

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
September 26, 2000

PRESENT: Akwabi-Ameyaw, Almy, Alvarez-Palma, Anderson, Buell, Burroughs, Carroll, Clark, Costa, Cross, Dunbar, Farrar, Finley, Gackowski, Gerstenfeld, Hilpert, Johnson L., Keymer, Kohlhaas, MacDonald, Mayer J., Mayer M., McLaughlin, Nagel, Nelson T., Olivant, Oppenheim, Pandell, Peterson, Russ, Souza, Sundar, Thomas, Thompson, Yang, Zarling

PROXIES: Demetrulias (Curry), Johnson M. (Kimyai)

ABSENT: Chu, Cruz, Floyd, Hernandez

GUESTS: Blodgett, Klein, Hughes M.

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

15/AS/00/SEC--2000/2001 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate, APPROVED

16/AS/00/SEC--Respect for Faculty Recommendations in the FMI Process, APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT

17/AS/00/SEC--Opposition to Proposition 38-School Vouchers, FIRST READING

Linkage of SSI to FAR, DISCUSSED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, October 10, 2000
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:

Christine Souza, Clerk

Speaker Pandell called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. The agenda was approved with the addition of 4) Reports and Announcements (i) President Hughes. The minutes of May 16, 2000 were approved by consensus.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Speaker/SEC (Pandell)

1. Speaker Pandell welcomed Senators and guests to the Senate meeting. He stressed his hope that meetings will be short during his tenure as Speaker.
2. There is an opening for Faculty representative on the Board of Trustees. Interested faculty should contact Diana Saugstad, Office of the Academic Senate, ex 3400.
3. There is an International Faculty Partnership Conference to be held in Germany, June 24-29, 2001. The

ACIP and the Office of International Programs are coordinating the Conference. The theme of this Conference is "the New Europe and the New California: Coexistence, Convergence and Collision of Cultural Communities." If you would like further information, please contact Diana Saugstad.

4. The CSU International Programs is calling for applications for 2002-03 International Programs Resident Director assignments. Application packets and further information is available from Diana Saugstad or Bob Anderson, campus ACIP representative.

b. University Educational Policies Committee (Thompson)

1. Thompson reported that UEPC will look at accountability performance indicators dealing with research and scholarship activities.

2. Currently, there is an Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Technology. UEPC is considering amending the General Faculty Constitution to add this as an additional subcommittee of UEPC. The scope and turf will be discussed and presented to the Off Campus/Distance Learning Subcommittee, since duties could overlap.

3. The University Writing Committee is reviewing a document that may effect the writing proficiency courses program.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Anderson)

1. Anderson reported that FAC is requesting input on Post Tenure Review. Two faculty fora are scheduled: October 4, 3:30-5:00 and October 5, 2:30-4:00, both in DBH 118. It is the goal of FAC to have a proposal ready to go to the Academic Senate by late October, early November.

d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Oppenheim)

1. Oppenheim reported that the first meeting of the FBAC is scheduled for October 6. The Committee solicited information from Vice President Strong and Vice President Stephens last Spring with a due date of September 2000. Vice President Stephens has sent the Committee some information. Vice President Strong asked for an extension and will be sending his information to the Committee by the end of September. The Committee is waiting for the information from the Vice Presidents to proceed in the budgeting process.

2. Associate Vice President Manoharan will attend the FBAC meeting on the 6th to discuss the budget for her office.

e. Graduate Council (Dunbar)

1. Dunbar reported that the GC approved the Interdisciplinary Committee.

2. GC set up a work group in order to draft a working document for Assessment of Graduate Learning Goals in the Accountability Plan.

3. The RSCAPC representative from the GC will be April Hejka-Ekins.

4. GC is working on the IRB Policy for graduate students, Recruitment Plan for Graduate Program and

Proposal for a Graduate School.

Thompson questioned if the TA waiver issue was on the GC agenda, and Dunbar replied yes.

f. Statewide Academic Senate (Hilpert/Thompson)

1. Thompson reported that the SWAS Report has been distributed over Facnet.
2. A Joint Committee is working on revision of the Master Plan (K thru Ph.D.).
3. The Chair of the Board of Trustees is in agreement on the issue of merit pay, but he has no explanation on why it should stay.
4. No one is sure when the 120-unit degree minimum will take effect. The Provost/VPAA and faculty governance should decide how to approach the issue on each campus.

g. Foundation Board (Dunbar)

1. Dunbar reported that there are four faculty representatives on the Foundation Board. Bob Fisk is the Academic Senate representative, Ellen Dunbar-College of Arts, Letters and Sciences representative, Sara Garfield-College of Education representative and Rao Cherukuri-College of Business Administration representative.

Pandell questioned where the foundation money comes from and Dunbar replied that the majority of their money comes from fundraising, but some state money is used for core staff.

h. Associated Students (Alvarez-Palma/Cross)

1. Alvarez-Palma reported the ASI is taking action on two resolutions, one supporting Proposition 39 and one against Proposition 38.
2. ASI is looking for a graduate student representative. Also needed is a student representative from the Stockton campus.
3. ASI will be involved in voter registration and will try to set a record for registering students.
4. The Student Fee Advisory Committee has met.
5. Thompson asked if the students planned to bring to UEPC the issue regarding food in the classrooms. Alvarez-Palma replied no.
6. Keymer reported that the Student Fee Advisory Committee needs to be advised of user fees for courses. This only applies for new course fees or changes in fees.

i. President Hughes

1. President Hughes stated her pleasure that the ASI is taking a position against Proposition 38 (School

Vouchers). The Board of Trustees is also taking a strong position against this Proposition.

2. The President stated that she has heard a lot about the high quality of our faculty from the community and thinks this is just one of the indicators that has increased our enrollment. We are up by 500 students to a total of 7,000 students with two weeks remaining. We expect to reach 7,050. This is an 8.8% projected increase over last Fall. We have 1,126 students in Stockton; projected increase is 15.84%. President Hughes thanked Vice President Keymer and the academic leaders for their hard work in helping to make this happen.

3. President Hughes advised that Strategic Enrollment Management is the single goal for this year. This goal was crafted during the Cabinet Retreat held this past August. There are several components of it. The system also has determined that enrollment management is an issue in the CSU. It is projected that the CSU system will have 130,000 additional students within the next 10 years. Our campus, she stated, has decided to try to attain a target of 10,000 students, although the original master plan set a target of 12,000.

4. The Board of Trustees received the Cornerstones Report. They are very pleased with the campus reports. They agreed that each campus should establish its baseline, and be compared to itself rather than against other campuses. The Chancellor announced that he will follow up with each campus using Cornerstones as a benchmark to establish goals with each President.

5. Community College articulation--The President reported that transfer from community colleges to the CSU is down. As a result, there will be considerable time devoted to examining the reasons for the decline. The President will meet separately with the four community colleges in the CSU Stanislaus district.

6. The City Council in Stockton will be taking a vote on the Joint Powers Agreement, which is an agreement between the CSU system and the City of Stockton on the development of the CSUS-Stockton campus.

7. Recent partnership activities: A partnership agreement with the Azores has begun. The Arab-American University has its inaugural opening on September 29 and Linda Bunney-Sarhad will represent this campus at the opening.

8. Chancellor Reed will visit the campus Thursday and Friday, September 28th and 29th. The SEC and ASI will meet with him on the 29th. All constituent groups on campus have been scheduled to meet with the Chancellor during his visitation.

Thompson voiced concern about increasing enrollment and the effect on remediation, especially in English. This semester the English department had to increase remedial English courses. President Hughes replied that strategic enrollment management has at its core planned and managed growth. This is our first effort with SEM. Keymer replied that the CSUS sets prerequisites for admission. New students do not test for Math and English until they are here. Although these students meet admission requirements, they still may need remediation. These students are fully admissible to the University.

The President expressed concern with community college articulation and the trend of declining numbers of transfers from some community colleges. Farrar questioned what the problem seems to be. The President replied that she didn't know the cause yet, but she will meet individually with the Presidents to find out reasons for a decline in community college transfer students. There is speculation that they are not as

motivated to take the academic track program, maybe because of a booming economy. This must be studied.

Farrar asked if we were under pressure to admit community college transfer students and President Hughes replied no. We have the reverse problem today.

Alvarez-Palma advised that the ASI discussed remediation at their meeting. ASI wonders if the ELM is an appropriate exam for screening for Math knowledge. Sundar responded that there are many avenues to demonstrate Math placement besides the ELM. Not all students have to take the ELM because of their SAT score.

CONSENT ITEM

a. 15/AS/00/SEC--2000-2001 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

It was MSP to adopt the 2000-2001 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate.

FIRST READING ITEMS

a. 16/AS/00/SEC--Respect for Faculty Recommendations in the FMI Process

It was MS Thompson/Russ

WHEREAS: Respect for the judgment of faculty and faculty committees implies that their recommendations and decisions should be overturned only rarely and for clear and compelling reasons, as stated in the AAUP document: Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*; and

WHEREAS: In 1999/2000, just over 80% of the FMI recommendations made by duly constituted department entities were overturned by the administration (approximately 40% raised and 40% lowered); and

WHEREAS: No reasons, compelling or otherwise, for these changes in compensation recommendations were communicated to the faculty; and

WHEREAS: In 1999/2000, 100% of faculty appeals were granted in favor of the faculty member; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU, Stanislaus insist that administrators adhere to recommendations of faculty in faculty merit increase (FMI) deliberations except in rare and compelling circumstances.

*Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty

action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

Thompson stated that this is based on the idea that faculty should have the right to make the determination for merit increases. The numbers included in this resolution are numbers derived from the report supplied by Associate Vice President Bowers. The numbers are correct to the best of his knowledge. Also the Provost was in several SEC meetings when this was discussed, and there was no mention the numbers were incorrect.

Finley questioned what the numbers meant and Klein replied that the deans had to make every raise divisible by 12, although he was not sure if that affected the numbers reflected in the resolution.

Keymer stated that the directive he got for his eight people was that these had to be merit increases and he had to find some way to find differences in merit. The Counselors came up with a proposed across the board increase which left him and Noble to come up with ways of equity. Further, this year we've asked the counselors to use a point structure to differentiate merit amounts.

Hilpert stated his support of the motion. Further, there is no mention in the MOU about differentiation in merit. It is unclear where the expectation of differentiation is coming from.

Almy asked Keymer if a reason was given for the difference in merit amounts. Keymer replied that his perception was that the deans and vice presidents tried to behave in the least harmful way as possible. Russ stated that the SWAS agreed that everyone should receive the same amount. Chancellor Reed heard this and advised the presidents that there has to be differential merit and that not everyone is the same. That was a clear mandate by him, she stated. Sundar replied that there are no winners in this type of system. It is more than being divisive-we have to compete with one another as well as work together.

It was MSP Thompson/Zarling to waive the rules and go to a second reading.

Zarling expressed his displeasure by the notion that the deans are concerned with appearance rather than real merit. Further, it is good that AAUP language is in this resolution. He is in favor of the faculty being responsible for judging their peers. We just have to reassert what has always been the case.

Keymer stated that he tried to look at the distribution of work and fairness when making his merit recommendations. Zarling replied that all faculty are saying that given the complexity of deciding what makes a good faculty, we value a wide variety of contributions. It is very hard to balance faculty research, teaching, etc. That is why the faculty thought the decisions made by administrators were capricious and their assessment of what was important was also capricious.

Gackowski voiced his disappointment because his dean applied criteria that the faculty were unaware of or discussed with faculty. All merit numbers in his department were overturned.

Costa called for the question. There was no objection. Vote on the resolution passed without dissent, with two abstentions.

b. 17/AS/00/SEC--Opposition to Proposition 38-School Vouchers

It was MS Hilpert/Thompson

WHEREAS: Proposition 38 would significantly alter the present system of financing K-14 education, resulting in large initial costs to the state educational budget with no clear accountability to the people of California; AND

WHEREAS: Both the initial increased costs and uncertain outcomes make it highly imprudent to initiate such sweeping changes on a statewide level; AND

WHEREAS: The Proposition would impose significant new restrictions on the ability of state and local governments to adopt new laws and regulations affecting private schools; AND

WHEREAS: The ability of private schools under the Proposition to restrict admissions "on the basis of ability or disability" will make it likely, according to the legislative analyst, that the responsibility for educating higher-cost pupils, those with special needs, will disproportionately fall upon local school districts, thus significantly increasing average per-pupil costs to public schools; AND

WHEREAS: Passage of Proposition 38 would signify a decrease in the state's commitment to the long-established principle of support for public education; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus opposes passage of Proposition 38 (State-Funded School Vouchers for Private and Religious Education).

Hilpert explained the resolution and noted that standards are difficult to force private schools to adhere to. The SWAS passed a similar resolution. Also, the ASI and Board of Trustees are also opposing this Proposition.

Peterson stated that she is sympathetic to the resolution, but some faculty in her department oppose the resolution. She stated that this is a political matter and questions if the senate should be involved in this issue.

Russ responded that the Senate has dealt with controversial issues before. We have department representatives and as such should discuss these issues with their department. But, anything related to education, specifically K-12 effects the CSU. We don't have to agree, but it should be discussed and acted upon. Public schools have our future students and we have always supported them.

Farrar stated that this money would come from the general budget, so would effect us.

Nagel stated that this is an academic issue. If this means there will be an erosion of academic integrity, it will effect us through remediation.

Hilpert stated that this language went through a sifting of opinions. The Whereas clauses do not speak to quality. It speaks to accountability difficulty. It is not making a negative statement on private schools.

Keymer stated his concern that if this Proposition passes, students that need additional support will still be turned away from private schools and the public schools will have to take them. Further, these schools will still get state money and that is not equitable.

Pandell advised that this will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

OPEN FORUM

1. Thompson read an excerpt from a memo received from his dean referring to his receiving a SSI and linking that to the review of the FAR. He questioned how the review of the FAR became attached to SSI. There is no language in the MOU regarding this. This issue was discussed last semester. It seems that when the Senate approved the FMI calendar, that was construed as policy linking the FAR to the SSI.

Anderson stated that Associate Vice President Bowers advised that the review for SSI would be dependent on the FARs and other criteria. Anderson further stated that FAC would be reviewing this issue.

Hilpert stated that maybe the review focuses on rank, not content.

Russ advised that she talked to last year's Chair of FAC and he advised that the SSI review was to be incorporated into the FAR. He assured her it was policy.

Thompson questioned if we wanted a personnel policy shaped by a calendar.

Hilpert advised that faculty should take a look at the current FMI policy. Dunbar stated that faculty should also look at the communication received in the mail from Associate Vice President Bowers.

Pandell advised that this issue will be put on the Senate Executive Committee agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.