

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
March 11, 2003

PRESENT: Afonso, Aronson, Avilla, Bargetto-Andres, Brown, Brunn, Dauwalder, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Garcia, Luo, Karlstrom, Jaasma, Mayer J., Mayer M., Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Oppenheim, Orenstein, Paterson, Peterson, Sarraille, Sereno, Shipley, Stone, Sundar, Tan, Thompson, Tynan, Vang, Weikart, Zarling

PROXIES: Poole (Lindsay), Stone (Stessman), Janey Youngblom (Jim Youngblom)

ABSENT: Ferriz, Harris, Piskoti, Potter, Rumayor, Washington

GUEST: Haapanen, Morgan

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

3/AS/03/FAC--Posting Guidelines,
APPROVED

4/AS/03/UEPC--Guidelines for Academic
Collaboration between CSUS-Stockton and
San Joaquin Delta College,
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

5/AS/03/SEC--Resolution on Student Fee
Increase, FIRST READING

Facilitating Graduation Report,
INFORMATION ITEM

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

SEM UPDATE

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, March 25, 2003
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:39 pm. The agenda was amended as follows: move the First Reading Item 5/AS/03/SEC to before 6) Action items. Under 8) Information Items, add a time certain of 4:00 for SEM Update. The agenda was approved as amended. The minutes of February 25, 2003 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Mayer announced he still has a few tickets for The Producers. He also advised that another play called Proof is playing the next three weeks in Merced.
2. Luo announced this Sunday is the annual CSUS Triathlon/5-K race.
3. Morgan-Foster reported that Arnold Schmidt sent an email over Facnet advising that Mas Masmumoto is coming back to campus on March 28 and would like to have interaction from students. Thompson added that the summer reading concept has been very positive, and he hopes it will continue. Contact Thompson, Arnold Schmidt or Vice President Morgan-Foster if you are interested in becoming involved.
4. Thompson thanked the Provost for refreshments.
5. Dean Morgan and ASL Subcommittee Chair Haapanen were welcomed.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

1. Thompson mentioned an email he sent out to Facnet advising of a memo from Executive Vice Chancellor Spence and SWAS Chair Kegley to Provosts and campus Chairs concerning authentic consultation and shared decision-making with campus academic senates on SEM and goals. This is a very important communication to campuses, he stated.
2. Thompson advised he is on the Auxiliary Business Services Committee and the Foundation Marketing Committee. Two important things came out of these meetings. One was licensing-the idea is to sell CSUS merchandise at local businesses and secondly, they are considering changing the University logo. Vice President Strong assures us that it would be a long, consultative process. Thompson distributed some books that are ideas about signage on campus. The Foundation Marketing Committee is working on this issue. This is contingent on funding.
4. Sarraille advised that the CMS audit is out and the URL has been sent over Facnet. He urged Senators to have a look at the narrative and recommendations.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 5/AS/03/SEC--Student Fee Increase

It was MS Filling/Avilla

Resolved: that the Faculty of CSU Stanislaus oppose any action by the CSU Board of Trustees on proposed fee increases until after the release of the Governor's May budget revision and its analysis by the Legislature; and, be it further

Resolved: that the CSU demonstrate its financial need, if any, through an open and comprehensible analysis of the CSU budget prior to considering student fee increases; and, be it further

Resolved: that the CSU Board of Trustees begin direct and meaningful consultation with students, faculty and staff to investigate alternative funding sources that will alleviate the need for fee increases; and, be it further

Resolved: that the CSU exhaust alternative funding sources [e.g., foundation funds] prior to imposing any student fee increases; and, be it further

Resolved: that any further Board of Trustees action on student fee increases be coordinated with state executive and legislative leaders.

Rationale:

The Academic Senate and Faculty of California State University Stanislaus [CSU Stanislaus] recognize the unmet financial needs of significant numbers of our students. We are also committed to preserving student access and retention, and believe that significant increases in student fees could limit that access. We further believe that the process which determines the level and timeliness of systemwide student fee increases must include students, faculty and staff and should be an open, consultative process. Such a process will ensure that any alternative funding sources are identified and that all members of our community come to consensus about student fee increases before those increases are mandated.

Filling explained that this resolution is loosely patterned on a resolution passed by the CFA Board of Directors. Avilla further explained that students are not saying not to have a fee increase, but that the CSU Board of Trustees and Chancellor need to demonstrate dire need before doing so. Further, they should look at alternative funding sources and spend some time consulting with students and other constituencies. Students do understand an increase might have to happen, but 35% in one year is too much.

Thompson explained that this is a first reading item on today's agenda. We are looking for advice and discussion on the resolution.

Oppenheim suggested getting information on the fee structure of the 1990's. It would help in seeing where we are compared to then. His belief is they are lower now than in the 1990's. Sarraille urged Senators to not only look at the fees, but the total cost of education including room, board, transportation, etc.

Zarling stated his concern about the fee increase is that it seems like we are backed into a corner by the state government and student fees are an easy out. He suggested amending the resolution to emphasize the feeling of being hoodwinked.

Weikart voiced concern about the first Resolved: "that the Faculty of CSU Stanislaus oppose any action by the CSU Board of Trustees on proposed fee increases until after the release of the Governor's May budget revision and its analysis by the Legislature." How would that impact students? Is the hope that the May revise may limit the fee increase? Avilla advised that students got a revised bill last spring, so that doesn't seem to matter. Weikart stated that his point is that students should be able to budget and plan for their fees.

Thompson stated that the figures he's heard quoted from the last budget crisis indicate that the CSU lost large numbers of students. Filling advised he would forward information on this over Asnet and Facnet.

Sereno stated that we tend to take education as a given, which is a good thing. However, there is a real cost to providing education. The fee increase history would be helpful in this discussion and hopes that it is forthcoming for the next meeting. Filling will follow up.

Sarraille noted that we can't find 'normalized' cost of education, but we can get an actual money amount and that the ability to pay should also be included.

Jaasma asked if we knew what the impact would be on our ability to offer classes if we don't get a fee increase? Dauwalder replied that scenarios have been done in UBAC, but all are guesses. Sarraille stated that it is not just a matter of student fees, but consideration should be given that there are other ways of finding revenue. Morgan-Foster noted we've been talking about how the Governor's budget is presented, and his unallocated portion of the cut is almost exactly equal to the fee increase revenue. Thompson added that the combination of no enrollment growth money and no fee increase money would be devastating. Filling stated that we can decide many things: Don't build lakes. Decide not to offer classes. It's really not a rationale question. What should we do is the question. We don't pay enough attention to assumptions.

Sundar recommended we educate our students about the value of their education. We are already subsidizing education so much ; is there anything we can do that might soften the notion that education must be free? We really need to look at this issue in a broader sense than complaining about fee increases. She asked the percentage students currently pay for their education and the Provost replied it was about 18%, but now it's about 21%. Tan noted that students might end up taking longer to graduate if there is no fee increase because classes would be cut. So, the net cost would be the same.

Zarling explained that whenever there is a budget tightening, we hear a lot about how students in California get a good deal on education. Students are already aware of that. The education needs to be teaching the state what a deal they get out of education. It is in the state's interest to have a well-educated populace.

Weikart stated although he wasn't here in the early 90's, he was told that this campus responded by trying to retain faculty and courses to the extent possible. He recommended we do some administrative budget tightening and look closely at some programs.

Avilla stated that students are educated about what is going on and know the cost of education. Students are not arguing about a fee increase, but rather, propose a long-term fee program that fees would increase gradually.

Thompson advised that this will be a second reading at the next meeting. Any comments or amendments should be sent to Diana Bowman.

ACTION ITEMS

a. 3/AS/03/FAC--Posting Guidelines

Brown explained that based on the input from the last Senate meeting, Vice President Stephens made some changes as well as FAC. Changes are bold and underlined. FAC felt that in general, the point of guidelines is to restrain outsiders to the community, not faculty, staff and students. FAC approves of this as extant.

Sarraille questioned page 9 under Removal of Posted Materials, there is some reference to getting approval. Will there be guidelines for approval? Aronson also questioned if there needs to be another section to deal with Approval for Posting. Thompson explained that although it is ambiguous, the question of who approves is there. Mogan-Foster further explained that her understanding about approval is that it is directed at clubs or organizations (students), not individuals.

Sarraille still urged that there should be some clarification made, but reminded Senators we need to keep in mind the difference between guidelines and policy. These are guidelines, which means that we don't come under the threat of sanction if we bend these a bit. Passing these guidelines is one means of keeping things that way.

Zarling noted for the most part, the changes made have done a lot to clarify the document.

It was MS Sarraille/Filling to call the question. Vote was 31-1-1 passed. Vote on 3/AS/03/SEC passed with 2 abstentions. The resolution will be forwarded to the President.

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

Thompson thanked Dean Morgan for taking the time to join the Senate today. Morgan noted that at the last Senate meeting the point was made on No. 2, second sentence to amend by removing "liberal studies" and end the sentence after 'courses, but no change was made to the document. Jaasma asked that this change be accepted as a friendly amendment. Stone asked that "would" be changed to "will" throughout. Both changes were accepted by the body as a friendly amendments.

There being no further discussion, the vote was taken, and 4/AS/03/UEPC passed unanimously. The resolution will be forwarded to the President.

INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Facilitating Graduation Report

Thompson explained that his idea is to present this today and it will reappear as a Discussion Item the next meeting. An overview of this item was previously sent over Asnet. He was part of a task force made up of 7 faculty, 4 provosts, 1 vice president, 1 student and 4 trustees. The position of the trustees was that there should be no disincentive to students until at least 4 years out. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence held the position that this is primarily about students getting a degree and secondarily to do so in a timely manner. The document starts with principles for the task force and then there are recommendations for all parties. The Board of Trustees expect to act on this. Sarraille advised that the SWAS endorsed this. Thompson noted it may have a noticeable impact on this campus, so he wanted to bring it here to avoid any surprises.

Aronson questioned page 15, item 13, would after 4 years there be mandatory summer school? And page 17, would this require students to be full-time? Shipley also questioned this is built on the presumption that time to degree is a priority. For many of our students, the plan is not four years; it is eight or ten years. Thompson reiterated that time to degree is secondary, and the primary focus is completion. He believes the idea of time is more related to units before graduation than time that goes by. Shipley asked if this would penalize reentry students and Thompson replied that he thought the Board of Trustees were clear that they want the University to facilitate students and nothing in this, especially in the next four years, should penalize students.

Weikart voiced concern about drawing of 4, 5 and 6-year plans. This is a nightmare. In his department (History), there could be 30-50 roadmaps that could be drawn up. This is ridiculous when lots of electives

are involved. Thompson stated he just saw a CSU Fullerton presentation where they have degree programs charted out for students, and students find it useful as a guideline. Weikart voiced this would restrict student choices and cause scheduling nightmares. . The question of who would do the work that would be involved and what the likely impacts would be was expressed. Thompson stated that we recently had a big discussion about advising here in senate, and the most positive thing we could do is work on advising.

Nagel stated that as an undergraduate, he didn't remember having such intensive roadmapping. It seems like a way to solve advising resource problems, but a mechanical one.

Oppenheim questioned language on page 17 that requires one summer term. The other side refers to making use of summer term more efficiently. Requiring full time enrollment might cost us half of our students. It is hard to tell how much leeway campuses will have.

Thompson stated this is a double-edge sword in that you have faculty, provosts, other vice presidents and trustees working together. We want direct consultation and then we end up with a 40-page report that isn't tailored to individual campus needs. Sarraille explained that most of these recommendations are laudable, but we have to have resources. We need to pick and choose what we want to do. It is a loaded issue. We're being told we need to be more efficient, but there is no evidence that we're not being efficient.

Thompson advised that there is 60% graduation rate for the CSU and CSU Stanislaus is third in graduation rate in the system.

Tan noted that if there are not enough summer classes for students to take, it is not their fault if they can't take a summer class. There should be some mention about the CSU having the resources for these classes.

Thompson stated this issue will be brought back to the Senate as a Discussion Item.

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

Thompson stated that at the Fall 02 General Faculty meeting, he mentioned this as one of the two main things he wanted to accomplish during his tenure as Speaker. His idea is to separate accountability from assessment, and ensure that the faculty member has control over assessment. The Provost has helped with assembly of the workgroup to deal with this issue.

Provost Dauwalder explained that there seems to be a lot of discomfort concerning what is or might be required for assessment activities. He and the Speaker came together to put together a joint ad hoc committee to talk about these issues. The goal is to create a set of definitions then talk about the roles and responsibilities. It is important to define the various levels of evaluation. Dauwalder encouraged Senators to read this document through. Thompson agreed stating on page 20 under Assessment of Student Learning-Classroom level, it is important to take that statement about control of classroom-level ASL data remaining at faculty level seriously.

Avilla questioned why students can't see evaluation feedback. Provost Dauwalder explained that this portion of the document refers to assessment of student learning in the classroom rather than to student evaluation of teaching [e.g., IDEA data]. Assessment of student learning [ASL] is an activity faculty engage in to determine whether students are assimilating and integrating the information content of the course. ASL data is only useful for improving pedagogy when unbiased, which is likely to happen only when control of that

data remains with the faculty member. Accountability data, on the other hand, is intended for broader distribution.

Nagel stated if Avilla is talking about the IDEA evaluation, they are confidential personal documents according to the faculty MOU. Dauwalder agreed, and noted that the task force was attempting to layout some parameters for ASL data as well as accountability data.

c. SEM UPDATE (Pugh)

Thompson advised that SEC asked Assistant Vice President Pugh to update Senators on SEM.

Pugh reported that the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee is a large committee and thanked Speaker Thompson for suggesting the addition of the faculty to the committee.

Pugh gave an overview of what he feels enrollment management is. A systematic, holistic, and integrated approach to achieving enrollment goals by exerting control over those institutional factors that shape the size and characteristics of the student body. It encompasses all activities associated with attracting and retaining students, including marketing, recruitment, financial aid, orientation, advising and instruction. It also involves examining institutional mission, program, service offerings, organizational structure, and resource allocation. The enrollment management process relies heavily on the use of pertinent data and information for informed decision-making.

He stated his majority priorities are: 1) to serve students better, 2) need for better students and 3) need for additional students.

His goals are: to stabilize enrollments, link academic programs, stabilize finances, optimize resources, improve quality, improve service, improve access of information, reduce vulnerability to environmental forces and evaluate strategies and tactics.

Some of the issues the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee has dealt with are: application deadlines (we will probably continue the practice) budget, recruitment plans/activities, scholarships, strategies for managing enrollments, degree pledge-four year baccalaureate. He hopes to pull together his enrollment plan by Fall 03. Thompson noted that the recent memorandum from system senate chair Kegley and Executive Vice-Chancellor

Spence emphasizes that strategies and priorities for enrollment management are matters for shared decision making with the academic senate.

It was queried whether, in light of the fact that marginal funding does fully cover the cost of instruction, enrollment growth is the best course. Pugh replied yes, we are holding those conversations. Keep in mind, in California, access is a given. Basically, the majority of our new monies are through enrollment growth. We can grow to about 12,000 per our master plan. In the past, we have been able to bring in additional faculty as we grow.

Thompson advised that this is the first time a Provost has attempted to consult with the SEC on setting the enrollment target, but the timeline for response from the Chancellor's office was 1 day, and the SEC did not feel that was time enough for appropriate reflection

Sarraille reported that the campuses that didn't grow last year fared worse than the campuses that did grow. If you grow, you get money you should have gotten the previous year, but if you didn't grow, you didn't get the money you earned last year.

The Provost explained that the Governor budgeted enrollment growth money from last year. About \$45 million systemwide was allocated to campuses in two steps. One, whatever the December allocation was increased by 1%. Here, it was 4.6% so we went to 5.6%. Our thinking is we will have students anyway because of the type of admission policy we have. Sarraille stated there is more general recognition in Long Beach that we are not getting funds for students to educate them and we are falling further behind. Dauwalder stated it does make sense to have long range policy.

Stone questioned what percentage of students that do not meet the admissions requirements and Pugh reported for freshmen admissions in EOP we previously had 75-80 students and we have cut that number to 25-30 students. We are controlling that area more. Stone asked if he considered a sliding scale for admission date, and Pugh stated that, if we get students that have a high GPA, we will admit them after the deadline. We still have exceptions, but we try to control it better.

Thompson stated that the concept of "life-long learning" has been changed to "facilitating graduation." He thanked Pugh for updating Senators and he looks forward to continuing the dialogue with him on a regular basis.

Meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.