CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
November 20, 2001

PRESENT: Afonso, Almy, Bargetto-Andres, Blodgett, Buell, Burroughs, Carroll, Christopher, Clark, Farrar, Fazal, Ferriz, Filling, Floyd C., Harris, Johnson, Kobus, Kohlhaas, MacDonald, Manrique, Mayer J., McLaughlin, Nagel, Peterson, Potter, Rhodes, Robbin, Russ, Sarraillie, Sereno, Shipley, Sivak, Tan, Thompson, Yang, Zarling

PROXIES: Bowers (Akwabi-Ameyaw), Noble (Morgan-Foster), Brown (Towell)

ABSENT: Floyd R., Gackowski, Kimyai, Mayer M., VanRuiten

GUESTS: Oppenheim, Ostrander, Stephens

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

1% Budget Cut, DISCUSSED

23/AS/01/FAC--Administrative Review Policy, TABLED UNTIL 12/4/01

22/AS/01/GC--Fee Waivers for Graduate Students Carrying Teaching Responsibilities, TABLED UNTIL 12/4/01

10/AS/01/FBAC--FBAC/DUR Report, APPROVED

Voting Rights for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, DISCUSSED

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

Minutes submitted by:
Barbara Manrique, Clerk

Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. and requested that Information Item 5.a. 1% Budget Cut be moved up to 4.d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee. The agenda was then approved (MS Harris/Farrar). The November 6, 2001 minutes were approved with the correction of "Afonso" in the list of those present (MS Filling/Blodgett).

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Speaker/SEC (Russ)

Speaker Russ invited VP Mary Stephens to attend Senate meetings. Stephens will receive the Senate minutes and agenda and may request to have items placed on the agenda.

b) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)
Floyd reported that the committee is working on the grading options and will send the proposal to the GE subcommittee for review. The Academic Program Review document should be completed by December.

Nagel asked about the assessment coordinator position. Russ said she has not yet received a response to the letter sent to Provost Rhodes requesting that this position be moved to the office of FCETL Director Andrew Young. Thompson added that any machines formerly used by Novak were to be moved to this location also.

c) Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)

Randall Brown said that he would discuss Action Item 6.a. (Administrative Review Policy) and Discussion Item 7.a. (Voting Rights for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty) later. Russ then reported that Tom Young had requested that the action item be deferred until December 4 so that administrators may review the policy.

d) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)

Filling spoke of the request by the Chancellor's Office to cut 1% from the general fund because of the state's financial difficulties. CSU Stanislaus needs to cut $713,000. Budget cuts may not come from financial aid; therefore, all other areas must reduce expenditures by 1.4% this year, anticipating that we may be funded less next year. Filling believes that academic affairs will be expected to cut more than smaller areas of the budget and that this consequence is wrong. He hopes that the government will see that our operation works in inverse relationship with the economy since more students enroll during a recession.

Filling reported that FBAC recommends that the Senate ask the President to involve the SEC in Cabinet discussions of the ongoing budget challenges. He added that FBAC is trying to understand the financial information available and will talk to departments and staff in January to determine how funds are used. In addition, the BPAC review committee is trying to find a new process, one that is NOT top down and hopes that this process may be used in the next academic year (02/03).

Speaker Russ provided the information that the President and Provost have given assurance that faculty will be involved in the budgetary process. Farrar suggested that departments with more fee waivers might benefit, but Stephens said that the reductions of department budgets would be even according to the projection of student fees. Harris mentioned Vice Chancellor West's talk of a 15% cut next year. Tan asked about increasing private fundraising, but Stephens warned that private funds are usually one-time funds and are not part of base dollars.

e) Graduate Council (Blodgett)

Blodgett reported that the GC support the principles of academic assessment under UEPC review and that five departments have agreed to use the draft APR.

f) Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)

Sarraille noted that Chancellor Reed has asked for a $25-million cut in the current budget and said speculation is that deeper cuts will be in next year's budget and in succeeding budgets. He also reported that hundreds of CSU faculty and staff staged a rally at the November 16 meeting of the Board of Trustees. CFA leaders presented some 20,000 petitions to board members requesting improvements in CSU support.
and resource distribution. At the board meeting Chair Gould introduced newly appointed trustee Ricardo Icaza.

Sarraille mentioned newspaper reports on a survey of CSU graduates who recently became teachers. The study indicated that 25 percent of those who completed CSU teacher education programs felt somewhat unprepared to teach. Some Senate members felt that reports of deficiencies were over-stressed.

The executive committee sent a letter to Laurence Gould, Jr., Chair of the Board of Trustees, asking the CSU to conduct a study of CSU faculty hiring practices over the past decade to effectuate improvements and to "jointly develop a plan" with CFA and the Academic Senate to increase the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty to at least 75%.

California Faculty Association President Susan Meisenhelder met with the CSU Senate Executive Committee on Monday and discussed how the Senate might facilitate coming to a resolution on bargaining. Other items were discussions of recommendations from the Faculty Affairs Committee on improving shared governance and information that a proposal will be developed to take to the Council of Library Directors (COLD) concerning cooperation by CSU and UC on site licensing in order to facilitate use of UC library materials by CSU faculty.

g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)

No report.

h) Associated Students (Johnson/VanRuiten)

Johnson reported that the ASI Director search is progressing, open forums will take place soon to discuss constitutional changes, and policies for the CSU audit are being approved.

i) Other

Thompson reported that not many people attended the last two forums to discuss options for changes of the academic calendar but added that good discussions took place. CROAC will complete its report on schedule and will then forward it to UEPC, SEC, and finally to the Senate.

INFORMATION ITEM

a) 1% Budget Cut

Filling discussed this item earlier.

ACTION ITEMS

a. 23/AS/01/FAC-Administrative Review Policy

Randall Brown explained that a request has been made to defer action until December 4, but he opened discussion by saying that the present document has been revised four or five times. It subjects to review
administrators from assistant deans to the provost and involves one committee for the central administration and one for each school-four new committees with thirteen faculty members. The reviews will take place every five years within an April-October timeframe. Brown added that this review will add work for the faculty and supporters need to justify the cost vs. the value since the shelf life of administrators is about three years.

Johnson asked about the extent to which faculty are already involved in review of administrators and about the jurisdiction of faculty. Russ explained that the issue is that faculty want to be more involved and not to be asked only to submit recommendations.

Saraille asserted that the model is not IBM or the army. Faculty are not lower echelon troops but professionals in charge of maintaining quality academic programs that the administrators facilitate. It is natural faculty have significant input on how administrators are doing in furthering the goals of the institution.

Floyd pointed out that the purpose of a review process is to improve effectiveness but that a five-year review is summative, not formative, and perhaps not worth the cost. Farrar said, however, that a summative report will help the formative aspect and emphasized that this is a key right of faculty because the administrators should assist faculty.

Thompson asked about the number of people who would be under review each year. Brown thought one or two, possibly three. Thompson noted that administrators under review now provide a list of faculty whom they want on their review committee and faculty do not have that option. The argument came from the Barnett Report and also a faculty response to the administration's desire for a post-tenure review of tenure faculty. Peterson said that faculty think the RPT review is a good process and that a post-tenure review program seems to be a way to undermine tenure. Zarling observed that the administrative review policy might be seen as retaliation for the post-tenure review policy that the CSU endorses, but Saraille suggested that a defensive measure is wise. Johnson suggested revising the current policy to include more faculty input. The motion to postpone action on this item until December 4 passed. (MS Thompson/Peterson)

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

Blodgett reported that the committee was working on this proposal and said that establishing a policy is important even if funds are not available because of budget constraints. The motion to postpone action on this item until December 4 passed. (M/S Blodgett/Robbins)

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

Filling asked the Senate to approve the FBAC/DUR Report and accept the thirteen recommendations as written. The recommendations will then be forwarded to the administration. He requested that the vote be by secret ballot.

Oppenheim, FBAC Chair last year, reviewed concerns that DUR discloses funds raised without information about how it is spent. Although expenses of 15% may be reasonable, DUR admits to more without providing specific numbers. Oppenheim noted that the celebrity series raises funds for DUR but little for scholarships and mentioned problems with the $200,000 from Pepsi and the move to Division 2 also. The administration believes that details may hurt the public image of the
campus, but FBAC members last spring unanimously approved the report because more openness and honesty are very important.

Stephens said that the recommendations are not philosophically problematic, but donors may not like #3 because it allows up to 15% of donations for DUR costs and might require some general fund to support the operations. Ida Bowers acknowledged that donors to The Bridge do not want their donations to be applied to administration costs. Stephens reported that VP Strong is moving on clear reporting of information and that President Hughes approves of the present reporting about athletics. She supports recommendation #9 that endorses close consultation with faculty and other constituencies on facilities issues.

Peterson stated her support for the recommendations, but stated that the current FBAC has not read the Report and have concerns. She asked that the report and recommendations be split. Filling responded to Peterson's observation that some members of the present FBAC have reservations about the report by saying that most of the former members are present members of the Senate and that one person who expressed reservations had not studied the report. He stressed that DUR should not "fool" the public. Almy stated that the report passed last spring after long study by the committee.

Mayer observed that DUR receives 8% of theater-ticket revenue and that more accountability is desirable. Kobus referred to recommendation #11 and noted that having athletics under the direction of DUR seems to be in conflict with the educational mission of the campus. She also mentioned that the Office of Civil Rights calls on universities to abandon Native-American names for their teams, but that the President rejected the report of a committee of faculty and students to discontinue the "Warrior" name. Johnson mentioned his outrage over controversies related to athletics and agreed that honesty is the best policy. Harris added that the present situation has affected relationships that College of Business faculty have with the business community and he urged the Senate to pass the entire document and recommendations.

The vote to close debate passed (M/S Nagel/Mayer).

The results of the secret ballot were 29 Yes and 8 No; therefore, the report and recommendations were approved.

DISCUSSION ITEM

a. Voting Rights for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Discussion of this item ended when Speaker Russ explained that FAC had taken action on May 10, 2000, to resolve this matter so that the issue is moot.

OPEN FORUM

Christopher asked about the procedure to be used to request abolishment of the Warrior name and also change the name of the KIVA Bookstore. Russ said that any proposals should go first to the SEC and Thompson pointed out that the standing rules list all the steps.

Christopher further requested that if the campus is cut 15% next year, that the Academic Senate recommend we look very seriously at the athletic program, and ask that the current sports program represent our student
body.

Russ announced that applications for directors of overseas programs are due by December 1. Faculty may contact Bob Anderson for information (x3501).

Russ reminded faculty that the student evaluation period starts Monday, November 26 and ends Friday, December 7. Please do not evaluate during finals.

She also mentioned comments by faculty that the President often does not approve Senate resolutions; however, investigation revealed that President Hughes has approved 57 of 60 resolutions sent to her in the last seven years.

Russ reminded Senators that we can agree to disagree, but at all times treat each other with civility and graciousness.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.