

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES**

February 25, 2003

PRESENT: Afonso, Aronson, Avilla, Brown, Dauwalder, Filling, Gackowski, Garcia, Luo, Harris, Karlstrom, Jaasma, Lindsay, Mayer J., Mayer M., Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Oppenheim, Orenstein, Paterson, Peterson, Rumayor, Sarraille, Stessman, Stone, Sundar, Tan, Thompson, Tynan, Vang, Weikart, Youngblom, Zarling

PROXIES: Muedeking (Serenio)

ABSENT: Bargetto-Andres, Ferriz, Floyd, Piskoti, Potter, Tavernier, Washington

GUESTS: Brunn, President Hughes, Klein, Morgan, Ex. V.C. Spence, Stephens, Strong

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

**REPORT BY EXECUTIVE VICE
CHANCELLOR SPENCE**

17/AS/02/FAC--Amendment to GF
Constitution, Article VI. Section 2.3,
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

2/AS/03/SEC--Consultation on Campus
Accountability Report, **UNANIMOUSLY
APPROVED**

3/AS/03/FAC--Posting Guidelines, **FIRST
READING**

4/AS/03/UEPC--Guidelines for Academic
Collaboration between CSUS-Stockton and
San Joaquin Delta College, **FIRST
READING**

**REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE
FOR STUDENT EVALUATIONS**

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, March 11, 2003
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 2:37 pm The agenda was approved as submitted. The Minutes of January 28, 2003 were approved.

Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer David Spence was introduced to the Senate. He stressed the importance of communication through campus visits. He is proud of the CSU system and equally proud of the faculty and students. The CSU has a wonderful mission. Next year will be a challenge, but his hope is that we will come out even more dedicated to serving students.

He noted that he has put a number of initiatives and expectations on the agenda. But, he made a pledge to the Statewide Academic Senate that the Chancellor's Office not only would try to do agenda setting jointly, but also cut back on initiatives that come up each year. However, one of the issues he wants to keep in the forefront is graduating students. He stated his high priority for the next few years is improving our graduation rate. Improving the graduation rate makes the best use of students' time and resources if they invest in their higher education. And, given the budget situation, he stated that we need to graduate our students to make room for more students. There is great enrollment pressure and we need to do more to help students graduate but also keep to our high standards. We need to improve the transfer process, college preparation (we are close to developing early assessment program). This in no way means we will get out of outreach business. We have revamped the program review process and academic technology is at the point of benefiting faculty; we really need to immediately show our commitment to the use of academic technology in teaching and learning, he stated. We want to provide an environment and support for faculty who do see technology in teaching and learning, in meeting student needs and in terms of quality.

The Chancellor, CFA and SWAS have jointly produced reports in two major areas: ACR 73 is a plan for increasing the ratio of tenure track faculty, and we have agreed on seven recommendations including a recommendation to adjust the teaching loads to make more time for other activities. We are committed to a system of shared governance.

Sarraille noted that he heard a similar speech about this at Long Beach and that a lot of things are due to resource deficiencies--basically we have to do more with less. Spence explained that of the three components he mentioned earlier, assessment doesn't cost the CSU anything, transfer does not cost anything, (but we will support faculty travel to get faculty across the system to find answers or ways to improve transfer). Some of the recommendations in the graduation facilitation initiative will cost. An automated audit system is important, and we have been assured it will be up in running, he stated. It will provide information all students need. Every student should be required to have a degree audit to tell them when they are to finish. We will recommend to students to sit down and develop a plan to graduate. If it costs money, we will have to get funds. A lot of this is a change in expectations, we need to convey to our students that what they get in a CSU education is equally valuable one from the UC.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Klein reported that on March 20-22 the second annual Women in the Arts Festival will be held .
2. The President's Planning and Steering Committee and the President are hosting two forums March 4-5. The subject is how the University is doing regarding the Pathways to the Future goals. Documents are on the web.
3. Mayer announced that a block of tickets are available for the national tour of The Producers coming to San Francisco. Anyone interested, please contact him. Date is April 13, 2 pm with a cost of \$82.
4. Stephens reminded faculty that there will be two sessions on the budget February 27 (faculty) and 28 (staff), 8-9:30 am at the Event Center.
5. Luo, member of the Faculty Development Committee, encouraged Senators to have lunch at the JSRFDC.

In order for lunch service to continue, they need 50 people per day. It's a wonderful place to meet.

6. Thompson thanked the Provost for refreshments.

7. Annie Hor was appointed to the Search Committee for AVPFA.

8. March 4 is the JSRFDC dedication.

9. Thompson acknowledged guests Dean Morgan, Vice President Stephens, Vice President Strong, and Sandy Brunn from Nursing.

QUESTIONS ON REPORTS

Nagel questioned the last two sentences first page, "collected but not distributed." Tynan replied that the statement that was made about enrollment dollars from last year is that some scenarios presented were these dollars would be held to offset some of the budget cuts. Stephens stated that the decision was made that we are facing cuts, so rather than distribute those dollars and then have to ask for it back, UBAC says it is less disruptive not to distribute and put this money to one time cuts this year only. Provost Dauwalder further stated that if we had this money at the beginning of the year, it would have helped, but we received it at the end of the year so we decided not to spend it then. Nagel questioned when we get enrollment dollars, are they tied to specific uses or entered as general fund. The Provost replied that it is entered as general and the campus decides. Nagel questioned under UEPC new business, at the end of the first paragraph, Earth Science Liberal Studies major 2042 standards. Stone replied that 2042 is not a year but a reference to a pending bill.

ACTION ITEMS

a. 17/AS/02/FAC Amendment to the General Faculty Constitutional, Article VI., Section 2.3

Brown explained the revised wording from FAC. Avilla questioned why the student is not voting. It was then MS Avilla/Sundar to add the student as a voting member of the subcommittee.

Questions and comments followed:

--A Senator noted that there are students on various committees, but they do not always attend. Would this change the quorum for a committee?

--Some supported adding a student to the subcommittee, but were concerned with six voting members. It could be difficult to have a majority.

--Some felt it was valuable to have student representation, but it was not necessary to have the position voting.

--The subject of student representation on committees should be looked at next year. Possibly sit down with the ASI and come up with a policy so as not to have it so random. We looked at other subcommittees, some had students, some do not.

-- FAC had no objection for the student representative voting, in fact, it might encourage them to attend.

--The GF Constitution does not address this question.

The amendment passed. There was no further discussion, and the resolution, as amended, passed unanimously and will go to a vote of the General Faculty.

b. 2/AS/03/SEC--Consultation on Campus Accountability Report

Thompson reminded the body that this resolution speaks to a broader review of the Campus Accountability Report (CAR) before it leaves campus.

Tynan suggested in the first Resolved clause to delete "President Hughes" and add "the President." This was accepted as a friendly amendment, there was no further discussion, and the resolution passed unanimously.

FIRST READING ITEMS

a. 3/AS/03/FAC Posting Guidelines

It was MS Brown/Filling

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus endorse the attached Posting Guidelines.

Rationale: The Posting Guidelines were presented for consultation by VPBF Stephens, discussed at length in the Academic, revised in light of that discussion, and referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee. This process was followed in response to 19/AS/01/AS-Posting Guidelines which included these resolved clauses:

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 a 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 as well as any proposed policies or procedures which might affect faculty rights and/or academic freedom.

FAC Chair Brown explained that the FAC was asked to review these guidelines. Thompson further explained that Vice President Stephens previously brought the Posting Guidelines to the Senate. As noted in the rationale of the current resolution, a previous Senate resolution stated that such policies as this one should be reviewed by the Senate. The process has been followed. Brown stated the FAC did not detect any erosion of faculty rights in the guidelines. Filling, as CFA President, stated he also reviewed it and has no objection to the document. Thompson explained that this is a first reading item and open for discussion. The resolution can be changed at the next meeting as a second reading item, but the document cannot be changed at the Senate. Suggestions can be made to the FAC for their consideration

Questions and comments:

--Concern faculty might not be able to tape anything to the outside of their door. Stephens replied that this issue was discussed and it was not intended to put a restriction on that. That language can be clarified.

--These guidelines are not directed just to faculty, but to staff, students and the external community. There is a need to have something in writing.

-- Need to clarify reasons for prohibitions on posting on glass and on interior walls. Stephens replied that we don't post over glass areas because we then couldn't see. If it is a temporary posting, that is all right, but we

would prefer to set up a bulletin board for posting rather than on a glass surface.

--It was noted that there was a previous discussion about policy versus guidelines, and because of that discussion these are only suggestions for behavior not mandates. Thompson stated that for those interested, they should read the rationale from 19/AS/01/AS.

--Some voiced there seems to be too many exceptions, and maybe have a time restriction such as "exceptions may be made for brief periods of time." Stephens noted that that is why these are guidelines and not policy.

--Concern others post on department bulletin boards without approval. Stephens explained that if a department has a message board, they are the sole authority of what should go on it.

--There was also the question of need for guidelines at all. Stephens explained that the bigger picture is not faculty office doors but external postings. Further, that the previous Senate approved a resolution stating they wanted to review this. Thompson added that it is very important that we expect to review either guidelines or policy, because it is possible guidelines can become policy or can be acted upon as if they were policy.

--Concern on page 13 regarding taking down posters. This sounds like policy language. Stephens explained they are trying to create an environment where students, faculty and staff have equal rights about space and this lays out the ground rules, timing of how long materials can be posted, and protection of people's right to post. There are ground rules for equal access. If we see a pattern in a building, we will talk to the departments.

-- Continued concern about language that is mandated that you have to follow and guidelines that only suggest. Stephens stated the people this really is directed at (external) will not make that distinction. The bottom line is disciplinary action will not be taken, but it is still helpful to have.

Thompson advised if Senators have further commentary or suggestions, send them to FAC Chair Brown and copy Vice President Stephens.

b. 4/AS/03/UEPC--Guidelines for Academic Collaboration between CSUS-Stockton and San Joaquin Delta College

It was MS Stone/Jaasma

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus endorse these "Guidelines for Academic Collaboration between California State University, Stanislaus-Stockton and San Joaquin Delta College,"

1. Usage of classrooms and other academic space by California State University, Stanislaus has top priority.
2. Under these guidelines, courses offered by SJDC would come from lower division courses that are articulated between California State University, Stanislaus and SJDC. The initial coursework offerings would come from the articulated Liberal Studies GE transfer pattern courses, as liberal studies comprises our largest transfer population from SJDC.
3. The Dean of CSU Stanislaus-Stockton would consult the appropriate CSU Stanislaus Colleges and Departments.
4. The finalized list of courses would be presented to SJDC.
5. Each semester the CSU Stanislaus Provost/VPAA, UEPC, and College Deans would be provided the list of SJDC courses being offered.
6. Initiatives involving changes or additions to the list of courses should follow a coordinated systematic process to ensure proper consultation and review at all levels.

7. Classrooms would have standard classroom furniture, supplies, and equipment.
8. If needed, office space for instructors to meet with students would be available.
9. SJDC instructors may place materials on reserve at the Library Access Center for SJDC classes offered.
10. Students may have access to the Library Access Center. Delta College is a member of HECCC, which provides students borrowing privileges at other HECCC libraries. There would be a one-time fee to cover the cost of generating an ID card, as we do for our own students. There are two services that we cannot offer due to contractual issues: accessing our databases off-campus and retrieving materials from outside the CSU Stanislaus system via interlibrary loan. Students can, however, request materials from our Turlock collection to be sent for them to use in Stockton.
11. Open Computer Lab access and printing. SJDC students taking SJDC courses at CSU Stanislaus-Stockton would be required to have a valid CSU Stanislaus ID card to use the computers in the computer lab. Students would be charged per page for printing. Students could purchase laser print cards at the Enrollment Services office for printing in the computer lab. Student ID cards would be purchased in the Library Access Center. and, be it, further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate acknowledge the goals of the guidelines, namely to facilitate students access to higher education and to improve the transfer of students to the CSU Stanislaus-Stockton site, and be it, further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate particularly emphasize items 3 and 6 which ensure that the Faculty and Departments will have authority over the initial offering of courses as well as the addition and deletion of courses, and, be it, further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urge that the Dean of CSU Stanislaus-Stockton report to the University Educational Policies Committee each spring the offerings planned for the following summer, fall, winter, and spring semesters and terms, and, be it, further

Resolved: That the effectiveness of these guidelines be assessed by the UEPC every three years. If the goals are not being met, then these guidelines must be reviewed and changed as appropriate.

Rationale: California State University, Stanislaus-Stockton is a CPEC approved Educational Center. An educational center is an off-campus enterprise owned or leased by the Trustees and administered by a parent State University campus. CPEC policy mandates that an educational center must offer courses and programs only at the upper division and graduate levels (Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers, 1992).

To facilitate student access to higher education and enhance the transfer of students from our main feeder institution in Stockton, San Joaquin Delta College (SJDC), the above recommendations are presented as guidelines for collaboration between California State University, Stanislaus and SJDC regarding the ability of SJDC to offer articulated lower division coursework in CSU Stanislaus-Stockton academic space.

Additional collaboration between the two institutions would find the Dean of CSU Stanislaus-Stockton acting as the central coordinating person in collaborative efforts involving the two institutions. Collaborations between the two institutions are encouraged as a way to strengthen connections between the two institutions and their academic departments/areas. The attached flow chart is intended to serve as a guide to ensure a coordinated systematic process for the development of collaborative initiatives.

These guidelines will help to increase transfer rates for SJDC students to California State University, Stanislaus-Stockton and contribute significantly to the collegiality and communication between the two faculties and student bodies.

Stone advised that the main changes were to take out the exact dollar amounts so as not to limit and to add a sunset clause to the fourth or fifth resolved.

Thompson noted that since the guidelines have been incorporated into the Resolution, they can be amended.

Morgan stated that there was a need for more collaboration between Delta and CSUS. These guidelines were developed by Morgan and C. Floyd, which were then sent to the UEPC for their review.

Questions and comments:

--under number three, what is the content of consultation? Morgan replied that the dean and department would be consulted, making sure the department is in agreement before a course would be offered. Further, each semester she would send a list of courses to UEPC for their approval.

--number eight, making office space available--is office space available? Morgan explained this is primarily during the day when fewer of our own classes are being offered. But, there is space available for our lecturers.

INFORMATION ITEM

a. Report from Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations

Thompson explained the handouts provide background. He referred to a previous AS resolution that encourages departments to test alternative teaching assessments and another that said we would do a comparison of SATE and IDEA (which the previous ad hoc committee was unable to do).

Aronson explained that the ad hoc committee took on something with a long history. The ad hoc committee spent a lot of time looking at the IDEA, looking at alternative instruments, surveying other CSU's, asking for input from department chairs here and trying to come up with ideas of what to do relative to this instrument. There was a strong feeling of the committee that it was important to have some instrument consistent across the campus for RPT. Also, it was important to have other alternatives along with the IDEA. There is also a recommendation for workshops offered by FDC centered around what IDEA does or does not do. Then the committee moved to look at formative assessment. If we are to improve teaching and learning, other things need to be done.

Questions and comments:

--under PTR, Aronson noted that it should say place the IDEA reports and data from other *summative* evaluation in the PTR file.

--were cost issues discussed? Aronson replied that W. Miller was consulted and she saw no problem. Further, the ad hoc committee did discuss the use of the short and long form of IDEA. Since there are limits to the IDEA, we encourage departments to develop their own instrument and make sure they're included in the department elaborations. The ad hoc committee suggests two different things. One is that IDEA is to be

used by everyone for RPT, and second we really encourage departments to develop their own instrument to use along with IDEA.

Weikart stated that the History Department is not satisfied with this because the ad hoc committee states that no instrument has been found to be better than IDEA, but History feels they have not found any to be worse than IDEA. Further, in 1998, the Senate passed a resolution stating that the faculty use SATE and IDEA and then we were suppose to vote up or down which instrument we wanted to use for RPT. Last year, the Academic Senate charged the ad hoc committee to develop procedures to be used so a department could use an alternative instrument for RPT purposes. The ad hoc committee did not do this, but decided to do something else. He stated he would like to see the Senate take action to vote up or down the use of SATE, the IDEA, or a department instrument.

Aronson replied that the ad hoc committee did contact departments asking that they send them information as to what they were using, but very little feedback was received.

Sarraille voiced concern related to PTR. It seems the language in this report suggests changing our current policy calling for how PTR would be conducted. The question of what is called for to be put in the WPAF is important and further Sarraille stated he is trying to give faculty as much latitude and limit what they are forced to do per the faculty contract. Thompson noted that PTR is still being discussed and will go to the FAC before coming to the Senate.

Tynan advised that the charge from SEC made May 7 was asking for the ad hoc committee to develop procedures not to recommend whether we would keep IDEA. Avilla questioned why the information is confidential. Garcia noted that if departments are to develop their own instrument, they need resources. Thompson advised that the Senate Office would not be able to handle the formative part of evaluations because it would cost additional resources. Nagel questioned if this could be done online.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.