CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
April 8, 2003


PROXIES: Stone (Stessman)

ABSENT: Afonso, Bargetto-Andres, Ferriz, Harris, Piskoti, Potter, Rumayor, Washington

GUESTS: Klein, Manoharan, Peters

6/AS/03/FAC--Policy for University Search Committees: Appointment of Administrators, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

7/AS/03/UEPC--Academic Technology Plan, APPROVED

8/AS/03/UEPC--Program Discontinuation: BA in Vocational Education, REJECTED

9/AS/03/ SEC--Authentic Consultation and Shared Decision Making on Enrollment Management, FIRST READING

10/AS/03/AS--Program Discontinuance for the BA Program in Vocational Education, FIRST READING

Facilitating Graduation Report, DISCUSSED

Methods Used in Academic Affairs at CSUS to Examine Institutional Effectiveness, DISCUSSED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, April 29, 2003
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman
Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:36 pm

The agenda was approved as amended to remove 9a. and switch 6A and 6B. The AS minutes of March 25, 2003 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. CFA President Filling attended the joint legislative hearing on the CMS Audit in Sacramento. The Chancellor’s Office was repeatedly berated for, among other things, lack of cost benefit analysis, ethically questionable behavior, and lack of common business sense in the process to select and implement CMS. The hearing chair emphasized that the CSU has damaged trust with the legislature; this damage may make faculty more reluctant to follow the Chancellor's urgings that we speak with one voice. Filling encouraged Senators to view the videotape or DVD available from the CFA office.

2. Thompson noted that
   a.) The campus budget summit was successful with approximately 80 participants. The suggestions have been distributed electronically and another forum to expand and prioritize strategies will be held Monday 14 April at 11:00 in MSR130.
   b.) Ballots for General Faculty and Academic Senate committees and officers as well as on the proposed constitutional amendment are due this Friday by 1:00 in the Office of the Academic Senate.
   c.) The Senate appreciates the provision of refreshments by the Provost
   d.) He appreciates the President's approval of 2/AS/03/SEC.
   e.) Guests P. Peters, Manoharan, Klein are welcome.
   f.) David Lindsay is our Outstanding Professor; the Senate warmly applauded Senator Lindsay.

Questions about reports: None

ACTION ITEMS

a. 7/AS03/UEPC-Academic Technology Plan

Thompson advised that amendments are on page 11 of the packet. There being no discussion, the vote was taken, and the resolution was approved.

b. 6/AS/03/FAC—Policy for University Search Committees: Appointment of Administrators

Brown explained the revisions by FAC which are intended to help emphasize the collegial intent of the policy and ensure that hiring and appointing administrators can exercise their authority while also guaranteeing that the search committee is not reduced to the role of a screening committee.

Oppenheim thanked the FAC for their work and spoke in favor of the resolution, opining that he preferred some of the previous language but understands that the change in 9 makes the policy more palatable. He would prefer ranking, but comments will let administrator know the feelings of committees.
There being no further discussion, the vote was taken, and the resolution was approved unanimously.

c. 8/AS/03/UEPC—Program Discontinuation: BA in vocational Education

Nagel allowed the AS might be positioning itself to not accept its responsibility vis-à-vis the curriculum. It was MS Nagel/Zarling to add a whereas clause which said that the College of ALS which was proposed to house this program has indicated it does not want to and to add a resolved that the AS place the program on hold.

A point of order was made and discussion ensued as to whether the proposed amendment was in order. Thompson ruled the motion to amend out of order; challenge by Zarling. Discussion ensued as to whether the ruling should be overturned. The challenge failed, 11 for, 22 against.

Oppenheim spoke against the resolution which calls for continuance of the program. Filling proposed referral back to the UEPC stating that the resolution is flawed.

It was MS Nagel/Peterson to table. The motion to table failed 10 for, 23 against.

It was MS Sereno/Oppenheim to close debate. The motion was approved 29 for, 5 against.

8/AS/03/UEPC failed on a voice vote with 1 abstention.

It was MS Weikart/Jaasma:

10/AS/03/Floor (Weikart/Jaasma)

Whereas: The number of students majoring in and graduating with a Bachelor of Vocational Education has been and still is extremely small; and

Whereas: The dean of the College of Education does not want the Vocational Education Program housed in the College of Education, but has recommended that it be housed in the College of ALS; and

Whereas: The dean of the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences does not want to oversee the Vocational Education Program, but instead recommends program discontinuance for it; therefore, be it

Resolved: The Academic Senate at CSU Stanislaus recommends program discontinuance for the BA Program in Vocational Education.

Weikart noted that the original committee was heavily loaded with education professors and the Dean of Education. The Special Review Committee based continuance on acceptance into ALS. The number of students involved is very small. There was discussion how much emphasis should be given to program size and whether the degree is useful for students.

It was MS Oppenheim/Sarraille to move to second reading. Discussion revolved around whether there was an actual urgency to pass the resolution and whether the previous discussion and review of 8/AS was a de facto first reading of 10/AS. The motion failed 18 for, 14 against (2/3 required).
Garcia recommended deletion of language about number of students while Sarraille was curious to know if there are actually students in the program.

This will be second reading at next meeting.

Thompson personally thanked the FAC and UEPC. The action items today represent a great deal of long-term work by many people

**FIRST READING ITEM**

a. 9/AS/103/SEC—Authentic Consultation and Shared Decision Making on Enrollment Management

It was MS Aronson/Filling

Resolved: That the Academic Senate California State University, Stanislaus urge the President and the Provost to ensure that direct, authentic consultation and shared decision making occur concerning approval or subsequent revision of any Enrollment Management Plan or policies for the University and be it, further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urge the President and the Provost to ensure consultation and shared decision-making on the campus enrollment target and be it, further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate request that consultation on enrollment management plans, policies, and targets initiate with the Senate Executive Committee for referral to appropriate governance groups.

Rationale: In 2000, the Senate Executive Committee recommended to the President that the office formerly known as Director of Admissions and Records be moved from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs. The primary reason for the SEC’s request was to improve consultation and shared decision making related to enrollment management. Subsequent to that recommendation, the President moved those services to Academic Affairs and created the office of Assistant Vice President for Student Enrollment Management.

The Academic Senate of the California State University has approved a number of resolutions related to the development of enrollment management policy and the implementation of that policy on all campuses of the CSU system. AS-2483-00/AA includes in the resolved clause that “Campus faculty and Senates shall participate fully in developing policy, procedures, and criteria for admitting students” and notes in the rationale that “Admissions policies go to the very heart of the nature of the CSU and its mission. The faculty believes that discipline faculty should take the lead in identifying standards and criteria for their programs.” AS-2569-02AA urges the Board of Trustees to require that “The presidents of the individual campuses shall consult with the Academic Senate of their campuses each year before developing enrollment targets and enrollment management practices implications for the next admission cycle.” The extant BoT policy asserts that “each campus shall develop and adopt a strategic, long range enrollment management plan” but fails in that document to require authentic consultation. The Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU conducted a survey of campuses; nine campuses responded, with most indicating that the committees making recommendations on campus-wide enrollment management policies are administrative
committees with one or two faculty representatives.

In Fall 2002, Executive Vice-Chancellor Spence forwarded to campus Presidents coded memorandum AA-2002-48 and its attachments, where he refers to several approved enrollment management steps that campuses may implement. In response to that memorandum, the report of the CSU Academic Affairs Committee’s notes that: 1. Student enrollment management (SEM) is a critical issue in the CSU; 2. Enrollment management affects access, instruction, retention, and faculty development directly and indirectly; 3. Communiqués from the CAO are likely to be seen as “marching orders” at the local administrative level; 4. Many if not most campuses do not have authentic consultative processes in place for SEM; 5. Changes in course enrollment limits should be made based on consultation with and concurrence of faculty; 6. Authentic consultation is necessary on campus enrollment targets and all of the SEM options outlined in coded memorandum AA-2002-48 and its attachments.

On February 24th, 2003, Executive Vice-Chancellor Spence and ASCSU Chair Kegley forwarded a memorandum to Provosts and Campus Senate Chairs which included: "Because enrollment management policy is directly related to educational quality, it is necessary that decisions are made based on authentic consultation and shared decision-making with the campus Academic Senates. Campus enrollment targets, and all of the enrollment management goals and options outlined in coded memorandum AA-2002-48 and its attachment, as well as the selection from and prioritization of those goals and options, are appropriate for consultation with the Academic Senate on campus. If the proposed rules apply to a smaller unit within the CSU campus, consultation with the Academic Senate and with the smaller unit is also appropriate."

21/AS/01/SEC which states the position of the Faculty on shared governance and has been recognized by the Provost calls for:
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. [END]

Aronson explained the basic rationale is that SEM is here and effecting us. It is an area that really needs structured, faculty input into a shared decision making process. Filling added that the resolution also benefits local administrators when Headquarters leans on them.

Nagel queried what mechanism is intended; Thompson explained the intent is to direct the plan through appropriate governance committees and the Senate. Youngblom clarified that all faculty recommended by COC have been appointed to the SEM committee. Mayer suggested including more structure in the approach and questioned the use of "authentic."

There was discussion of whether this resolution should call for student involvement, should reflect a joint effort, should incorporate language which might be viewed as directive to students, or whether ASI should speak for the students with a resolution that the AS might then support. Sarraille noted that we need to have language respectful of students, but also we do not want to decide what the role of students would be. It was clarified that the resolution is not about the committee membership but about the enrollment management plan the campus is required to have and campus enrollment target which has also been defined open for consultation with faculty.
Further advice or comments concerning the resolution should be forwarded to Thompson or Bowman.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**a. Facilitating Graduation Report**

Thompson noted that both the Statewide Academic Senate and Board of Trustees have endorsed the Report. Two related task forces currently being formed are one on graduation facilitation and another specifically for advising. Any interested Senators should contact Senator Youngblom.

**b. Methods Used in Academic Affairs at CSUS to examine Institutional Effectiveness**

Provost Dauwalder stated a group of administrators met a few times and developed spreadsheets attached to the March 11 agenda. Table 1 presents definitions and 9 different methods to examine institutional effectiveness. There has been a lot of disagreement when talking about assessment so the group attempted to define various kinds of assessment and describe uses to promote a common understanding. Table 2 identifies individuals, groups, committees and relationships.

Nagel pointed out that when we are dealing with issues of assessment, evaluation, and accountability, we find a lot of faculty do not seem to have clear conceptions among various kinds of measures. We need clearer communication of information. Provost Dauwalder responded that some discomfort about assessment stems from the idea that student learning data might be used inappropriately. By reviewing the table, we can better differentiate. Thompson added that there is a very strong protective element in the document. Sarraille feels that we should not be imposed upon by the assessment movement, especially due to legislation. Stone noted that last fall UEPC brought forth principles of assessment which were intended as further protection for faculty.

Garcia noted the lack of funding to support assessment. Dauwalder said support will be required for programs to assess ways in which they are successful as well as areas where some changes may be necessary; we are taking a first step to define what elements are. Brown added that much of our assessment is geared to occur too late in the students' degree when little can be done if the assessment indicates problems. Avilla queried about students funding and doing assessment; is there a way to work together? Myers voiced hesitation; it is not clear that students are the best qualified to assess student learning. Avilla suggested finding a way to come up with course evaluation that could be made public for student use. Thompson recalled that he and the Provost discussed this issue with the ASI, that the item has been on the SEC agenda for the last two meetings, but that the SEC has not received the materials to review from ASI.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30