of graduate education to the university's mission. The CSU Stanislaus graduate program would be better reflected and more accurately represented among California universities if identified as being under the auspices of a Graduate School.

The functions of the current Graduate Studies office include all functions carried out by graduate schools at other universities and therefore would be more accurately identified as a Graduate School. The current structure includes a Dean of Graduate Studies, a Graduate Studies Director, and three support staff. No additional staff will be required for a change of name. Any major expansion of graduate enrollment may require additional staff regardless of the title, however the change of title will not entail additional costs.

**Programs.** CSU Stanislaus currently offers ten master's degree programs that contain seventeen concentrations or emphases. These include programs in Business Administration, English, History, Interdisciplinary Studies, Marine Science, Psychology, Public Administration, Social Work, and Education (School Administration, Physical Education, School Counseling, Special Education, Reading, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Multilingual Education, and Technology Education). A postbaccalaureate certificate program is also offered in Art—Printmaking.

**Enrollments.** Students in postbaccalaureate programs total over 1,700 in Fall 2000. When postbaccalaureate credential students are included, graduate and postbaccalaureate enrollments represent 24% of the student body.

**Value.** As the campus approaches the next century and struggles with issues related to student learning in the new millennium, the role of Graduate Studies at CSU Stanislaus is an important element for consideration. The academic goals vary among the graduate programs, but the overarching goal is to educate graduate students with the advanced knowledge, values, and skills that have been historically at the center of the academy. Thus, the quality of the programs, the faculty, and the students remains the premier criterion for graduate education.

Dunbar introduced the resolution by referring senators to the rationale provided in the resolution document. The name change would give a structure for quality graduate education on our campus. Roe stated that she has been on Graduate Council since the early 80's. She continued by stating that this name change is being generated by faculty and not administration. Roe stated that Associate Vice President Hanna developed the infrastructure of the Graduate Council that we have today. This faculty committee has overseen the graduate programs on campus. This is typical of graduate schools on other campuses. Graduate Studies at CSU, Stanislaus has functioned as a Graduate School for years. There is nothing different except a name change. Currently, it is inconsistent with what we really do. The name is a throwback in time when CSUS was a state college. We currently have Colleges and Schools within Colleges. The number of post baccalaureate students has grown and is 20-25 % of our total student population. Quality of our graduate programs has gone up over the past years. Roe stated that she is proud of the graduate programs.

Farrar asked if there will be a graduate faculty designated. Roe stated no, absolutely not. Faculty would be identified in their various departments.

Akwabi-Ameyaw asked if there will be any expansion in enrollments. Roe stated yes. The graduate programs have expanded comparably to undergraduate programs. She stated that the name change will probably not bring more students. Akwabi-Ameyaw stated that he came to the Graduate Studies Office and asked for materials and was treated very badly and he recommends that if we plan to convert from Graduate Studies to Graduate School, the staff are going to have to transform the office to what goes on in universities with graduate schools.

Thompson stated that the fourth paragraph of the rationale regarding respecting departments implies there will be no change in autonomy with the name change. Hejka-Ekins stated no funding or structure would change. This would help us get more scholarships for students and be recognized within the system. This is not a power move attempt but a symbolic move to better meet student needs. This would not change any existing structures.

Carroll asked if the name change would change the dean title. Dunbar replied no.

#### **d. 10/AS/01/FBAC-FBAC/DUR Report**

It was MS Oppenheim/Hilpert:

**RESOLVED**, that the Academic Senate accept the FBAC DUR Report and approve the recommendations set forth in that document.

Oppenheim made the following correction in the DUR report: 1) Athletic fees are \$25.00 per year not a semester and 2) Correction on page 13, \$65 instead of \$95.

Oppenheim introduced the active members of FBAC: Steve Filling, Paul O'Brien, Arthur Buell, John Almy, David Lindsay, Don Bowers (ex secretary), Chuck Floyd (ex officio)

Oppenheim stated that the first paragraph of the report explains why FBAC has been evaluating DUR and University Relations. This is the 9th draft of the report and the document has been reviewed multiple times. FBAC also revised the document based on SEC recommendations.

FBAC thanks Speaker Pandell and SEC for careful review of the document.

Oppenheim reported that on March 26th the DUR Report was sent to the President for response by April 9th. VP Strong attended the following SEC meeting to respond to the report. VP Strong told SEC that he believed the report was full of errors and a waste of time to respond. Further, that FBAC exceeded their constitutional authority. He felt that FBAC carried out an audit. He further stated that he believed that the report was "legally challengeable." But nevertheless, he did state that he had no problem with many of the recommendations contained in the report. He promised SEC his written response to the recommendations by April 9, and that after April 25, he would be happy to meet with FBAC.

The administration, unfortunately, chose not to respond to the report or recommendations, Oppenheim advised, and it appears there might be an effort to stall so the Senate does not have time to respond by the end of the year. After realizing there would be no response from VP Strong or the President, SEC met and concurred with the FBAC and decided to put the entire report on today's agenda.

FBAC feels that

1. There is a constitutional role for FBAC to review DUR based on the Faculty Handbook.
2. The report is factual and is based on information provided by University Relations and official CSU documents.
3. The report and recommendations will rise or fall on their merit.
4. The interpretations in the report might differ from administration, but FBAC is disappointed that administration stated that the report was full of errors but would not point out the errors over the past month.

Pandell reported that when he sent the draft to the President and VP Strong he requested input from the President, either in writing or verbally with SEC by April 9. There is a meeting scheduled with the President, VP Strong and SEC on May 8th to discuss DUR, Post Tenure Review and Administration Review.

Sarraille stated that he did not see the report and this important information should be posted somewhere or there should be a posting available. Saugstad advised that she did not receive the report electronically until a couple of days ago. Agenda and minutes are posted on the Senate web page as well as over Facnet and a hard copy sent to each department.

Akwabi-Ameyaw stated that he would like to commend FBAC for their work. Further, that the report should include the problems with acquisition of information. Oppenheim replied that the drafts have changed but the substance is the same. The tone has changed over the drafts because FBAC wanted to make sure that what was there was simply the facts so that the facts would speak for themselves.

Pandell stressed that the goal of the report is to improve shared governance on this campus.

#### **e. 11/AS/01/UEPC-Staff Support for Faculty Governance**

It was MS Thompson/Russ:

**RESOLVED**, that additional staff support, an increase from a .50 to a 1.0 support position, is necessary for effective functioning of faculty governance committees; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the staff support position(s) for faculty governance be administratively housed in the office of the Academic Senate.

**Rationale:** In the recent past, some committees of the Academic Senate and their subcommittees functioned without direct staff support for their work. Due to increases in governance workload for committees caused by a number of factors--new programs as well as system initiatives such as Cornerstones implementation, assessment, accountability, remediation, technology, year-round operation—the Provost began providing a .50 position for support of faculty governance work. That position was augmented by the AVPAA with an additional .25 originally intended for other work (a description of intended and actual duties for the original position is attached). The AVPAA has alerted affected committees that this additional support will no longer be available.

Those who work in governance are very grateful for the support provided by the Provost and the AVPAA; however, we also realize that, with the continued expansion and growing complexity of the University as well as system initiatives mentioned above, additional work is required of faculty who serve in governance and that additional staff support will be required as well. As an example, two new subcommittees of the UEPC, Academic Technology and Assessment of Student Learning have recently been approved and will require staff support.

The attachment also provides a basis for prescribing the level and kinds of support the staff person(s) will provide to the governance committees and subcommittees.

When staff support was initially provided, there was discussion in SEC in support of directly linking the position to the office of the Academic Senate; the position instead reports directly to the Coordinator of Academic Programs. The Senate Executive Committee feels strongly that staff support positions provided for governance be administratively housed in the office of the Academic Senate.

Thompson explained the resolution. No discussion ensued.

It was MSP Russ/Souza to waive the rules and move to a second reading.

Farrar asked where the money would be coming from. Russ stated the Provost's Office.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the resolution was unanimous approved. The resolution will be sent to the President for action.

#### **f. 12/AS/01/UEPC-Process and Criteria for Justification of Units Beyond 120 for Graduation**

It was MS Thompson/Hilpert:

**RESOLVED**, that upon approval by the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus:

1. Justification of units beyond 120 will become a component of the 5-year Academic Program Reviews.
2. Programs will not be compelled to justify units before the programs are under review but may undertake a review of required program units before their regularly scheduled 5-year program review (for example, as part of program modification).
3. As part of the program review documents, departments will submit an outline fully accounting for all degree requirements.
4. Justification of units beyond 120 may be based on rationales of importance of units to the degree program and/or accreditation standards.

5. The Justification will follow the same "path of approval" as do other components of the 5-year Academic Program Review.
6. Justification of units beyond 120 will become a component of proposals for new undergraduate degree programs.

**Rationale:** Title 5 requires a campus monitoring system for approval of units beyond 120 in degree programs. The UEPC is concerned that the process and criteria should not create additional burdens for degree programs and emphasizes that the justification for units beyond 120 is an important component of faculty control of the curriculum.

Thompson introduced the resolution by explaining that the justification is mandated in Title 5. Title 5 requires that the campus have a monitoring system for majors that exceed 120 units. UEPC felt that the monitoring system would be best placed with Academic Program Review. UEPC tried to leave this as open as possible so it would be simple and easy.

Zarling asked if this justification will be done only once or does it have to be done every 5 years. Thompson stated that it probably needs to be done every 5 years. Thompson stated that committees change, perspectives change and programs change. Zarling stated that this is more work over time. Peterson stated that this will be part of the 5-year review and not an extra document. There is a section on Curriculum in the 5-year review and this section can be used to justify the need for more than 120 units.

Christopher asked how many programs exceed 120 units and will be affected by this resolution. Thompson stated he does not know.

Reidmann asked if this is required by WASC or the CSU. Thompson restated that this is required under Title V.

Zarling stated that one alternative is that anytime a major changes it goes for review. Peterson responded that we already have to do the five-year review so why not include it. Zarling stated that we don't have to add more to the report.

Pandell asked Zarling to think about what language might improve this policy and bring his ideas to the next Senate meeting.

#### **g. 13/AS/01/FAC-Amendment to Article VI, Section 2.3 of the GF Constitution**

It was MS Anderson/Russ:

**RESOLVED,** That the General Faculty Constitution be amended as follows effective Fall 2001.

2.3 UEPC shall, in consultation with the Committee on Committees, establish and discontinue working subcommittees as it deems appropriate and necessary. There are four six standing subcommittees of UEPC: General Education; Off Campus/Distance Learning; University Writing; and Academic Program Review, Academic Technology, and Assessment of Student Learning. The name, function and membership of all subcommittees shall be published to the faculty. The Committee on Committees shall appoint subcommittee members in consultation with the chair of UEPC. Subcommittee membership shall be:

General Education Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other

members appointed at large. There shall be at least three tenured members on the subcommittee.

Off Campus/Distance Learning Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at large.

University Writing Subcommittee: 7 members from the faculty; three faculty from the English Department, two additional faculty from the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, one from the School of Business and one from the School of Education.

Academic Program Review Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at large. There shall be at least three tenured members on the subcommittee.

Academic Technology: 7 voting members; 2 faculty members from the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, one faculty member from the College of Business, one faculty member from the College of Education, one faculty member from the Library, a member of the Off-Campus Distance Learning Subcommittee of UEPC, and a student appointed by the President of ASI. The Associate Vice President of Information Technology shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee: 5 voting members; 2 faculty members from the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, one faculty member from the College of Business, one faculty member from the College of Education, and one student representative appointed by the President of ASI. The Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning and the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning shall be ex-officio, non-voting members.

Terms of the subcommittee members shall be two years, terms to be staggered at the onset by lot. Subcommittee members may include non-members as well as members of UEPC. Each subcommittee elects its own chair each year. The charge of a subcommittee shall be to formulate, review, and recommend to UEPC any policy issue within its purview. Subcommittees under whose purview is the approval of courses for general education or writing proficiency credit have the authority to approve or disapprove those courses. Ad hoc subcommittees may be appointed as needed.

### **Rationale:**

The UEPC approved the formation of an Academic Technology subcommittee and the Assessment of Student Learning subcommittee. Both committees are to be standing committees. Note that an Ad hoc Assessment subcommittee has been in place for about 2 years and that, in essence, we are merely formalizing and giving more authority to the work that subcommittee does. There was extensive consultation about AT over the course of about 9 months, and review of UEPC minutes will demonstrate that the UEPC considered all concerns carefully, repetitively, and at length.

These changes would, besides bringing the language up to date with the number and names of subcommittees, lessen the ambiguity caused by referring to both "working" and "standing" committees. As the entire section now reads, there is reference to "standing," "working," and "ad hoc" subcommittees. Our reading is that the intent is to distinguish between standing and ad hoc.

Thompson stated that this amendment would bring the General Faculty Constitution in line to reflect what is already being done. The amendment would change the working of UEPC to include two additional

subcommittees. These two new standing subcommittees were created by UEPC this year.

It was MSP Russ/Farrar to waive the rules and move to a second reading.

There being no discussion, the question was called. Vote on the amendment passed unanimously. This will now be sent to a faculty vote.

#### **h. 14/AS/01/FAC-Bonus Award Policy**

It was MS Anderson/Oppenheim:

RESOLVED, That the CSUS Bonus Award Policy be approved effective Fall 2001.

Rationale: In excess of \$158,000 have been carried over from previous PSSI and FMI allotments. Inasmuch as these funds were unencumbered during the scheduled award cycles, they cannot constitute a permanent increase in the base salary of individual faculty members (MOU 31.9). In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding, however, monies subject to this restriction may be distributed in the form of a one-time bonus to faculty teams, groups or departments (MOU 31.9). FAC has designed the "Bonus Award Policy" to provide a mechanism for the disbursement of the unencumbered PSSI and FMI award funds.

Pandell stated that this issue has been very frustrating for him because we have known about the \$158,000 since the Fall.

Anderson reported that \$158,000 has accumulated from PSSI/FMI Awards. Since they have accumulated and were not awarded in the same year, they do not add to the base salary. These are one-time awards. The goal is to get the money back out to the faculty. This money would have to be dispersed before the spring term. This has to be concurrent with the FMI process.

Christopher asked if it would be possible to disperse the money equally. Anderson stated he would love to do that but it is not possible. Bowers stated that this is merit money and it has to be allocated as a merit/bonus. FAC tried to develop a policy that is inclusive. Bowers stressed that whatever policy our campus approves, it still has to be approved by CFA and the CSU.

Oppenheim stated that when we first found out about the money, everyone agreed that this money should be given to the faculty because that was the intent of the money. We have tried since the Fall to figure out how we could do it. This is the result of the process that has been going on for 8 to 9 months.

Riedmann asked about the wording of teams and groups. Anderson responded that this is in the contract.

Thomas asked what period this covers. Bowers responded that this money has accumulated over 4 years. Oppenheim stated that this is just for people who are here now. If you have retired during the last 4 years, you cannot apply.

Anderson stated that the departments would design the formula for distribution. Bowers stated that we would have a hard time giving money to people who are no longer here.

Sarraille stated that some of this money is left over PSSI money and the terms are no longer enforced in that

contract. There is nothing in the contract regarding the PSSI money. Sarraille asked if it could be rolled over. Pandell stated no because this is one time money and cannot go to base salary. The only way to get one-time money is through a bonus. Bowers stated that the only individuals that can apply for Bonus Awards are those Full Professors at the top of their scales. Russ commented that merit money is merit money and it doesn't matter what we call it.

Carroll asked about the interest generated on this money. Bowers stated that he is unaware of the interest. It was noted that someone is earning interest on this money.

Hilpert stated that at the end of the introduction this phrase be added:  
"This provision is subject to change when a new contract is in effect."

Hilpert asked the Senators to look at what was originally contained in the appeals process that is not contained in this document. He stated he would amend the document to include an appeal process. Anderson stated that FAC is discussing the appeal issue but they don't want to put money into an appeal process because then we continue to have roll over money each year.

Bowers commended the committee for coming up with a proposal. Bowers stated that the current FMI committee has money set aside for appeals and if it is not used it is rolled over. Pandell asked if a person who gets what the department sent forward can appeal if the faculty member thinks they should get more money. Bowers said no.

Hilpert stated that we are the first campus putting together a Bonus Policy so there have been a lot of negotiations.

Peterson stated that the faculty collectively has been acknowledged in many instances so why cannot we all apply for the bonus money as a team. We could designate the Speaker as the director that would put the report together for the team (all faculty). The President might appreciate the brevity of this process. Bowers responded that everyone is trying to get this money to the faculty. Administration tried to distribute the money to everyone but were told no.

Sarraille stated that his time is worth more than asking for this money. The quickest way of getting the money out is better.

Russ stated that we need to think about the things we do collaboratively as departments or department committees. Think of the things we do that take a lot of time within departments.

Oppenheim stated that administration is in favor of faculty getting this money. On other campuses, faculty don't even see this money. This is an honest effort to get the money to the faculty.

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

Meeting adjourned 4:35 PM