CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
May 15, 2001

PRESENT: Akwabi-Ameyaw, Anderson, Buell, Christopher, Chu, Cruz, Curry, Dunbar, Farrar, Fazal, Floyd, Hilpert, Johnson, Kimyai, Kohlhaas, MacDonald, Mayer J. Mayer, M., Nagel, Nelson, Oppenheim, Pandell, Peterson, Riedmann, Russ, Souza, Thomas, Yang, Zarling

PROXIES: Renner (Keymer), Souza (Clark)

ABSENT: Alvarez-Palma, Byrd, Burroughs, Costa, Cross, Finley, Gackowski, Hernandez, Olivant, Thompson

GUESTS: Blankinship, Blodgett, Bowers D., Demetrulias, Erickson, Hejka-Ekins, Klein, Manrique, Roe, Sarraile, Stephens, Tuedio

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

10/AS/01/FBAC--FBAC/DUR REPORT, TABLED UNTIL 11/6/01
7/AS/01/FBAC--RESOLUTION ON AN ARENA, APPROVED
9/AS/01/GC--RESOLUTION TO NAME GRADUATE SCHOOL, APPROVED
12/AS/01/UEPC--PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR JUSTIFICATION OF UNITS BEYOND 120 FOR GRADUATION, APPROVED
14/AS/01/FAC--BONUS AWARD POLICY, APPROVED
15/AS/01/AS--POSTING GUIDELINES, TABLED UNTIL 9/25/01

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, September 25, 2001
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:

Christine Hamlow Souza, Clerk

Pandell called the Academic Senate meeting to order at 2:35 PM. The agenda was approved as presented. The minutes of May 1, 2001 were approved with the following clarification: Change Reports and Announcements, f. Statewide Academic Senate, paragraph 3, "Farrar stated that the institution should be
supported before we talk about advanced degrees" to "Farrar stated that tenure track positions should be greatly increased before we talk about advanced degrees."

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Speaker/SEC (Pandell)
Pandell announced that there is a correction in the Academic Senate list at the back of the meeting packet. Harriet Blodgett is the Graduate Council Chair and Chuck Floyd is the UEPC Chair.

Pandell made the following announcements:

1. The IDEA student evaluation period ends May 23rd. The Senate office is open until 9:00 pm during the evaluation period. Please do not evaluate during finals.

2. The Spring General Faculty meeting is Thursday, May 17th from 2:30-4:30 PM in South Dining Room.

3. The ballots for the two faculty constitutional amendments are due on Friday, May 18.

4. There are several open fora for the VP for Student Affairs. There is one on Wednesday at 1:15 PM and another on Friday.

5. Pandell informed the faculty that the President has approved the Human Subjects Policy and the Shared Governance/Open Budgeting resolution. The President did not approve the Post-tenure Review Policy.

6. Pandell congratulated Provost Curry on his new position in Nevada.

7. An Ad hoc committee has been appointed to evaluate the academic calendar and prepare a response to the Academic Senate.

8. Assistant VP for Enrollment Management search is ongoing. Two candidates have been interviewed so far.

b. University Educational Policies Committee (Thompson)
No report.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Anderson)
No report.

d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Oppenheim)
No report.

e. Graduate Council (Dunbar)
No report.

f. Statewide Academic Senate (Hilpert/Thompson)
Sarraille reported that the SWAS passed a resolution to get an EdD going on various campuses. SWAS passed a resolution calling for a new study for post baccalaureate programs. Sarraille reported that SWAS
passed the following resolutions: Calendar, Priorities resolution calling for library funding, Budget priorities and a Resolution on the Chancellor.

g. Foundation Board (Dunbar)
No report.

h. Associated Students (Alvarez-Palma/Cross)
No report.

i. Other
1. Erickson announced that the Faculty Barbecue is on Saturday and there are still tickets available.

2. It was MS Oppenheim/Carroll

WHEREAS: Al Pandell has served as Speaker of the Faculty in 2000-2001; and

WHEREAS: Al Pandell has served as Speaker with patience, fairness, and firmness; and

WHEREAS: Al has done this while maintaining his wonderful sense of humor; and

WHEREAS: Al Pandell's year as Speaker is, in terms of faculty governance, the culmination of 31 years of outstanding service to this institution; therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus, on behalf of the entire faculty, express its very great appreciation to Al Pandell and wish Al Pandell and his family much health and happiness in future years.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

Pandell thanked the Senate for their hard work and collective wisdom in dealing with difficult issues. Further, he noted that last January we were the only campus that passed a No Confidence vote in the Chancellor. Now, four months later, there have been several campuses that have passed similar resolutions, and several more to come. He credited the Senate with their leadership on this issue.

Pandell announced that the President has a memorandum to the faculty explaining why she did not approve the Budget Priorities resolution.

Hilpert announced that on May 21st there will be a general chapter meeting of CFA from 2-4 PM, in C 102. The current contract bargaining will be the main topic for discussion.

Information Item
a. Additional Information Related to FBAC/DUR Report
Pandell introduced the response received by the President to the FBAC/DUR Report, the memo from Vice President Stephens and the memo from Vice President Strong. Further, Pandell advised that the President has said she will reassess the BPAC.
Oppenheim stated that last Tuesday SEC met with the President, VP Stephens and VP Strong. The President was anxious that the Senate not take up the resolution today at this Senate meeting. Stephens and Strong both gave reports on the FBAC/DUR Report. After they left, SEC discussed the request, and in the course of the discussion, arrived at the agreement the resolution would be tabled until Fall 2001, and in turn that the President could display good faith by approving the Shared Governance resolution. The Speaker and Speaker Elect then met with the President. The outcome of that meeting was that the President agreed to approve the resolution and the SEC would recommend to the Senate to table the DUR Report to November 6, 2001. By doing so, it will give FBAC time to review the materials received from both Stephens and Strong. Filling gave a written response to their response, but Oppenheim decided not to share the response at this time, but send it forward with the review of the documents in Fall 2001.

Sarraille asked what is meant by tabling, and Oppenheim replied that the report will come back to the Senate for action on November 6, 2001. Pandell further clarified that the report will be sent back to FBAC along with Vice President Stephens and Strong’s response.

**Action Items**

a. 10/AS/01/FBAC-FBAC/DUR Report
It was MS Russ/Anderson to table the FBAC/DUR Report until November 6, 2001. It was unanimously approved.

b. 7/AS/01/FBAC-Resolution on an Arena
Oppenheim stated that the FBAC/DUR report #10 addresses this Arena idea. Vice President Strong even wrote in his response to the report that he agrees that wide consultation should occur on any major project that affects the university community, and at the SEC meeting he also agreed with this. This resolution calls on the Administration to do no further work on this Arena until there is broad discussion on this campus for interest and feasibility.

Peterson responded that it appears that Strong is supportive of a discussion, but this resolution ties administration’s hands. We should have some research done, she stated. Oppenheim responded that if the feasibility study states it’s a good idea, it will go forward without campus input. Further, he stated that he heard that it would cost $73,000 for a feasibility study, which would come from an outside donor. If we spend money on the feasibility study and then it is not appropriate, we have wasted that money. The resolution states that we should wait until Fall, have discussions and decide as a campus if it is worthwhile to go forward. If so, we should have a feasibility study done at that time.

VP Stephens stated that she is unaware of any $73,000 for a feasibility study. Oppenheim stated that FBAC was told this information by two members of the University Facilities Planning Committee (UFPC). Stephens stated that Strong said that he is not pursuing this and the $73,000 does not exist. She further stated that the University would like to do a market analysis and this is coming to UFPC. Oppenheim asked how much this analysis would cost, and Stephens replied maybe $20,000-$25,000. Oppenheim replied that it is FBAC’s position that no money should be spent until the campus decides if the arena is a worthwhile idea. Russ asked for a clear understanding that there is no $73,000 for a feasibility study. Stephens replied that is correct, and there is no donation for this. Russ asked at what point will faculty be involved in this issue and Stephens replied that there are a number of faculty on UFPC. Sarraile stated that the Senate should be getting reports on these issues. Klein stated that there is a Senate representative on UFPC. Farrar is concerned about VP Strong’s comments in #10. We need to know the priority before it goes to the community, he stated. Stephens stated that often items are raised at the Foundation Board meeting. The
President suggested adding the Speaker to the Board, she stated. Russ agreed, stating there would then be three faculty members, one from each College and one at large, which would be the Speaker.

Peterson stated that maybe the phrasing could overly tie our hands. Some research should be done.

Zarling stated that the faculty should be consulted as to whether the Campus Community wants to proceed on projects before any money is spent.

Hilpert responded that the first resolved doesn’t obstruct the campus from doing feasibility studies. Buell asked if the problem is in the first resolved. Peterson restated that it is important to sometimes look at feasibility to see if there should even be a discussion. Christopher reminded Senators that this resolution only addresses an Arena.

Russ called the question. No objections.

Secret ballot distributed. 23 yes/ 6 no/ 1 abstention. The resolution passed.

c. 9/AS/01/GC-Resolution to Name Graduate School
Dunbar opened the discussion stating that all the reasons for changing the name were presented at the last meeting.

Christopher reported objections from her department peers: This resolution is grandizing and misleading. It adds more administrative levels. It splits the powers with departments.

Kohlhaas stated that Biology is in favor of the resolution.

Hejka-Ekins stated that nothing is going to change with the departments or the office. The issue of power will not change. Departments will have control over their majors and faculty. This change in name will increase our presence and make us more available for scholarships. Roe stated there would not be graduate faculty only faculty that teach graduate classes. Farrar asked if departments are going to identify their graduate faculty? The response was no. Farrar asked if new graduate degree programs will have to identify the graduate faculty. The answer was no.

Carroll stated that as a historian, he is concerned about relying on the past. GC wants to make graduate students more important on the campus. Nagel stated that the name change either does something or doesn’t do something. There shouldn’t be a symbolic nature for the change. The alteration of the name could have side effects.

Sarraille stated that this name change seems innocuous.

MacDonald stated that the only responses she has received from her department are negative and that she feels uncomfortable about the vote. The graduate programs should be treated at tangential to the operations. She is unsure if changing the name does this, but there needs to be more support for graduate education at this University.

Russ recommended a secret ballot for voting.
Roe stated that the name change makes a symbolic difference when dealing outside of our campus. If we have a graduate school, outside community will know what we are talking about. It also will help the students getting into doctoral programs.

Cruz stated that in the academic world, schools go with graduate schools. Nelson stated that he is surprised at the dissent on this change. We don’t need to be so cynical and suspicious of what will happen.

Tuedio reported on the response from the Chairs of the College. Chairs do not support the proposal, but aren’t necessarily against it. The MAP committee was against this proposal but are in favor of increasing funding. Northridge has graduate programs. Schools have faculty and a budget. This proposal is an unusual hybrid of this typical definition. It seems that there will be a new administrative structure. The Senate needs to have an understanding about the implications and structure.

Hilpert asked if there are monetary implications and Dunbar stated no, they are not asking for money.

Akwabi-Ameyaw asked why we are using a secret ballot. Pandell responded that this protects all faculty so they can express their views freely without the possibility of revenge. This is a courtesy.

Hejka-Ekins stated that two schools have already changed their name to colleges, and we now have a School of Performing Arts. This is the same. Everyone on GC voted unanimously for this. It would be good to see a united attempt to fund graduate studies.

Carroll understands why GC wants to move forward with the name change but understands Tuedio’s response. How does GC feel about a title like Graduate Programs. Dunbar stated that there are no graduate programs; they are called schools.

Tuedio stated that even if we change the name, we still have to address the resource issues and the visibility on campus. The resource issues have to be addressed by the departments and the University. The primary steering should come out of departments because that’s where the money is.

Nelson responded that the resource issues have always been there. This would be a baby step to bring us toward being like other campuses.

Hejka-Ekins stated that the resources would still stay in the colleges.

Carroll responded that this name change could be the vehicle to start an administration super system. Is there another way to get the resources and visibility without the name change? No response was given.

Nagel asked if the name "school" can define our programs. Dunbar stated that we have the structure already in place. We have the Graduate Council, Graduate Dean, graduate office. Everything we do in Graduate Studies are done in a Graduate School.

Hilpert asked if the name "graduate studies" has hindered us from getting any funding on campus? Blankinship stated that he is unaware of this occurring.

Tuedio stated that the example of the School of Performing Arts is not the same. This school has a budget and the graduate school would not. Roe stated that the name change will go nowhere. It is already occurring
and there will be no change. If a department wanted to develop a master’s degree, there would be somewhere to go for support, the graduate dean and the graduate council. If we want to enter into a joint masters program with another school, no one knows what graduate studies is. Departments will retain their power.

Souza called the question/ Anderson seconded. Unanimous.

Secret ballot: Yes 16 No 11 Abstain 3 Resolution passed.

d. 12/AS/01/UEPC-Process and Criteria for Justification of Units Beyond 120 for Graduation
It was MS Zarling/Hilpert:

To amend the resolution as follows:

Replace items 1, 2, and 5 with:

1. Justification of units beyond 120 for programs which currently require this many units may be undertaken as part of the programs' first 5-year review following passage of this resolution, or earlier as a separate action at the option of the department offering the program.

2. Justification of units beyond 120 must be undertaken as part of the normal approval process for any new or modified programs which would require this many units.

3. the initial justification will follow the same "path of approval" as do other components of the 5-year Academic program Review. Justification for new or modified programs will follow the procedures for approval of the program or modification.

Zarling explained that these changes bring the resolution into compliance with current practice.

Question was called.

Vote on the amendment passed with one abstention.

No other discussion.

Vote on the resolution as amended passed with one abstention.

e. 14/AS/01/FAC-Bonus Awards Policy
Anderson stated that the rationale or this Bonus Awards Policy is that we have $158,000 that is unencumbered and we want to get the money to the faculty. Anderson circulated a friendly amendment that gives the President a 5% appeals fund. This would provide the President with a little latitude. Friendly amendment is:

IV. DISPOSITION OF BONUS AWARD FUNDS: At the beginning of the bonus award process, 5% of the bonus funds shall be set aside for the appeal process. It shall be the goal of the reviewees to expend the entire amount.
V. REVIEW:...
B) President...
4) After the completion of the appeals process, the President shall endeavor to distribute the unencumbered funds in an equitable manner.

VI. APPEALS PROCESS...

D) the Appeals Committee shall have free access to the appeals monies (5% of all bonus funds) to utilize during the appeals process.

VII. PUBLICATION OF BONUS AWARDS...

B) the amount of money, if any, to be rolled over until the following FMI cycle shall likewise be published.

VIII. CALENDAR...

February 5-10 The President shall endeavor to distribute the remaining appeal funds, if any, in an equitable manner.

There was no objection to the friendly amendment.

Riedmann asked why we couldn’t follow the practices we have in the past. Bowers responded that this is one-time money. The collective bargaining agreement only allows bonus money to be given for group projects or faculty that are at the top of their pay schedule. Bowers stated that we have presented our ideas to the CSU and they have not complied with the system. This policy has to be approved by CFA and the CSU. Not every campus is aware that there is money left over and those that do have money are using the money for faculty travel and equipment.

Oppenheim strongly urged the Senate to approve this policy. SEC felt the money should go to the faculty. All other ideas have been shot down. The administration stated that if this doesn’t pass, we can try again next year.

Sarraille asked why this money is one time only. Bowers responded that the University gets an allocation for FMI. A retainer of 5% is retained for appeals. The money left over is carry over money and doesn’t go toward base salary.

Hilpert stated that this policy meets the two concerns by the Chancellors office/Human Resources. This addresses merit and the time frame of the FMI process.

Dunbar thanked the faculty who have worked on this policy to get the money to the faculty.

Zarling asked why we aren’t using the money for faculty travel and instructional equipment. Pandell stated that SEC and FAC felt that the money should be given to the faculty. Russ stated that administration sees this as merit money.

Peterson stated that she doesn’t like the idea of another set of paperwork but she feels that it is not a good
precedence to start. It can be used as an excuse not to fund travel and equipment needs.

Hilpert clarified that the CFA local executive committee looked at this question and CFA feels that this is faculty money. The local executive committee would have liked to see the money given to the faculty equally.

Farrar called the question.

Vote on the resolution passed unanimously.

First Reading Item
a. 15/AS/01/AS-Posting Guidelines
Due to the lack of time, Russ suggested that we carry this over as a first reading until the next academic year. This was accepted by the body.

Open Forum
Oppenheim raised the issues regarding the resignation of Provost Curry. Oppenheim stated that before the President appoints an interim appointment, that faculty be involved in the discussion and decision or at least the Speaker and Speaker-elect. The President should run her ideas by faculty governance. Pandell stated that he and Russ will talk to the President about the issues.

A question was raised about the accumulation of left over money with FMI’s. Bowers stated that one of the problems is that the SSI and FMI money are in the same pot and that the campus has to estimate how much is needed for SSI.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM