Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m. The agenda was amended by moving 6) Discussion Item c) Provost Search Committee under the Speaker's report. It was then MSP Floyd/Filling to approve the agenda as amended. It was MSP to approve the minutes of October 9, 2001 as submitted.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Speaker/SEC (Russ)

Russ advised that course evaluation forms are due in the Academic Senate Office this Friday, October 26. She also reported CFA President Hilpert and she will be drafting a charge on teaching load to be referred to the UEPC.

b. University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)
Floyd reported that the grading option of ABC N/C is still being discussed at UEPC, and asked Senators to discuss this option with their colleagues. The revised assessment document is under study. The summer calendar for 2002 is being discussed and will probably mirror last year's summer calendar. The name change from Women's Studies to Gender Studies is on the agenda.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)

Towell reported that the committee is working on the Administrative Review Policy. Voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty are still being discussed. A ballot on proposed constitutional amendments for 1) adding the V.P. for Business and Finance as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Academic Senate; 2) name change from Graduate Studies to Graduate School; and 3) name change from Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs to Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will be distributed Monday, October 29.

d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)

Filling reported the committee is trying to determine FBAC's role in program review, the resource effects of assessment, and ways to obtain information on financial matters.

e. Graduate Council (Blodgett)

Blodgett reported Linda Bunney-Sarhad will chair the Search Committee for Graduate Director. The Committee on Committees will select three faculty representatives. The committee discussed early semester revision without reaching consensus, but sent the opinions to CROAC. Also discussed was the serious concern about graduate space in the new Mary Stuart Rogers Educational Gateway Building. Space has been diminished by 1/3 and given to the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management. Blodgett and April Hejka-Ekins will meet with Interim Provost Rhodes to discuss this concern. In addition, GC is working on a graduate listserv and the graduate bylaws.

Russ clarified that the COC will select four faculty for the Search Committee for the Graduate Director, one each from the College of ALS, Business, Education, and the Library. She further stated that the SEC is supportive of the Graduate Council's concern over the space issue.

f. Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)

Sarraille reported the Chancellor will make a special announcement to the statewide academic senate at 10:00 am on Halloween. It will concern "CSU budget and the impact of California's financial situation."

The SWAS will meet for a plenary session on November 1-2. At the plenary, the chief financial and chief academic officers of the CSU will present reports.

At the plenary session, the Motion on Constitutional Revision issue is on the agenda. This is a proposal that all the provisions of the SWAS constitution concerning Membership, Representation, Eligibility to Vote for Campus Representatives, Elections of Campus Representatives, Terms of Office, Substitute Members, and Recall of Representatives be moved to the bylaws. (Actually the intent of the writers may have been only to move the Membership section) These categories would as a result become much more plastic--they could be modified simply by a majority vote of the SWAS. It is thought that the motion stems from a desire to obtain more senators for larger campuses and to modify the number of senators from each campus more easily in
response to changes in campus enrollments.

Sarraille thanked Mark Thompson for writing the motion about the CFA teach-in that the Senate passed at the previous meeting.

**g. Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)** no report

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

Johnson reported the constitution has been finalized for a vote of the students at the end of November. The search for an interim and permanent AD Director is ongoing.

**i. Other**

Thompson reported the first CROAC forum was conducted today. About 40 faculty/staff/students attended. The best showing was by the students. A second forum will be held tomorrow 1:45 to 2:45 p.m.

**FIRST READING ITEMS**

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

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus acknowledge receipt of the attached 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 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, especially where such proposed policies might affect faculty rights and/or academic freedoms.

**RATIONALE:** The Faculty appreciates the work thus far on the draft guidelines, offers it comments and suggestions to the University Facilities Planning Committee, and is amenable to the development of posting policy so long as faculty, appropriate faculty governance committees (e.g. Faculty Affairs), and the Academic Senate are fully involved in development, review, and approval.

Thompson explained the revised Posting Guidelines resolution which had been moved at the last Senate meeting.

Ferriz stated he did not think this resolution necessary. Vice President Stephens stated that after the last discussion, she took notes and made changes to the document. It will be brought back to the Senate for review.

Kobus stated it is important to create a record, so that is the reason for this resolution. Thompson agreed stating we have previous occasions when something was presented as guidelines but then enforced as policy.

Christopher stated she is more unhappy with the guidelines now. She tried to post something in one of the glass cases and all were locked. She doesn't know who maintains these cases. Stephens replied that this issue...
will be considered.

Zarling stated that all this resolution says is that we have seen the guidelines, but if they turn into policy, they have to come back to the Senate for review and action. Russ explained that this issue goes back to shared governance and how rules are created. Any policy change goes through the Senate. Thompson further explained that this question relates to the Visual Identify Guidelines of a few years ago. They were presented as guidelines but then were enforced as policy resulting in additional restrictions to what faculty can get printed on campus. We are trying to discriminate between guidelines which are not binding on faculty; if the administration wants binding policy, the documents have to go through the faculty governance structure. This resolution provides a foundation for requiring full consultation.

Macdonald said that members of her department are concerned about postings on their office doors.

Kobus stated the use of the term 'Posting Guidelines' is confusing because the document also says "draft." Stephens replied that the use of the terms "policy" and "guidelines" in the document is confusing.

Carroll reminded the body that at the last meeting the issue of academic freedom was raised. If we accept this resolution, we can put things on our office door, but if this is a policy, we cannot. Saraille stated that what tends to happen is that rules comes as policy and we don't know the origin. We need to determine whether these "guidelines" apply to faculty.

Almy stated that this discussion serves a purpose. He will take these concerns back to the Facilities Planning Committee. Any other concerns about this document should be sent to him or Stephens. The committee will revise the document and send it back to the Senate.

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

It was MS Thompson/Saraille

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus embrace the three principles of Executive Vice-Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Spence’s initiative on shared governance; viz.,

1. Early inclusion of faculty in identifying issues and in agenda setting,
2. Ongoing consultation, much of it face-to-face, as an iterative process between faculty and administration to reach understanding, and,
3. Substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreement cannot be reached.

and be it, further,

**Resolved:** That, concerning the exercise of authority over educational functions, the Academic Senate assert that the Faculty generate, define, and sculpt policy for the educational functions of the University while administrative authority is secondary in these areas, and be it, further,

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate invite the Administration to join us in adopting the principles of the preceding resolved clauses as the campus model.

**Rationale:** For over a year EVC & CAO Spence has undertaken an initiative to improve shared governance
and has reported on success of the initiative at the system level. It is important to know that the list in the first resolved clause is not taken from Spence’s document; rather, the list is re-created from three recitations of the provisions by Spence (Fall 00, Spring 01, Fall 01). This is because the provisions have not been provided in written form. These provisions provide a strong foundation for trust, the most important element of shared governance.

The EVC/CAO’s initiative is likely in response to the growing unease among faculty that, since the 1985 Academic Senate, California State University’s *Collegiality in the California State University System*, the strength of the Faculty’s voice in governance has declined. The 2001 document *Shared Governance Reconsidered*, a joint project of the ASCSU and the Chancellor’s Office, relates a faculty view that, contrary to the detailed views of the 1985 document, "administrators have taken the initiative in the area of academic policy and that faculty members have been relegated to a reactive or defensive mode," (5) adding that many faculty:

perceive that they are not respected by the administration and that they believe the administration does not treat them as an "equal partner" in governance of the institution. The survey indicated that faculty, in general, are skeptical not only of administrators’ intentions and motives, but also of the notion that shared governance even exists. In short, it appears that some people believe the notions of "respect" and "trust" are so important to concepts of shared governance that their absence indicates that shared governance does not really exist—despite the presence of formal structures and processes. (4)

The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) articulates the Legislature’s understanding that "joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions."

Precedent, practice, contractual responsibility, and the CSU Board of Trustee’s (BOT) *CSU Statement on Collegiality* "assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Trustees," adding that "faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons." The BOT also recognizes the "value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which for which the faculty has primary responsibility."

Thompson advised that he couldn't find any resolution from our campus on the issue of the position of faculty on shared governance. There is a statement from Board of Trustees on Collegiality. This is a first attempt to state our position and invite the campus community to embrace this position also.

Russ stated we will put this resolution on the Senate listserv. The SEC reviewed the 1985 document and the March 2001 unofficial document. She also prepared a document for the President's retreat last August regarding her views on our role and CFA's role in shared governance.

Russ asked Senators to share this resolution with their colleagues.

Sarraille stated that in case a department faculty do not know how faculty governance works, they can agree or not agree with the statement, 'there is an erosion of faculty rights and it is an ongoing trend we have to overcome.' He warned that faculty must protect its rights.
DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Assessment

Russ explained that the campus has been under the assumption that the push for assessment was coming from the Chancellor's Office. But Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that assessment is not one of their priorities. So, the question is, where is this coming from? The administration? At the last Senate meeting Russ asked Senators to go back to their departments and discuss this issue. Later, on the recommendation of Senator Carroll, Senators were asked to send questions directly to Assistant Vice President Hogan so she could answer them today.

Hogan advised that she is the resource for the entire campus. Assessment is the evaluation of student learning, and faculty are in charge; her role is to help facilitate. Program review is one component of the assessment process. She wants to streamline so there is meaningful program review and that will take care of WASC accountability issues. Further, she stated there has been some miscommunication in the past and she wants faculty to teach her how she should work with them and governance committees. She also stated she is working with the Assessment of Student Learning subcommittee of UEPC and will use it as an advisory committee. She asked Senators to give her a year to get up to speed. She stated that assessment should not be an additional process, but built in to what we already have. We need to be more systematic and explicit.

Floyd asked for clarification of the relationship between her office and the faculty governance structure. Hogan replied "Whatever you think is appropriate."

Thompson voiced his alarm in reading a memo from Novak stating his position of Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning no longer exists. Hogan replied that she has no knowledge of that memo, but she has discussed that issue with him. His position was never a permanent position. It was released time only. Do we really need an administrative superstructure with an office of student learning also? No final decision has been made. Russ asked who would be making that decision. That is the faculty's domain. Hogan asked if this issue should come to SEC and Russ replied that it should.

Russ stated that the position is important to faculty, and the position should not be under Institutional Research and Assessment but under Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. Faculty are central in assessment of student learning.

Interim Provost Rhodes stated there is no funded position for Faculty Coordinator for Assessment. We had a one-half time office for institutional research. We now have a centralized office to get data. This office is new and evolving. The office is trying to work with academic units, deans, chairs, assessment committee, putting this together in a collegial shared governance process. The release time previously allocated is being reassessed, but no resources have been taken from that office.

Thompson stated the perception was that we had a Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and that is noted in the Faculty Constitution. Hogan stated that the position was never Coordinator for Student Assessment, but the position was to handle faculty development. Russ stated that faculty thought the position was Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning.

Christopher advised she is happy with data on the web. But, there are problems with data for cross-listed
Hogan stated she focused on student data during the first year, and then got into SFRs.

Floyd again voiced concern about how the lack of understanding about how Institutional Research and Assessment will work with the various faculty committees. Also, the issue of resources is of concern. Hogan replied she would like to meet with faculty groups to discuss how her office should work. She will be available to listen and be ready to do what faculty want. She further stated we need to rethink what we will be doing with assessment. Not all of what we are doing is necessary. We need to make smarter use of what we are already doing.

Ferriz noted that we need raw data. Hogan replied her office has raw data and can provide it. Almy stated that we need to control the number of studies and focus on data that are really needed. Hogan agreed, stating we need to answer questions important to us.

Filling questioned who is doing the assessment of the "position." Hogan replied that she was going to meet with him tomorrow to discuss this issue.

Russ asked that the agenda be moved and the Senate will invite Hogan back. She further reiterated that faculty play a primary role in student assessment, learning, and outcomes. The role of Institutional Research and Assessment with UEPC, its subcommittees, and Graduate Council needs to be discussed.

b. Voting Rights of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Towell asked for feedback on the issue of voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty. FAC has held two forums, they are still asking for feedback. FAC will be amending the Voting Rights Policy shortly.

c. Provost's Search Committee

Russ advised that the Provost Search Committee has been formed with Steve Hughes as chair. The first meeting was last Friday. The composition of the committee, specifically faculty representation was discussed as well as faculty input in writing the position description. It was noted that of the committee of 18, includes only 6 faculty representatives. In 1990, the provost search committee of 12 members included 6 faculty, and in 1996 the committee had 15 members with 6 faculty representatives. The concern was that the percentage of faculty has declined. This concern was brought to the President. Russ stated she asked for two more faculty representatives and the President agreed. Russ invited the chair of the search committee to this meeting to answer concerns of Senators. Thompson explained a process describing the formation of search committees, the position description, the composition of search committees for academic administrators, etc. and encouraged a policy addressing these concerns.

President Hughes gave a statistical count of previous provost search committees. She added the three community members to the committee because it is important to have that link. Also, she added the three vice presidential unit members to represent their areas: Business and Finance, DUR, and Student Affairs. After conferring with the Speaker, she has added two additional faculty members to the committee. She further explained that those at the administrative retreat discussed the importance of the Academic Senate and the faculty making the decision on the kind of Provost they are seeking. The President stated that she would hope faculty would want a Provost with a background in teaching, research, and service.
Carroll questioned how one would explain the reduced percentage of faculty on the search committee that went from 50% to 33%. With the addition of two more faculty, the percentage would still be about 45% [actually 42%]. The President explained that she followed the 1995 guidelines with the exception of adding University Advancement which did not exist in 1995.

Russ stated that we are still trying to get back to 50%, but the percentage now is only about 42%. The President asked if the Senate was negating the faculty status of the deans and vice provost.

Thompson replied to the President that the Senate would not negate their faculty experience, but there is a distinction between faculty and administrators. He also voiced concern that only two of the six faculty were selected by the COC and asked why the COC didn't select all of the faculty. Filling pointed out that there seems to be a shift toward adding more administrative people to the committee.

Sarraille stated that it was the sense of the SEC that this is an opportunity for the Academic Senate to express their views on this important issue.

Kohlhaas questioned the purpose of having 3 off-campus people on the Committee. The President replied that we have a strong foundation board and they are very interested in being a part of our campus. We have a strong advisory board and they also wanted a seat on this committee. Further, she stated it would be a mistake for us to isolate ourselves.

Carroll noted that the issue is not necessarily the administrative presence but the faculty absence.

Sarraille stated that it seems odd to have three people from the community to represent the public.

Kobus also questioned why only two of the six faculty were chosen by COC and asked if that process was historical. President Hughes stated that during the summer the Speaker and she talked about the position description and composition of the committee and there didn't seem to be a problem with the process.

Thompson stated that as Speaker-Elect and as a member of the COC, he went to the COC with the direction to find two faculty representatives. He didn't know there were more faculty who would be appointed by someone else. He assumes that, if two additional faculty are added, the COC would appoint.

Nagel voiced surprise that we have no policy. He suggested FAC develop a policy for the selection of administrative search committees. Russ suggested UEPC look at this issue. Kobus agreed, stating her surprise of the lack of influence the faculty have over the selection of faculty representatives. It is all about process. Almy suggested we come to an agreement on this committee and develop a policy for the future.

Christopher advised that there is no one representing the arts and humanities. Thompson stated that it doesn't mean none were asked. Russ agreed with Thompson's statement.

Christopher agreed that a policy needs to be developed, so this doesn't happen again. She also asked if a faculty member has to be a full professor in order to serve and Russ replied no, but a lot of junior faculty will not voice a dissenting voice. We will be looking at Associate Professors too. Sereno stated that Assistant Professor should also be considered.
Blodgett suggested bringing the total number of faculty to 10 rather than 8.

Sarraille explained that this committee would not vote on applicants and Russ explained that search committee members study files, rate the applicants (low, medium, high), then talk about the choices to reach consensus. Strong faculty voices are crucial.

Steve Hughes stated that as long as he's been here, there has always been a de facto process. The search committee is put together in consultation with the Speaker, SEC, and the President. He further stated that he has no problem with adding more faculty; in fact, he is glad the concern was raised, but we need to get on with this process. The timeline is tight. He also stated that the community representatives are excellent. He reminded the body not to lose sight that the process is a consensus process and it is rare that a vote will occur. If the committee votes, probably the faculty are split. Sarraille asked about the ground rules of the selecting process. Hughes replied that the committee will first cut from the 22 candidates. The committee will meet on November 7 to cut that number to about 8-10, then complete reference checks and telephone calls. The committee will make another cut to 4-5 finalists who will be brought to campus.

Farrar asked if Hughes is comfortable with the position description. Hughes replied that the committee went through the position description and made revisions. He is comfortable with the present description.

It was MS Kobus/Blodgett that no members of the search committee be removed, that we increase the number of faculty to ten, that procedures be developed for search committees in the future, and that the policy should go to the UEPC for discussion and presentation to this body.

Zarling stated there should be something in the motion that states who will choose the four additional faculty. Russ stated that this task will go to the SEC and then to the COC. The COC will make the recommendations.

Russ moved the agenda for the time certain to discuss assessment. We will return to this issue after the time certain discussion with Vice President Hogan.

After discussion of assessment, the Senate returned to the issue of the Provost Search Committee composition.

President Hughes stated she is happy with the addition of two faculty members, but she will defer to the wishes of the Senate. Steve Hughes, chair of the committee, suggested compromising on three. Kobus, the maker of the motion, wished to proceed with the motion of four additional faculty members. Carroll called the question.

Vote on the motion passed with a vote of 14 yes, 13 no, and 2 abstentions. The request for four additional faculty representatives will be sent to the COC for recommendation to the President. The request for a policy will be sent to the UEPC.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.