

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 30, 2002

PRESENT: Afonso, Akwabi-Ameyaw, Almy, Bargetto-Andres, Blodgett, Christopher, Farrar, Filling, Floyd C., Floyd R., Gackowski, Kohlhaas, Luo, Manrique, Mayer J., Mayer M., Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson, Piskoti, Russ, Sarraille, Sereno, Thompson, Zarling

PROXIES: Hor (Buell), Sumser (Burroughs), Hamilton (Fazal), Brown (Towell)

ABSENT: Clark, Harris, Johnson, Kamyai, Kobus, MacDonald, Potter, Rhodes, Shipley, Tan, Vanruiten, Yang

GUESTS: Klein, Richards, Stephens, Young T.

5/AS/02/UEPC--Resolution on the Report of the Committee for Review of Academic Calendars (CROAC), APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

6/AS/02/SEC--Resolution on Academic Freedom, FIRST READING

7/AS/02/UEPC--Removal of Two-Course per Discipline Cap for Upper-Division GE, FIRST READING

8/AS/02/UEPC--Policy and Procedure for Academic Certificates, FIRST READING

DISCUSSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

IDEA/SATE Student Evaluation Instrument, REFERRED TO ASL SUBCOMMITTEE

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, May 14, 2002
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:

Barbara Manrique, Clerk

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. The agenda was approved (MSP Filling/Sarraille). The minutes of April 16, 2002 were approved with these revisions: a) 4.f. change ending of third sentence to

"and will grant campuses flexibility in the timing of implementation of CMS modules"; b) 8. Amend the words of Christopher on page 5 from "many negative evaluations" to "articles critical of this campus"; and c) 8. amend the words of Farrar on page 6 from "with CSU lawyers about proper procedures" to "CFA lawyers about legal interpretations" (MSP Filling/Thompson).

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Speaker/SEC (Russ)

No report.

b) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)

Floyd explained that he would introduce later the three resolutions listed as first reading items (6 a-c). He reported that the resolution concerning the proposed new grading option (A,B,C,NC) approved by the UEPC will be forwarded to the SEC. The committee also approved the continuation of the draft version of the Academic Program Review through AY 2002/03.

c) Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)

R. Brown reported that the committee was working on the composition of administrative search committees and consulting with the Leaves and Awards Committee concerning criteria for sabbaticals.

d) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)

Filling stated that the committee was working on a publication costs resolution, waiting for a response from President Hughes concerning the DUR report, and studying the department surveys received. He asked VP Stephens to speak about possible future revenue shortfalls.

Stephens reported that more accurate figures would be available after the May revise of the budget in Sacramento. Probably Stanislaus will need to cut another \$500,000; however, the CSU would still receive \$2.4 million in new funds. The worst-case scenario would be a 5% cut of the current base budget. She added that the interim budget committee has earmarked 72% of money available for academic affairs. Budget hearings in each division will begin on May 17. Since the State of California budget probably will not be passed by July 1, the deans will have a hard time determining the exact funds available for academic needs. Finally, Stephens reported the possibility of an increase in student fees in late summer.

e) Graduate Council (Blodgett)

Blodgett said that the committee had reviewed the policy concerning VLS serving on thesis committees and determined that they may serve only as third readers. She reported that the committee has drafted the statement about graduate course challenges for the catalog. It has also written guidelines for TAs and will submit them to the SEC.

f) Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)

Sarraille reviewed these second reading items on the SWAS agenda for May 1-3 : 1) Review of Administrators on the Campuses of the California State University System (faculty role in regular administration reviews); 2) Search, Selection, and Review of Systemwide Administrators (will recommend a joint committee to study the search, selection, and review of systemwide administrators that will retain qualified people); and 3) Implementation of CMS (grant campuses flexibility in the timing of implementation of CMS modules).

He also listed these first reading items: 1) Modification of Upper-division Admission Requirements (requirements for transfer from community colleges will increase from 56 units to 60); 2) Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities (to see the statement, go to <<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/>> and in the upper left under "HIGHLIGHTS" click on "English Competency Statement"); 3) Master Plan Task Force for Educational Support Services (systemwide task force charged with reviewing status and needs of Educational Support Services); and 4) Campus Consultation with Faculty Before Establishing Enrollment Targets and Enrollment Management Policies for an Admissions Cycle (urge that campus presidents consult with faculty each year before establishing enrollment targets and enrollment management practices).

Filling noted that these procedures are built already into the planning and budgeting process on this campus.

g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)

No report.

h) Associated Students (Johnson/VanRuiten)

No report.

i) Other-Summer Reading Project

Morgan-Foster reported on the summer reading project for incoming freshmen. The book chosen by the committee consisting of Renny Christopher, Mark Thompson, Ken Potts, Mary Cullinan, and herself is Epitaph for a Peach by David Mas Masumoto. She noted that a web-based study guide will be available in May and that the author will attend the Welcoming Convocation on August 31 to speak with students about the book. She also invited faculty to volunteer to help at the Convocation and to serve as faculty discussion leaders. Thompson, when asked by Christopher whether those attending today's orientation seemed interested in this project, replied that the parents were very attentive and positive.

Mayer announced two student productions on campus this week: The Rimers of Eldritch offered by the Drama Department and Trial by Jury presented by the Music Department.

ACTION ITEM

a) 5/AS/02UEPC-Resolution on the Report of the Committee for Review of Academic Calendars (CROAC)

Thompson thanked members of his committee: Aronson, Lindsay, Peters, and Zarling. He explained that, if the Senate approves this resolution, it will not be sent to the President for approval or rejection. It will be

sent to the General Faculty, President and to the Chancellor as a statement of the faculty. The motion received unanimous approval.

FIRST READING ITEMS

a) 6/AS/02/SEC-Resolution on Academic Freedom

It was MS Thompson/Nagel

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus declare and defend the right of the Faculty to express their opinions on academic matters publicly without fear of administrative reprisal, and be it, further,

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate urge the President to affirm publicly her commitment to academic freedom.

RATIONALE: The autonomy of the Faculty to express opinions, including those with which the University may disagree, is a cornerstone of academic freedom.

Russ explained that no changes could be offered until the second reading. She also revealed that a committee of faculty has suggested that, instead of rushing the organization of activities related to this vital issue, academic freedom should be the subject of the first fall event. Russ met this morning with Filling, CFA representatives, and A. Young.

They recommend having four evening events during 2002/03:

Wednesday, September 25, 2002 - Academic Freedom

Wednesday, November 6, 2002 - Intellectual Property

Wednesday, March 5, 2003 - Plagiarism

Wednesday, May 7, 2003 - Information Confidentiality.

Russ called for volunteers to help organize these events over the summer. They would lead to the opening of the new Faculty Development Center in January, 2003. She said that the Speaker, CFA and Faculty Center representatives, and members of the four committees would lead the process and added that A. Young will have these dates inserted into the master calendar. The COC will handle committee assignments.

Further statements about academic freedom included discussion of professional ethics, AAUP policies, and the First Amendment (T. Young); four constituencies-faculty, students, parents, and the community (Carroll); the difference between freedom as citizens and as employees (Sumser); faculty status as educators (Filling); plagiarism and student involvement (Morgan-Foster); changes in student attitudes about educators (Mayer); the right to state controversial opinions without fear of loss of tenure (Christopher); the history of challenges to ideas not considered "patriotic" (Peterson); and the importance of having a union to defend faculty when they might cause "embarrassment" to the administration (Giventer).

b) 7/AS/02/UEPC-Removal of Two-Course Per Discipline Cap for Upper-Division GE

It was MS Floyd/Thompson

WHEREAS: Departments have a limit of two upper-division general education courses, but offer as many sections of each course that the budget and space allows; and

WHEREAS: Faculty have curricular ideas that would make interesting upper-division general education course topics, but must remove an existing upper-division general education course to add a new upper-division general education course; and

WHEREAS: Departments are funded to meet enrollment targets, and departments determine how to mix service and major courses to meet program needs and enrollment targets; and

WHEREAS: The campus has grown considerably since the two-course cap was implemented in 1984 and the need to protect department enrollment is no longer applicable; and

WHEREAS: The removal of the two-course per discipline cap has been approved by the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences Council of Chairs, the General Education Subcommittee, and the University Educational Policies Committee; be it

RESOLVED: That the two-course per discipline cap for upper-division general education courses be removed effective fall 2002.

Floyd explained that faculty and departments want more flexibility and the ability to offer different kinds of GE courses.

To Farrar's question whether the cap removal might change GE course purposes from breadth to depth, Floyd replied that the purpose was to allow a greater range of courses. When Carroll asked if UEPC opposed any cap or the two-course cap, Floyd said that the UEPC wanted removal of the cap and that the resolution had been reviewed by the GE sub-committee. Peterson commented that the GE sub-committee believes that required courses meet a number of goals. Christopher added that with the cap the Summit courses are impossible, that it had been waived for these cluster courses, and that this action had not caused chaos.

Carroll asked why a cap had been placed originally. T. Young explained that upper-division GE was a relatively new concept; therefore, the number of courses was limited so that one department would not be able to take advantage of another.

Farrar referred to problems years ago when larger departments offered many courses and wiped out the courses of smaller ones. He also said that in the past community colleges wanted to offer all GE courses.

Russ reminded senators to discuss this issue with department members before the second reading.

c. 8/AS/02/UEPC-Policy and Procedures for Academic Certificates

It was MS Floyd/Thompson

RESOLVED: That the attached Policy and Procedures for Academic Certificates replace 6/AS/83/EPC (Academic Certificates)

RATIONALE: The original policy for academic certificates (6/AS/83/EPC) was written for traditional certificate programs that develop skills and knowledge through course work. Competency-based and integrated certificate programs also are being developed to provide students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge learned both from courses of study and from life and work experiences. The attached document includes the policy and procedures for course-based, competency-based, and integrated academic certificate programs.

Floyd then explained that the purpose was to produce a single document to tie in both competency and course-based certificates (e.g. gerontology). Farrar commented that certificates may be profession, vocational, and academic and said that he would like to know if the policy covers professional and vocational certificates also. Russ noted that the second reading would be next when amendments may be suggested.

DISCUSSION ITEM

a) IDEA/SATE Student Evaluation Instrument

Russ reviewed the discussion about the IDEA and SATE instruments and asked what we are assessing. Filling suggested starting with the assessment committee's opinion that assessment should make our jobs better. Christopher stated that most students do not think IDEA matters. Thompson pointed out that exit evaluations are not valid for personnel purposes and that multiple measures are required, not just student perspectives. Zarling asked about the meaning of "validity" and whether IDEA measures what it is supposed to measure. He believes that IDEA costs money and time and that the general agreement is that it is not helpful in indicating how to improve teaching. He added that faculty should develop questions that provide information that we can use.

Sumser asserted that IDEA is cheap. He agreed with Thompson that multiple measures are needed and reflected that the plan when SATE was developed was that it be attached to IDEA to provide two measures. Stanislaw recommends this procedure.

Nagel pointed out that IDEA is not supposed to be used for personnel purposes; however, Russ said that it is often used for RPT evaluation. Blodgett agreed. Sarraille added that the contract says evaluation should be part of a promotion/tenure review.

Floyd agreed that the merit of IDEA is debatable; therefore, we should develop our own measures for formative purposes. If we have our own evidence, we can bring it to committees for evaluation purposes. Peterson noted that all tests are flawed, as is IDEA, and agreed that formulating our own questions for formative reasons is better.

Thompson expressed his preference for bringing the primary voice in evaluation to the department level, but Russ said that other backup material is needed also. Nagel agreed with Thompson, noted that the Philosophy Department has teaching and evaluation instruments, and suggested that departments share measurement vehicles. Russ said that a wonderful place to start would be to have a committee to collect this data from departments. Floyd added that the ASL sub-committee and the Faculty Center could support this project.

Luo recounted his experience that the grades students receive affect their evaluations of faculty; that is, B grades produce better evaluations than C grades. Since any standardized test is biased, he designed his own

test to assess how much the students learned, the most important question to answer.

Carroll said that, since IDEA has so many deficiencies, he would prefer to use the History Department instrument in all his classes. Filling recommended spacing evaluations over the semester and using IDEA at the end, noting that collecting data is helpful.

Russ ended the discussion by saying that this issue should be referred to the ASL Subcommittee to gather department assessment forms, look at student input, and work with A. Young to resolve the IDEA/SATE controversy.

OPEN FORUM

Russ invited VP Stephens to share a description about the project to increase on-campus student housing—the reasons, schedule, and other details. VP Morgan-Foster said the project would add 300 beds and will be a positive development. She asked for Senate input. VP Stephens added that the funding will be from revenue-producing bonds, a CSU debt. The project will be integrated with the existing Village I and II projects, will include improvements suggested by students such as study rooms and laundry facilities, and will provide more summer housing and allow more activities.

Morgan-Foster added that the project will include an adjacent dining facility. Filling asked about the possibility of release from the present cafeteria/Mom's contract. VP Stephens answered negatively, but Morgan-Foster said that the contract will expire by Fall, 2004, about the time when the project is finished. Then another bidding session will occur.

Thompson asked about the need for additional housing. Stephens said that the facility will provide room for about 10% of the student body, whereas now the campus provides space for only 5%. Farrar reflected that in the 60s students generally turned away from student housing, but Morgan-Foster stated that the market seems solid now because not many apartments at modest prices are available. She added that students now are not rebelling against the university, but often they want to live at home.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.