CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
November 6, 2001

PRESENT: Alfonso, Almy, Bargetto-Andres, Blodgett, Buell, Burroughs, Christopher, Clark, Farrar, Ferriz, Filling, Floyd C., Floyd R., Harris, Johnson, Kohlhaas, MacDonald, Manrique, Mayer J., Mayer M., McLaughlin, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson, Potter, Robbin, Russ, Sarraille, Sereno, Shipley, Slivak, Tan, Thompson, Towell, VanRuiten, Yang, Zarling

PROXIES: Bowers (Akwabi-Ameyaw), Oppenheim (Carroll), Towell (Kobus), Demetrulias (Rhodes)

ABSENT: Fazal, Gackowski, Kimyai

GUESTS: Klein, Stephens, Stone, T. Young

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

FACULTY COORDINATOR FOR ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING--INFORMATION

19/AS/01/AS--POSTING GUIDELINES, APPROVED

21/AS/01/SEC--POSITION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE, APPROVED

10/AS/01/FBAC--FBAC/DUR REPORT, TABLED UNTIL 11/20/01

22/AS/01/GC--FEE WAIVERS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS CARRYING TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES, FIRST READING

23/AS/01/FAC--ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW POLICY, FIRST READING

VOTING RIGHTS FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, DISCUSSED/TABLED UNTIL 11/20/01

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, November 20, 2001
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:

Barbara Manrique, Clerk

Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m. Towell requested that the agenda be amended by moving items 7.b. and 8.a. up to section 5. The agenda was then approved (MS Towell/Filling). The September 25, 2001 minutes were amended by adding "Hughes stated that the committee was
working well, efficiently, and effectively" to paragraph 5 on page 8 and then approved (MS Filling/Sarraille).

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Speaker/SEC (Russ)

Speaker Russ reported that she had attended the recent meeting in Long Beach concerning the budget crisis, but not much definite information was available. Russ added, however, that meeting with statewide senate chairs was enlightening. One interesting fact is that most senate chairs have a term of two or three years. She will attend the Statewide Academic Senate conference on November 28.

b) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)

Floyd named the four additional faculty representatives who are now members of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Search Committee: Bret Carroll, Randy Harris, Deborah Kavasch, and Priscilla Peters. The committee will meet tomorrow to begin the review process.

Floyd also thanked the faculty for sending comments to him about the grading proposal. This item is on Thursday's UEPC agenda. The UEPC will also review Delta course offerings in Stockton to determine whether they relate to any policy issues and will continue to discuss the academic program review with the goal of completing the committee report by the end of November.

c) Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)

Report appears later.

d) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)

Report appears later.

e) Graduate Council (Blodgett)

Report appears later.

f) Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)

Sarraille and Thompson disclosed that the Board of Trustees, at the November 12-13 meeting, will endorse the request for a budget increase for the CSU of over 9%. Included would be a 4% enrollment increase and a 4% increase in compensation for all CSU employees. The Governor's budget proposal will be released in early December, 2001.

The SWAS discussed but took no action on two proposed amendments to reshape the configuration of the Senate as well as the process by which it is configured. Sarraille and Thompson believe that this issue is important to small campuses because larger campuses may gain greater representation through this process. The proposed resolutions will be forwarded to the campuses.
CAO Spence commented that, since enrollments are about 8,400 FTES above target (essentially unfunded), campuses must think about enrollment management (including more restricted application and admission periods). Spence also stated that the CSU/UC Joint Ed. D. agreement conforms to the guidelines set forth in consultation with the Senate. He emphasized the importance of regional common prerequisites to the major as a way to treat community college students more fairly. He is also very interested in 2+2 dual admissions programs to get community colleges to commit students to a baccalaureate degree. Spence will never support a move to admit the top quarter rather than the top third of high school graduates. The expectation will be that every campus come in right on enrollment target in the near future. The effective growth at campuses will be less that 4% to compensate for this year's unexpected +6.5% growth.

In addition, CAO Spence said that we need to consider the burden placed on campuses with program review, accountability, and assessment from the system, WASC, and specialized accreditation. He asserted that Cornerstones accountability was never intended to impose any burden at the department or college level. (He mentioned specifically the conversation at Stanislaus earlier this semester related to the burden of accountability.) He sees as very important the chance through an alliance with the State Board of Education and all segments of higher education to revise the 11th grade California Standards Tests in mathematics and English to use as an exemption based on scores determined by our faculty. Unsuccessful students will have the senior year to work on remediation.

CFO West expects that the system will face cuts of $20-25 million and that the Governor will attempt to push most of the problem into next year. Under that scenario, access, at least up to 4% growth, job security for tenure-track faculty, and ongoing tenure-track searches are not on the table for cost savings. Over the past several years, adequate funding for the basic ongoing services of the University have been inadequate; in fact, new initiatives have been given only one-time funding. To maintain access, California may need to consider increased student fees. Balancing budgets will require both decreasing costs and increasing income. Money was available to 16 campuses to convert to YRO for matriculated students with additional growth funded at full marginal cost. The system seriously exceeded projections by 8,400 FTES when the target "excess" is about 200.

Academic Affairs will recommend specific types of data collection (e.g. progress of remediated students in GE courses) and also look at effects of the change to limit time for remediation. A concern is that some campuses may be farming out remedial courses into non-academic areas such as Student Affairs.

Spence reviewed the Senate approval of the thrust for an independent Ed. D.; however, Spence and Reed met with UC representatives on September 9 to discuss a joint Ed. D. The UC would fund the program at their rate (about $10K/student) with fees allocated between CSU and UC on a workload basis and money will flow directly to the involved campuses with the UC faculty workload as a basis. A joint Ed. D. board will have authority to oversee the program beginning with RFPs for new CSU/UC joint Ed. D. programs in eleven different regions of the state. There are currently three Ed. D. programs with UC. Each system will commit $2M for start-up funds. Campus approval procedures will be respected with expedited approval. Recent general joint doctoral guidelines have proven ineffective. UC will probably not continue to offer any independent Ed. D. degrees.

Passage of SB2042, Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, requires more rigorous standards for K12. Credentialing programs will be revised to include content that must be covered in disciplinary classes. Disciplinary faculty are invited to attend an information and planning meeting on
December 6-7 at the LAX Crowne Plaza that will "feature national and state educational leaders and will include briefings and technical assistance from CCTC staff."

g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)

Absent.

h) Associated Students (Johnson/VanRuiten)

VanRuiten reported that an auditor has examined the books, that interviews of candidates for the position of AS Director have taken place, and that students will vote in a referendum later in November.

i) Other

Russ reported that the Auxiliary Services Committee needs a faculty representative and the COC will be asked to appoint.

INFORMATION ITEM

a) Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning (Filling)

Filling referred to the memo attached to the minutes that he and Andy Young sent to Provost/VPAA Rhodes on October 26, 2001, and the accompanying two-page Position Description. He noted that the budget for this position had been conveyed to the area of Dr. Roseann Hogan, AVPIRA. The letter requests that the Provost "transfer the funds allocated to the Coordinator's release time as well as those for the Office of Assessment of Student Learning to Dr. Young's FCETL budget."

ACTION ITEMS

a. 19/AS/01/AS-Posting Guidelines

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus acknowledge receipt of the attached draft Posting Guidelines for its review and comment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the guidelines as a draft document and not as policy or procedures binding on the Faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate expect to review and act upon any proposed posting policy created in the future as well as any proposed policies or procedures which might affect faculty rights and/or academic freedoms.

Thompson explained that he has made changes because of faculty feedback: expansion of the original rationale and broadening of the third resolved clause to cover visual policy and other guidelines. The purpose is to distinguish between guidelines and policy that denotes enforcement. Zarling wondered if the third resolved clause described procedures rather than guidelines. Thompson answered Christopher's question about "visual identity guidelines" by explaining that the term refers to the format of printed documents, not the content. Problems occur when some documents are presented as guidelines then
enforced as policy. VP Stephens said that the guidelines are an attempt to assure that if something is posted, it will not be removed; however, Filling pointed out that those who tear down material don't follow policies or guidelines. Ferriz stated that guidelines are reasonable but objected to VP Stephens' clarification that staff are trying to deal with these situations by asserting that custodians should not be the enforcers.

The question was called. The vote was 19 Yes, 2 No, 15 Abstentions. The resolution passed.

b) 21/AS/01/SEC-Position on Shared Governance

Thompson explained that this document is an attempt to formulate a faculty statement on this issue and that it invites administration inclusion. Tom Young explained that President Hughes could not attend the meeting to express her concerns. She believes that the final authority rests with the administration. Young admitted that meanings of the words "authority" and "responsibility" cause problems. Thompson explained that the statement uses "authority" as distinguished from "power" whereas the President's documents use the word "power." Zarling said that the thrust of the first resolved clause was that faculty propose policy for educational functions. The administration has secondary authority, but ultimate power.

After considerable discussion of the meanings of words, Russ explained that the purpose is to create a document for the faculty, not for the President. Faculty initiate curriculum.

The vote to close debate passed - Yes 24, No 12.

The vote to approve was Yes 24, No 8, Abstentions 5. The resolution passed.

Russ said that the SEC will discuss this resolution. It is really for the faculty and may or may not be sent on to the President.

c) 10/AS/01/FBAC-FBAC/DUR Report

Filling referred to the FBAC/DUR Report of March 16, 2001, attached to the minutes, submitted to the SEC in March and then tabled in May by a unanimous Senate vote until November 6, 2001. Also provided were 1) a copy of his reply dated September 26, 2001, to the response of Vice President, Business and Finance Stephens to FBAC's original report and 2) a copy of the reply dated October 29, 2001, from VP Stephens containing her clarifications of statements made in her May 8, 2001, response to the FBAC/DUR Report of March 16, 2001. Filling reviewed the history of attempts to obtain responses and information and then moved to continue the discussion to November 20, 2001. (MS Filling/Oppenheim). Motion passed.

FIRST READING ITEMS

a) 22/AS/01/GC-Fee Waivers for Graduate Students Carrying Teaching Responsibilities

It was MS Blodgett/Filling
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus pass the Proposal for Fee Waivers for graduate Students Carrying Teaching Responsibilities to become effective upon receiving the President's approval.

Rationale: University policy through Executive Order 611 of October 27, 1993 allows fee waivers for graduate students carrying teaching responsibilities and extending the waivers also to non-salaried teaching assistants is a logical extension of the practice.

Blodgett then explained that the resolution is an extension and activation of what is currently allowed by system policy. She said that these waivers encourage retention of graduate students and help faculty cope with growing enrollments. The procedures for such waivers include competitive selection by departments, at least a 3.0 GPA, experience pertinent to the assignment, and a clearly defined assignment.

Nagel noted a possible unintended effect of having departments discourage teaching assistants and instead expecting all graduate students to teach. Blodgett answered Sarraille's question about the number of students involved by disclosing that a survey of 8 graduate coordinators last year indicated 16 TAs and that the estimate is that 25-30 might be involved if waivers were available.

Other questions concerned the amount of work required, possible exploitation since waivers for graduate students cost less than payment of lecturers, disparities in funds available in different departments, problems connected to supervision and accountability of course content, and potential loss of revenue for departments. Tom Young pointed out that graduate students were removed from the MOU in 86-87 because they were replacing lecturers. Christopher explained that the Department of English has used graduate students to teach composition classes and has designed evaluation procedures. Students are overseen by the instructors of record and they must take a 3-unit pass/fail course to prepare for this graduate internship; therefore, accountability is insured.

Thompson clarified that the Senate cannot amend the proposed policy, but the Graduate Council may consider faculty questions and suggestions and bring a revised resolution back to the Senate later. Russ added that the Graduate Council now has information to discuss concerning this proposal.

b) 23/AS/01/FAC-Administrative Review Policy

It was MS Sarraille/Oppenheim

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus, endorse the proposed Administrative Review document, which includes policies and procedures for periodic evaluation of university administrators (on a rotational basis, every five years); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus strongly urge President Hughes to accept and implement this Administrative Review policy in addition to the annual Management Personnel Plan which is currently in place.

RATIONALE:

On March 31, 1998, the SEC established an Ad Hoc Committee for Assessing Administrative Review and Hiring Practices chaired by John Barnett for the purpose of examining current CSU Stanislaus policy for
annual review of Management Personnel; comparing documents from other institutions for management review and suggesting practices for greater faculty participation in periodic management reviews.

On December 16, 1998, the report from the committee was sent to SEC and on to President Hughes, but there was no response from the President. The purpose of sending the Barnett report to the President was to begin a dialogue with her which would lead to greater faculty participation in administrative reviews.

On October 17, 2000, SEC asked FAC to look at the Barnett Report and Sam Oppenheim's proposal to develop an Administrative Review Policy. A draft of the Administrative Review Policy was sent to the President by Speaker Pandell on March 22, 2001.

On April 23, 2001, a memo was sent to SEC by the President regarding the policy stating that the current Administrative Review Policy includes faculty participation, and that the proposed Administrative Review Policy did not comply with some MPP policies.

President Hughes, Tom Young and Cecil Rhodes attended SEC on May 10, 2001 to discuss the draft, along with a critique of the document. There was no time for FAC to review the President's comments, so the charge to FAC was carried over to the 2001/2002 academic year.

September 18, 2001 SEC asked FAC to review the document again according to proposed changes in the critique from the President.

October 17, 2001 FAC met with Tom Young and further revised the Administrative Review Policy after listening to his suggestions. The draft was presented to SEC on October 30, 2001.

Towell explained a change of the Administrative Review Policy attached to the minutes. In 6.1, on page 3, the final sentence should be: "Other pertinent areas of review shall be determined in consultation with the administrator's immediate supervisor." The last sentence printed should be deleted.

Towell then summarized the history of the faculty attempts to institute an administrative review in addition to the annual Management Personnel Plan currently in place, as described in the rationale provided with the resolution. She explained that the FAC, after discussion with Tom Young, Assistant to the President-EO&IR, made changes to make the proposal more acceptable to the President. Young added that no administrators subject to the policy have seen it yet, but he said that the FAC had done a good job of working in the spirit of shared governance and he will present the proposed policy to administrators in this way.

Russ noted that this item will be an action item on November 20.

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**a) Voting Rights for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

Towell explained that Option A of this proposed amendment requires a university-wide policy, but Option B would allow departments to decide the voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty (full-time VLs). The FAC would like input from faculty about the two options. At the recent forum, only
the Social Work, English, and Teacher Education departments were represented. Towell added that this resolution would be added to the faculty handbook and was not a constitutional item.

Sivak said that Social Work makes no distinction between tenure-track and visiting-lecturer faculty members. This department believes discussion and voting by all are valuable. Christopher pointed out a possible contradiction since Option A says non-tenure-track faculty may NOT vote on hiring, yet 3.a. indicates they may vote for department search committees recommending the appointment of probationary faculty. Some senators suggested adding a third option to require departments to have a definite policy.

Russ asked the FAC to clarify some language and then bring the proposal back to the Senate.

**OPEN FORUM**

Russ reminded senators to respect diverse opinions and to concentrate on achieving Senate goals.

Meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.