

<p><b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</b></p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES October 10, 2000</p> <p><b>PRESENT:</b> Akwabi-Ameyaw, Almy, Alvarez-Palma, Buell, Burroughs, Carroll, Chu, Cross, Cruz, Dunbar, Finley, Gackowski, Gerstenfeld, Hernandez, Hilpert, Johnson, MacDonald, Mayer, J., Mayer, M., McLaughlin, Nagel, Olivant, Oppenheim, Pandell, Peterson, Russ, Souza, Sundar, Thomas, Thompson, Yang, Zarling</p> <p><b>PROXIES:</b> Demetrulias (Curry), Souza (Clark), Towell (Anderson)</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Costa, Farrar, Floyd, Keymer, Kimyai, Kohlhaas, Nelson</p> <p><b>GUESTS:</b> Cartwright (Trustee), Klein</p> <p><b>Recording Secretary:</b> Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>Presidential Joint Doctoral Studies Task Force Report, INFORMATION</p> <p>17/AS/00/SEC--Opposition to Proposition 38-School Vouchers, APPROVED</p> <p>Post Tenure Review, DISCUSSED</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, October 24, 2000 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Christine Souza, Clerk</p>
--	---

Speaker Pandell called the Academic Senate meeting to order at 2:38 PM. The agenda was approved as presented. The minutes of September 26, 2000 were approved with the following addition: Add Hernandez and Chu to the attendance list.

## Reports and Announcements

### a. Speaker/SEC (Pandell)

Pandell reported on the lunch meeting with SEC and Chancellor Reed. SEC "peppered" the Chancellor with questions. Pandell asked the Chancellor about bridging the salary gap between full professors in the CSU and the 20 CPEC comparison institutions. Chancellor Reed reported that 74% of the faculty in the CSU are full professors with tenure (54% in other institutions). The average salary of all professors in the CSU is \$72,000 with the average salary of a full professor being \$77,000.

Kofi asked Pandell to clarify the information that the Chancellor gave on the current salary gap. Pandell reported that as of January 2000, there is a 13 % salary gap for full professor. Oppenheim reported that the Chancellor stated that he has done a good job at decreasing the gap for assistant and associate professors, but the gap for full professor is much more difficult to decrease as rapidly because of the number of full professors in the system.

Regarding FMIs, Chancellor Reed stated that he does feel the current FMI process could be improved, but does agree with a merit system. The Chancellor would not discuss the issue further.

Pandell reported that he attended a statewide meeting of chairs last week where the question of differential FMIs were discussed with Jackie McClain, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. The word differential is not a Board of Trustees policy, she stated, but since these are merit increases, one assumes that there will be differences between people. She stated that departments could give the same amount of money if everyone was equally meritorious.

Also discussed with Vice Chancellor McClain is the fact that the system is down 1,000 tenure track positions since 1990. Sundar questioned the reason for the drop. Pandell replied that there was a big drop in enrollment at one time and positions were never filled, especially at large campuses. The Chancellor has said we are going away from hiring part-time faculty to hiring full-time faculty, but Pandell stated that what he hears is that campuses cannot fill full-time positions, so they end up hiring part-timers.

120-unit minimum has been passed by the Board of Trustees. Pandell will bring the 120 minimum BA/BS to SEC to propose a resolution for CSUS. This could mean evaluating departments who are over the 120-unit minimum. Johnson asked for a clarification on the 120 unit minimum requirement for the BA/BS. Pandell clarified that this is a reduction from the current 124 unit minimum requirement. Thompson stated that departments will have to provide a justification for going over the 120 units.

Statewide Chair Kegley asked Pandell if our faculty had input in writing the accountability recommendations? Pandell stated he had trouble answering that question, since nothing came to the Academic Senate that he is aware of. He will investigate this question. Thompson reported that No. 11 is being reviewed by UEPC and the Statewide Academic Senate wants the Academic Senate to get involved in this process. The SWAS also wants the Senate, through its committees, to be involved in budget development. Pandell agrees, stating he wants FBAC more involved in the campus budgeting process.

Pandell further stated that the state is revising the Master Plan to include K through University. The CSU and UC system are keeping their eye on this new master plan.

#### **b. UEPC (Thompson)**

Thompson distributed the UEPC report to Senators. He advised that the Senate might expect resolutions on Criteria and Process for Justification of 121+ unit degree programs and Winter Term Residency Requirement

UEPC is also working on:

1. Academic program review reports,
2. Review of Student Records and Registration Policies,
3. Expecting recommendations from UWC on a proposal to alter the WP Program and on the WPST Graduation Requirement,
4. Still considering Instructional Technology Subcommittee: have discussed with OCDL and about ready to do broader consult as soon as the Ad Hoc committee finishes it's task on recommended charge--open to ideas on process. Even though not required will bring to SEC/AS.

UEPC received a memorandum from Chairs/Coordinators of Chemistry, Geology, Geology and Physics, and Biological Sciences concerning the proper criteria for Natural Sciences for GE.

Next meeting October 26th from 1pm to 4pm, DBH118

**c. FAC (Anderson)**

Towell, Chair Elect of FAC, stated that FAC is working on the post-tenure review issue. She thanked the faculty for their input at the fora and via facnet.

**d. FBAC (Oppenheim)**

Oppenheim reported that FBAC met last Friday with Associate V. P. Manoharan and discussed her budget for OIT and their technical needs for the campus. The next meeting is October 20 where FBAC will discuss the information provided by V.P. Strong. The committee should receive additional budget information from V.P. Stephens some time this month.

Oppenheim stated that he did ask the Chancellor about the role of tenure track versus part-time faculty. The Chancellor stated that over the last three years he has been hiring more full time faculty. As a follow up, Oppenheim stated that he sent the Chancellor questions to answer.

Finley asked if the reason that the CSU is having a problem hiring is because the starting salary is low. Pandell stated that supposedly the system is looking at this issue. Further, the UC system is also having problems hiring.

Russ stated that she sat on a committee that reviewed workload issue for three years. CSUs biggest problem with hiring is the workload/teaching load, competition with sister schools and salaries. Fifth grade teachers are making the same amount of money as our assistant professors.

Pandell shared that one campus chair said that there should be a pay difference based on where the campus is located. Faculty housing is also a problem on some campuses.

**e. GC (Dunbar)**

Dunbar reported that GC is meeting Thursday, October 19. They will be discussing graduate teaching assistants.

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

Hilpert reported that the SWAS has not met since our last Senate meeting, but there were committee meetings. The committee Hilpert is working on is looking at the accountability document. He reported that academic affairs is currently watching what is transpiring with the Master Plan.

**g. Foundation Board (Dunbar)**

No report

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

Alvarez-Palma reported that the ASI passed a resolution against Proposition 38-School Vouchers and for Proposition 39. Also, ASI participated in voter registration last week.

SBAC is looking at two fees to be voted on this year (Union expansion fee and athletic fee). A question has come up if Stockton students should be included in the vote. Oppenheim stated that Stockton students shouldn't be treated like second class citizens. Maybe a portion of the fees should be designated for the Stockton campus. Peterson stated that fees should not be different between the campuses. Demetrulias stated that it is difficult to designate which students are Stockton students and which are not. There are not that many students that are solely Stockton based.

Cartwright noted that there is a lot of pressure being put on the students in ASI from the President and Vice Presidents to come up with a decision on this issue. The Student Fee Advisory Committee will be meeting Friday, October 13th at 3:30 in North View Conference Room. If there are faculty members interested, please attend.

### **i. Other**

Pandell advised that if there are any New York Yankees or New York Mets fans in the Senate, they are permanent members of the Senate for life!

Demetrulias reported that the CSU received a Planning grant from the Department of Commerce. The planning grant allows us to work with educational partners in the area including K-12, colleges, businesses and county agencies. This would allow us to use the cable system to deliver educational programs. Finley asked if these would be closed circuit or open and Oppenheim replied that they are seeking subscriber channels for educational use. It has not been decided if the courses would be open to the public or not. Within 12 months the CSUS has to come up with a plan for delivery. Finley asked how this type of education will effect courses coming from different universities or faculty. Will our campus give the students credit for taking these courses? Oppenheim is not clear how this will work. Oppenheim advised that our campus is viewed as having an extension program where TV classes are part of our academic program. Other campuses can't say that.

## **INFORMATION ITEM**

### **a. Presidential Joint Doctoral Studies Task Force Report**

Demetrulias explained the task force report attached to the agenda. The report is given as an information item to the faculty. Pandell called for questions on the report. Demetrulias reported that this report is a summary of a yearlong analysis of the idea of a Joint Doctoral Program on campus. The Joint Doctoral Program possibilities are education, psychology, environmental sciences, criminal justice and social work. The task force considered the fiscal impact of these programs. The intent of the report is for information. Faculty must agree to move forward and bring forth a proposal for a joint doctorate if they are interested. The joint doctorate proposal must go through the university program approval process. If any departments are interested, a proposal needs to be put together and a request for planning money sent to the Chancellor's office.

Sundar reported that UC, Merced is hitting the community hard and asking the community what they expect from the University. This is timely.

## **ACTION ITEM**

### **a. 17/AS/00/SEC–Opposition to Proposition 38-School Vouchers**

There being no discussion, Finley called for the question. There was no objection. A vote was taken and the motion passed with 4 abstentions.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **a. Post Tenure Review**

Thompson asked what the Faculty Affairs Committee is planning on doing with post-tenure review. Towell stated that the major objections to the process proposed last year are as follows: 1) paper work, 2) punitive in nature, and 3) PIP. The main question was, "do we need a process?" and the answer is yes; the MOU mandates a review. If we don't come up with one, the administration will.

Thompson stated that the document needs to come out of the local need and not just the MOU requirement. The document needs a purpose and not just something that has to be done.

Oppenheim voiced concerns about last year's proposed policy because it's punitive, time consuming and meeting the Chancellor's needs. Oppenheim stated we should come up with something so that the administration doesn't do it for us. Oppenheim distributed a proposal for administrative review as well as faculty review. These two should be joined. Towell asked whether FAC needs to come up with a resolution related to post-tenure review for faculty and administrator review.

MacDonald asked if administrators are reviewed? Oppenheim clarified that administrators are reviewed by administrators and faculty are reviewed by both faculty and administrators. Mac Donald shared that she worked at another campus where she worked with the review process of administrators. There may be examples that can be used from other campuses.

Almy stated that faculty are evaluated by students so why shouldn't administrators be reviewed by faculty.

Demetrulias stated that she has been reviewed annually. She continued by stating Provost Curry asks all administrators to submit a list of faculty to review them. The administrators up for review give a list of faculty to consult with during the review process. As to her knowledge, faculty have a role in the evaluation process.

Carroll asked if the President has a line item veto. Russ clarified that she does not. She approves or doesn't approve resolutions.

Russ suggested that we look at the report from the Task Force on Administrator Review. Many of the recommendations included in Oppenheim's proposal are in the task force recommendations.

Oppenheim clarified that administrators are reviewed annually, and he has been asked to review administrators. But he is unclear if it is because of his interaction as a part time administrator or as a

faculty. Nevertheless, faculty do not have a determining role.

Hilpert stated that the work of the task force recommendations went to the President. There are parts of the recommendations that are being used but it is unclear what parts are being adopted and implemented. Maybe we should explore this.

Pandell clarified that he is a real proponent of tenure and recommends that we come up with a policy that is developmental and the least time intensive. He noted that other campuses have not made a big deal out of the post-tenure review process and their documents were not as involved as the one proposed at CSUS last year. The CSUS proposal went far beyond the MOU requirement.

Towell stated that FAC has looked at different schools and there are many variations, but we were one of two campuses that required a five-year plan.

Peterson states that her problem with last year's post-tenure review document was that it didn't recognize what a faculty member had to do to get tenure. Tenure means that we are experts and self-directed. A tenured faculty doesn't necessarily need someone in their department to approve their plan. The evaluation of administrators should be different than evaluation of faculty. The standards and the reviews should be different because administrators are usually not tenured.

Kofi questions why we need post-tenure review? Does the Chancellor's office need the review or do we as faculty. Post tenure review is a mystery for many. The faculty need to prepare an offense.

Thompson recommends that post-tenure review should be developmental to serve the faculty and to assist us in achievement of our goals. Dunbar agrees with Thompson's statements. Nagel voiced agreement. Pandell stated that the faculty can do what they want, and if the administration wants to challenge it, the President can oppose it.

Oppenheim stated he doesn't have a problem with post-tenure review. There is probably a minority of faculty that go flat after tenure. The issue of post-tenure review is a result of a few faculty that are not getting involved after tenure. There has to be a way to weed out those faculty that are not doing their job. The policy should address this issue. Thompson stated that we have to talk about it in the context it's presented. There is a danger when we think of the CSU, Inc.

## **Open Forum**

Hilpert reported that the Governor has vetoed the prerogative of universities to sell properties. This affects the CSUS because the campus was looking at possibly selling off pieces of the Stockton Campus.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.