

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 16, 2002

Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. and asked that item 6.a. (4/AS/02/RSCAPC-Policy Governing the Preparation and Submission of Proposals for Sponsored Projects at California State University, Stanislaus) be withdrawn from the agenda because the rewriting of the policy did not include full consultation. The amended agenda was approved (MSP Filling/Sarraille). The minutes of March 12, 2002 were approved as printed (MSP Sarraille/Filling).

### REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**a) Speaker/SEC (Russ)**

No report

**b) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)**

Floyd said that he would introduce later a resolution concerning the academic calendar. He also reported that he would bring a resolution to eliminate the two-course cap per discipline for upper-division General Education courses to a future Academic Senate meeting. The UEPC has voted to change the composition of the Academic Program Review sub-committee to allow the AVP of Institutional Research and Assessment to be an ex-officio, non-voting member. This change will be brought to the Senate for action. The committee has discussed the distance education report, the resolution to add one unit of credit for WP courses, and guidelines for collaboration between San Joaquin Delta College and CSU Stanislaus; in addition, it approved the Honors courses. Floyd added that a resolution to change the policies concerning academic certificates will be brought to the Senate.

**c) Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)**

Towell reported that the committee is working on criteria for sabbatical awards and the composition of administrative search committees. Russ noted that the issues of administration searches and review will be addressed in future Academic Senate resolutions.

**d) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)**

Filling said that AVP Bowers is searching for data concerning staffing and hiring freezes. The committee is waiting for final budget numbers. A five-percent cut is probable, but the campus should receive funds for growth. The consensus is that the government will duck issues because of the fall elections and that 2003/04 will be a difficult year. Filling added that the budget review committee has sent its completed report to President Hughes. A major recommendation is that committee size be reduced from 45 to 9 people. An end-of-year goal will be to assess the practicality of the process.

**e) Graduate Council (Blodgett)**

Blodgett reported that the Statewide Senate has asked about supervision and hiring of teaching associates. The job description is the same, but teaching associates could be assigned up to four classes of three units, instead of three. She added that the timeline for project reviews has been

distributed to council members. Christopher asked about the policy concerning external readers. Blodgett said that they read for certain kinds of errors. Christopher voiced concern external readers may be stepping over their bounds. Only the English and Psychology Departments use TA's at the present, but Sundar mentioned that the Mathematics Department was considering using them. Russ commented that the guidelines should be appropriate for all departments and approved of Blodgett's assurance that the council would formulate guidelines based on the experienced departments' advice and then bring them to the Senate.

**f) Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)**

Sarraille said he had received no word yet on the Constitution votes. He added that the SWAS approved a resolution on TA policy (hiring, supervising, and evaluating). The May 2/3 meeting will discuss the faculty role in regular administration reviews; will recommend a joint committee to study the search, selection, and review of systemwide administrators that will retain qualified people; and will evaluate the implementation of the Campus Management System (CMS) that has cost \$500,000. Sarraille also reported that the resolution concerning the review of inclusion of languages other than English has been withdrawn.

**g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)**

No report.

**h) Associated Students (Johnson/VanRuiten)**

No report.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

**a) 2/AS/02/SEC-Commendation for Assistant to the Speaker Bowman**

Thompson read the formal commendation thanking Diana Bowman for twenty-three years of assistance to the Academic Senate and Senators gave her a standing ovation. Resolution reads:

Whereas, Diana Bowman has steadfastly and admirably fulfilled her duties as Assistant to the Speaker of the Faculty, and

Whereas, Ms. Bowman provides a crucial and comprehensive Institutional Memory for the Faculty, and

Whereas, Ms. Bowman has received high praise from the entire succession of Speakers serving during her tenure, and

Whereas, the Faculty greatly appreciate Diana's assistance and good will, be it, therefore,

Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus express its heartfelt THANKS to Assistant to the Speaker Bowman.

Unanimously approved by the Academic Senate on April 16, 2002

**b) 3/AS/02/SEC-Recognition for California State University, Stanislaus Staff**

Russ explained that this resolution pays tribute to the CSUS staff representatives present who worked on the dining room renovations during Winter Term. She read the resolution commending them for their timely completion of this difficult job. Cliff Bailey said that they appreciated this recognition very much. He noted that only twenty-seven days were available to complete this project and that staff are now working on the fast-track completion of the landscaping around the new Mary Stuart Rogers Gateway Center. Senators gave the staff a standing ovation. Resolution reads:

Whereas, campus Staff worked diligently to complete the timely renovation of the Main Dining Hall, and

Whereas, the transformation of the Hall is a tremendous success, and

Whereas, the work of Staff has created a comfortable and desirable gathering place for all members of the campus community, be it, therefore,

Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus, express its hearty THANKS to all Staff involved in the renovation of the Main Dining Hall, and be it, further

Resolved that the Academic Senate take this opportunity to express its ongoing appreciation for the work of Staff on the Stanislaus campus.

Unanimously approved by the Academic Senate on April 16, 2002.

#### **FIRST READING ITEMS**

**a) 4/AS/02RSCAPC-Policy Governing the Preparation and Submission of Proposals for Sponsored Projects at California State University, Stanislaus**

Withdrawn.

**b) 5/AS/02/UEPC-Resolution on the Report of the Committee for Review of Academic Calendars**

It was MS Floyd/Sarraille

WHEREAS: The Committee for Review of Academic Calendars (CROAC) was appointed by the Speaker of the Faculty in May 2001 in response to a memorandum from the CSU system's Chief Academic Officer, David Spence, and a local Administrative Proposal, both suggesting a conversion from the CSU Stanislaus 4-1-4 academic calendar; and

WHEREAS: The Committee for Review of Academic Calendars carried out a thorough study of the April 2001 early semester proposal and the current 4-1-4 calendar; and

WHEREAS: The Committee for Review of Academic Calendars presented its recommendations to the Speaker of the Faculty and the Chair of the University Educational Policies Committee in a report dated February 8, 2002; be it

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee for review of Academic Calendars, as stated on page 16 of the CROAC Report (2/8/02), be approved effective academic year 2002/03.

Russ explained that no amendments may be considered until the second reading and announced that a calendar review will not occur again without significant justification. (MSP Floyd/Sarraille) Russ asked Senators to review the document and discuss with their colleagues.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **a) IDEA/SATE Student Evaluation Instrument**

Sarraille reviewed the efforts to track down the data gathered about IDEA and the SATE alternative by the faculty committee. The committee could not read the data supplied and Stanislaw is not sure any more efforts will produce helpful information. Sarraille listed three options: 1) leave the matter with the committee, 2) call for more help to decide on a new instrument, or 3) end the quest. He recommends the third option because he believes both instruments are bogus.

Zarling began the discussion by asking if the Senate must prove SATE is equally bad as IDEA. Christopher claimed that in 1995 many new faculty agreed that IDEA was worthless. Carroll said that his review of past minutes indicated many meetings and a motion to go away from IDEA. Thompson pointed out that SATE would need to be validated if it were used for RPT purposes. Russ added that some faculty used both or created their own instrument. Christopher mentioned that some campuses, including San Jose, use their own instrument. She also said that some court cases have found the use of student evaluations for RPT problematic because females are often rated lower and that some departments are especially negligent in collecting information.

Nagel reminded senators of the letter from IDEA a few years ago that informed faculty of some wrong numbers and of the changed evaluation criteria this year. Carroll asked if the evaluations' purpose is to find "bad" teachers. Floyd answered that the purpose of IDEA is not to foster better teaching practices but to fill administration needs. Muedeking referred to the many discussion over the years and cited the empiricists' concern about reliability and validity. He suggested that perhaps each department should devise a method to evaluate faculty. Filling said that Assessment of Student Learning Committee would emphasize the clear difference between the assessment of student learning and the evaluation of teachers. Almy stated that, however we devise evaluations, students need to be included. Klein said that he had a whole drawer of IDEA forms and pointed out that a 30% rating is considered effective. He asked if we want something helpful and or do we want to meet a requirement? ALS considers each instrument satisfactory.

Sarraille said that faculty would need release time to formulate evaluation instruments. Sundar noted that IDEA results do not help with present classes and use for future classes is debatable. MacDonald suggested that some faculty might work informally with the Faculty Center to discuss alternatives. Thompson endorsed Muedeking's idea of having something done at the department level, pointed out that any evaluation could be used against faculty, and referred to 5/AS/98 that required a "correlation and validation study of SATE." He asked whether the Senate should rescind 5/AS/98.

Farrar supplied some observations: students often don't answer truthfully and often rate popularity. Grade inflation may result because of fewer C and D grades. He would rather have IDEA than individual department instruments.

Peterson reminded senators that we may use an additional tool. Klein agreed. Gackowski said he uses his own questions in the middle of the semester. Muedeking noted that IDEA is NOT to be used for personnel decisions.

Finally, Russ asked senators to take a leadership role by discussing this matter with their department faculty, and we will continue the discussion at the next Senate meeting.

## **OPEN FORUM**

Carroll brought up the issue of academic freedom because of a recent administration "admonishment" of a tenured professor and referred to the discussion occurring on facnet. Sarraille noted that CFA has an interest because the professor has filed a grievance. The CFA executive committee will meet soon to discuss such actions as having an alternative Faculty Appreciation Dinner in the Quad and doing some picketing of formal events.

Floyd thanked Carroll for bringing up this subject. He approved of the CFA action but suggested that the Senate should also take some action. Almy suggested that it might be premature to take action before knowing the other side's viewpoint, but agreed that the Senate should show concern when academic freedom is threatened. Carroll and Russ also agreed that hearing the other side would be helpful.

MacDonald pointed out that a general policy issue is involved--the qualifications of students. Blodgett asked whether each time faculty write recommendation letters, not all glowing evaluations of students, they might be in jeopardy also. She also noted that the grievance process now often takes up to three years; therefore, any redress will be far in the future.

Filling added that the administration has not met three dates in responding to the grievance. He recommended that Russ ask the faculty member and the administration to share their letters. Russ responded by saying that the permission of the people who had received the letters would be required.

Thompson recommended that the Senate invite the administration to come to the Senate to discuss academic freedom. Blodgett supported this motion.

Almy said we need to find out what the perceived violation was and noted that the handbook was not helpful. Peterson stated that responsible faculty members need to be careful about letterhead use, but added that faculty need to be able to ask questions about students' skills. Christopher noted that academic freedom does not require being deliberative and mentioned Dr. Shockley at Stanford who expresses many "evil" ideas. She admitted publishing many negative evaluations of this campus and believes this freedom has been a guaranteed right since the McCarthy era.

Thompson suggested that we think about our response and consider a whole range of possibilities from the specific faculty member's situation to general statements about academic freedom. Russ said that she preferred general responses (no names) and Carroll agreed. He asked about our relationship to local high schools. Can only administrators communicate with these people?

Sarraille said that the faculty member has shared his letter (containing nothing "flame throwing") and the letter of "admonishment" from AVP Bowers. Nagel recommended that the Senate organize a forum to discuss this issue and that faculty bring classes to this event because of the

educational opportunity. Russ also recommended being pro-active. Sivak suggested inviting the local community as well.

Filling clarified that the administration letter used the word "admonishment" instead of "reprimand" to avoid contract language and recommended following the AAUP guidelines.

Russ endorsed the idea of a symposium, one of the final events of this academic year, that would involve senators, the Faculty Center, administrators, and CFA representatives. Muedeking suggested having the discussion in the evening so that members of the public could attend. Farrar recommended checking with CSU lawyers about proper procedure. Russ said that the Senate can confer with CFA lawyers and would follow AAUP guidelines concerning faculty rights to express opinions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.