Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m. The agenda was amended to add 12/AS/02/UEPC as an action item after 6a. The agenda was then approved as amended. The minutes of November 5, 2002 were distributed. It was MSP Sarraille/Filling to defer approval until the next Senate meeting (December 3, 2002).

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

a. President Hughes distributed a handout with the 2002 election results. She noted that Proposition 47 passed with a **yes** vote of 58.9%. The next phase of the bond will hopefully be on the ballot in 15 months.
She reviewed the results of the State Senate, Assembly and Congressional District and noted that the political landscape has changed for CSUS. She stated her intent to bring all of our leaders to campus soon and hoped faculty would be interested in meeting with them.

b. President Hughes noted major issues discussed at the Board of Trustees last week. The 60-unit transfer credit was discussed. Klein and Shipley will examine the impact it will have on the Liberal Studies Program. The campus received approval of residential life III: construction will begin this spring. This facility will have housing for a guest faculty member.

c. The University Extended Education Review Committee has been formed. They will review the task force report that Vice Provost Demetrulias completed.

d. The President advised that the Strategic Planning Steering Committee has been meeting and campus dialogues will be scheduled in the near future.

d. The President reported that the campus will be visited by the President and Vice President of a Taiwanese University that will possibly be proposing a partnership.

e. The Speaker thanked Provost Dauwalder for the refreshments. He welcomed guests: Vice President Walter Strong, Director Larry Plants, Victor Takahashi, Director Jim Burns, Vice President Mary Stephens, Associate Dean Jim Klein and President Marvalene Hughes.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 16/AS/02/SEC--Elizabeth Anne B. Papageorge Faculty Development Award

It was MS Aronson/Bowers:

WHEREAS, Elizabeth Anne B. Papageorge, Professor Emeritus of Elementary Education at California State University, Stanislaus, strongly supported and encouraged probationary members of the Faculty in a variety of ways, and her efforts had a positive impact on the careers of many current faculty members at CSU Stanislaus, and

WHEREAS, Elizabeth Anne B. Papageorge was a founding force for the faculty development program at CSU Stanislaus through which she was able to spread to colleagues her enthusiasm for the art of teaching and her dedication to student learning, and

WHEREAS, The Papageorge family has expressed support and appreciation for the development of an award for probationary faculty honoring Elizabeth, and

WHEREAS, The Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning has strongly endorsed this concept as an appropriate activity for the Faculty Center to support; therefore, be it,
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus heartily endorse the creation of the Elizabeth Anne B. Papageorge Faculty Development Award to recognize and encourage outstanding achievement by probationary faculty members at Stanislaus, and be it, further

RESOLVED: That the names of recipients for this award be placed on a perpetual plaque in the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center, and be it, further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate forward a copy of this resolution to Andrew J. Papageorge

Aronson commented that Elizabeth was a wonderful supporter of junior faculty and this is a very appropriate way to honor her memory.

Bowers advised that in the early 1990's the CSU encouraged each campus to do a faculty development plan. A person was hired, but after that year, there were budget cuts that caused us to reduce some programs. The faculty development program was one that was cut. We still wanted to continue the program, so we recruited Elizabeth as a part-time director, which she did for three years, Bowers advised. This is appropriate recognition for her, he stated.

Young noted the wonderful influence she had on him as a junior faculty member. Further, this award helps to recognize a group of faculty that has not been recognized with such an award before.

Sundar advised that Papageorge was an early proponent of how to teach and how to learn.

Saraille suggested Senators run this by the assistant professors in their department to see how it would fit into their concept of support for their development.

Questions and comments:

--The first Resolved "...to recognize and encourage outstanding achievement..." What does this mean and who decides? Reply, the Leaves and Awards Committee will make recommendations as they do with the Outstanding Professor awards, etc.
--The idea that drove this is innovative teaching, although now it is listed as just teaching.
--Draft guidelines have been sent to the LAC for their review and acceptance. They have responded and these guidelines will be brought to the next AS meeting as information.
--$500 award should be increased. Reply, the $500 is a minimum, not maximum.
--Although at first there was discussion about a grant, the final result ended up along the lines of an Outstanding Professor model with an award.

Sereno read an email from Cecil Rhodes that explained the background for this award pursuant to his discussions with Provost Dauwalder and Associate Vice President Bowers:

--It was agreed upon that Academic Affairs would set aside funds for this award.
--That the award would follow in the same concept (i.e. established award criteria, nominations, committee review, recommendation, selection and monetary award) as the Outstanding Professor and Outstanding Researcher Awards.
--Funds would not be relied upon from any fundraising in DUR, but would be an annually designated budgeted amount in Academic Affairs.
--The rationale was based on the same premise as the awards for the two other outstanding professor awards with the only difference being that the award would be in memory of an individual.
--The creation of the Elizabeth Anne B. Papageorge Faculty Development Memorial Fund was created after Elizabeth's passing as a result of being contacted by Andy Papageorge inquiring as to whether he could place in her obituary and in announcements to family and friends that in lieu of flowers and personal direct family donations, that donations could be sent to an established Papageorge fund.

Thompson thanked Sereno for sharing the email with Senators. Further, that Rhodes was in direct contact with Young and Elizabeth Papageorge discussing how this award should be set up.

This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

**ACTION ITEM**

**a. 12/AS/02/UEPC--Units for Writing Proficiency Courses**

At the October 8, 2002 Senate meeting, it was voted to table 12/AS/02/UEPC until the November 19 Senate meeting so the University Writing Committee and UEPC could explore issues brought up at the October 8th meeting. Resolution, as left on the table is as follows:

RESOLVED: That the writing proficiency designation of a course, the time spent developing discipline-specific writing skills in and through the course content, be considered justification for a department to request the assignment of an additional course unit; and be it

RESOLVED: That the request for the assignment of an additional unit be subject to the review and approval of the University Writing Committee prior to review and approval by the college's Curriculum and Resources Committee.

Stone advised that the UEPC does not agree with the amended resolution as stated above. It changes the original intent and they are confident that the necessary processes are already in place to request additional units for courses.

It was MS Stone/Jaasma to withdraw 12/AS/02/UEPC. Vote: 29 yes, 2 no, 2 abstentions. Resolution withdrawn.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**a. Facilities and Parking**

Vice President Stephens reported that the Trustees gave final approval to the residential life village addition. Bids have gone out and the winning bid architect has a very high quality rating. A contractor is on board. We should receive financing in January. We are well within our budget, she advised.

As soon as residential life addition is completed in 2004, construction will start on the Science building. The JSRFDC and the Flora Snyder Music Recital Hall are both on schedule.

Stephens explained the addition of the 77 parking spaces that extends Faculty/Staff Lot 5 should be
completed in December 02. Some student parking may be added within the 77, but no new reserved parking. Plants reported that the Parking Advisory Committee is still discussing the addition of student parking to Lot 5 and has not made a final decision.

Concerns voiced and presented to Vice President Stephens and Director Plants:

--Visitor parking in Lot 5 needs to be longer than 15 minutes.
--Ticket machines do not always work. Reply, in the process of replacing ticket machines, but they cost $16,000.
--Consider a parking structure. Reply, the cost is five times as much.
--24 hour and weekend ticketing concern by students.
--Reserved parking is at a high. Many times these spaces are vacant. No parking is available. Reply, the Parking Committee is looking at: there is currently a moratorium on additional reserved parking, price (has not gone up in years), where they are located, designation (individual or group).
--Public transit is being looked at. Peer Escort Service already available. Off-campus parking being looked at. Additional carts have been purchased.
--What is the proportion of spaces reserved?
--Excessive speed by cart drivers is a problem. Reply, Public Safety provides training for cart drivers and also provides cart drivers. Drivers are not required to have defensive driving.
--Excessive speed by trucks related to construction.
--DBH loading zone too small and interferes with pedestrians. Reply, noted by Vice President Stephens.

b. Academic Technology Plan

Thompson referred to the attached Academic Technology Plan that was developed by the Academic Technology Subcommittee of UEPC. He explained that systemwide there is an Academic Technology Advisory Committee that is advisory to the Executive Vice Chancellor. They have asked campuses to develop an Academic Technology Plan. The Academic Technology Subcommittee was developed so faculty would have a place to go if academic technology concerns came up and to develop an Academic Technology Plan. There are funding requests attached to the plan, and it will be in competition with other things on campus. It is also being discussed in the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee.

Concerns voiced:

--What kind of control do we have? Reply, that at the systemwide level there is a push to get a plan in place.
--How will this come back to the Senate? Reply, in the form of a resolution with the attached plan.
--It is important faculty priorities be put into the strategic planning and budgeting processes. Priorities came out of the subcommittee and FBAC is looking at it.
--Is there talk about reinstating offsite dial-in access from Modesto and Stockton? Reply, this has not been discussed. There is less of a need now that people have Internet service providers they connect to from home.
--There is a need for up to date computer information, including offsite dial-in access for new faculty based on their need. These faculty are trained to work with new technology tools, but either can't afford it, or they are not available. Reply, the Academic Technology Subcommittee should discuss this issue.
--Bullet 21 speaks to creating a forum for student voices. The same thing should be done for faculty.
Tynan noted that the budget for the AT plan is being reorganized because of the timeline. FBAC will bring forth a resolution.

c. Principles of Assessment of Student Learning

Members of the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee of UEPC attended today's meeting: Andy Young, Angelena Cunha, Gary Novak and Chair Iris Haapanen.

Young gave a quick summary on how the principles of assessment of student learning came about and urged Senators to take it up again. The principles were brought forward through faculty committees in order to protect faculty in assessment. Historically, there has been pressure for assessment in and outside the university from accrediting agencies and the Legislature, who want some proof that students are learning what we're teaching. Assessment should be a tool for faculty that want to find out how to improve teaching/learning. At CSUS, assessment is not faculty driven. It coincided with the budget cuts of the 80's and a push for distance education that made faculty nervous. It raised a number of fears for departments and individuals, micro management, fears that assessment practices might remove student contact hours, efforts to take control of the curriculum. Also, for those that appreciated assessment, any kind of imposition could corrupt the process. Several strategies have been deployed such as objection, stonewalling, ignoring--none of which is good for students, faculty, and the university. Then a group of faculty started to meet to develop principles of assessment document to protect faculty from unwarranted use of data or techniques. We have been working on the assumption that it is an ongoing process we can no longer ignore. Accrediting agencies such as WASC want it. The principles that were brought forward gave faculty control over the process. We focused on quality of learning and separated student learning from accountability and oversight. Although the Senate tabled this, the administration will continue their side of it (accountability). Young suggested Senators might have a conversation about assessment because accrediting agencies will continue to push it. We need to discuss this and come to a consensus as a faculty group. Issues whether assessment promotes student learning and if so, what configuration, how might faculty control or benefit from this and what should be or has to be our position to WASC. It might seem like a waste of time, but if faculty don't have principles of assessment, they are more vulnerable.

Novak further explained he has been involved with this issue for three years. The last WASC visit is where this came up. They asked what we were doing with assessment. We didn't have a plan then. We then formed an ad hoc committee on assessment of student learning. It has not become a permanent subcommittee of UEPC. This document is principles, not procedures. It is faculty driven. The number one principle is about student learning. This document also makes it clear it is not accountability. It is what faculty do in the classroom. The people that created this document are all faculty. It is a way to give faculty protection, and it is clear it will not be used in RPT or PT review. The faculty own the data. The accreditation committees want to know we are doing something. These are only guidelines. It establishes faculty are owners of the assessment process and it focuses on what you are doing in the classroom.

Haapanen also stressed these principles protect faculty. Also remember that the basis of this community is student learning. That is why we need to reconsider these principles.

Thompson thanked members of the ASL Subcommittee for coming in and sharing the context of the assessment of student learning principles. There has been an ongoing discussion made up of half faculty and half administration and the idea is to make clear the separation of accountability and assessment. We need to start talking about who is responsible for what, but be clear to separate student learning out as a
special areas of assessment. Any results from these meetings will come to the Senate.

Concerns:

--Definition of assessment by New Horizons is in the document, but then ignored.
--We already do assessment, and should not ignore what we're already doing.
--A form of assessment is already used in RPT: IDEA evaluations. Although most agree IDEA does not measure what students learn.
--Assessment can be lots of things to many people and needs to be defined.
--Previous discussions noted a suspicion by faculty that it does not provide protection since assessment will end up falling over into evaluation of accountability standards. It could be used against us. Reply, that the document has been of some use in the faculty/administrative group. We have been able to carve out assessment of student learning from accountability and evaluation assessment.

Filling reminded Senators that the principles took two years in writing by many faculty. He wrote the resolution. If that is the problem, he asked any Senator interested to assist him in rewriting it. This is too important to let go.

d. Guidelines for Academic Collaboration between CSU Stanislaus-Stockton and San Joaquin Delta College

Thompson stated that this issue has been discussed the past two years. It relates to the San Joaquin Delta College offering courses at the CSUS-Stockton campus. We are thinking about putting together guidelines for how decisions are made for what courses Delta can offer there. This will come back with a resolution.

Concerns and questions:

--Who developed the guidelines? Reply, UEPC developed them and then were forwarded to SEC.
--Can CSUS be hurt by Delta holding classes on the Stockton campus? Reply, it could facilitate student access and enhance transfer.
--Faculty need to consider what courses will be offered.

Stone explained that we are fully booked and have taken all the available space up at night, but during the day there are a lot of empty classrooms. Delta would fill those classrooms. Also, the idea is if students come during the day, they would transfer to CSUS and transition to our night classes. A timeline should be put in the resolution regarding what classes are to be offered so departments can discuss it.

Stephens noted that Morgan had said part of the emphasis is certain two-year programs at Delta could be transferred to a four-year degree at CSUS.

Additional concerns and questions:

--Collaboration with departments is a must.
--What does the University get out of this (revenue?) and where does the money go? For years we rented classrooms from Delta, so it is not unreasonable for us to charge them to use our rooms, especially when we have a revenue crunch. Reply, we are not out to make a profit. It is more like an outreach effort.
--Concerned with the general shift we are going in. We are a university and not a junior college.
Burns pointed out that in conversations with UC Merced, they are looking to us to provide teacher education training.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.