CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
October 22, 2002

PRESENT: Aronson, Avilla, Bargetto-Andres, Brown, Dauwalder, Filling, Gackowski, Garcia, Hall, Harris, Helzer, Jaasma, Lindsay, Mayer J., Mayer M., Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Oppenheim, Orenstein, Paterson, Peterson, Pliskoti, Rios, Sarraille, Stessman, Stone, Tan, Tavernier, Thompson, Tynan, Vang, Washington, Weikart, Youngblom, Zarling

PROXIES: Novak (Potter), Riedmann (Sereno), Vanisko (Sundar)

ABSENT: Afonso, Ferriz, Floyd

GUESTS: Burns, Demetrulias, Elmallah, Gallegos, President Hughes, Klein, Chancellor Reed, Regalado, Stephens

13/AS/02/UEPC--Principles of Assessment of Student Learning, TABLED

1/AS/02/SEC--Guidelines for Disclosure of Publication Costs, FIRST READING ITEM

14/AS/02/UEPC--Resolution to Adopt the A, B, C, N/C Grading Option, FIRST READING ITEM

Modification of Upper-Division Admission Requirement, DISCUSSED

Academic Technology Plan, DISCUSSED

Facilities & Parking, DISCUSSED

Visit by CHANCELLOR REED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, November 5, 2002
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:
Steve Filling, Clerk

Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 14:33. The agenda was amended by moving 8c to 3:45 so that Chancellor Reed can come in at 4:00. The agenda was then approved as amended. The minutes of October 8 were amended on page 5, paragraph 7: "It was suggested that a questionnaire be prepared and sent to our recent graduates. It could also be used for the WASC report. What our graduates think is the ultimate assessment. Morgan-Foster advised that there have been surveys done, just not as systematically. Also, First Year Programs has been working on constructing a survey about advising and they are about to distribute it. Sarraille suggested that perhaps student advising could be done seminar fashion rather than primarily one on one."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Thompson announced that he has received a memorandum from Charles Farrar, thanking the AS for the
commendation he was presented with and noting that retirees really appreciate the chance to participate in university affairs.

Klein announced that open forums would be held Wednesday and Thursday concerning the First Year Experience program.

Thompson thanked the Provost for refreshments and welcomed guests Elmallah, Burns, Demetrulias, M. Hughes, Klein, Reed, and Regalado.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

Nagel asked did any of missing reports get sent late Tuesday morning? Stone replied that the UEPC report is lost on the chem server, which had a system crash.

Stone stated that UEPC discussed the pending WP resolution. They are not exactly pleased with the present form, and are wondering how to unsupport it.

UEPC also worked on draft calendars for AYs 03-04, 04-05, 05-06. All are ready for review. Keep in mind that reading day has been preserved and we need to keep Veterans Day on the actual holiday. Also, we have to keep the same number of days of the week in each semester.

UEPC put the proposed name change of UEE's Applied Studies program [to Professional Leadership] on hold, as the College of Business unanimously rejected approval of that change. The name change is a continuing discussion item, and UEE should not be using Professional Leadership as a program title in the interim.

UEPC also discussed the position for FCETL ASL associate. Does this person have fundraising responsibilities?

Rios asked if the 2005 calendar will still have reading day? Stone replied not in the spring, but fall has one. Some semesters where reading day would have broken up finals, so we opted to do without reading day.

ACTION ITEMS

a - 13/AS/02/UEPC Principles of Assessment of Student Learning (ASL)

Thompson introduced the resolution, noting that this is an action item. There was a point of discussion about principle 6 and inclusion of ASL data in WPAFs, an attached letter from the ASL subcommittee responds to same. Of course, memorandum will not always accompany the principles. Open for discussion.

Discussion focused on issues with the word "definitive" in the 1st resolved, and with directives to future senates in the 2nd resolved which might also reopen the topic for debate in subsequent years.

Peterson/Zarling move to table. Aye- 31, nay- 5; 13/AS/02/UEPC tabled indefinitely.

FIRST READING ITEMS
Resolved: that the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus urge President Hughes to implement the following as University policy:

Every document produced or purchased for public off-campus distribution by CSU Stanislaus [or its auxiliaries and related entities] shall include a statement of total production and printing cost [including internal and external printing, layout, design, photography, editing, etc.], number of copies printed, and source[s] of funds. Valuation of contributions in kind will be established by agreement with the vendor.

Rationale:

As has been evident of late [see attached front page article from the Turlock Journal of 14 February, 2002], there is increasing interest, both on and off campus, in how CSU Stanislaus expends the funds it receives from the state and various donors. Some states [e.g., Louisiana] have made Disclosure statements similar to the above mandatory for state-funded entities, and our campus should take the lead in California by adopting a policy that greatly increases information available to the public.

Thompson reminded Senators that we are able to amend resolutions if we like. We have this left from last year. It was tabled to a time certain, and is still on the table. A memo from FBAC chair Tynan is attached to the agenda.


Thompson declared discussion open for advice to SEC in working on this resolution. Tynan summarized FBAC's lengthy discussion which concluded that the resolution as written is not something that could be done absent large costs and that the benefits are not clear. The way the resolution was put forth is not amenable to implementation and might depts [etc]. Whatever brought this to the attention of the Senate should be dealt with as a specific item. In response to queries about how other accounting is done and the extent of reporting, Tynan replied that it is difficult to ascertain where to draw the lines--e.g. does this include planning meetings for publications? FBAC was concerned with total production--which publications to look at? Fliers to announce speakers or glossy publications? Which ones would fit into the rubric?

Nagel noted that 1- One of the previous issues was that others report routinely. 2- Given the catalyst for this in the first place, the issue was excessive costs to print rather than other production costs. It had to do with a second run. Tynan noted this as a reason why FBAC did not support the resolution as written.

Thompson noted that we can also take advice as to how this might be amended.

Comments included that the Administration contends that these documents are marketing tools, that others suggest they are administration ego boosters. Maybe in terms of an amendment we should alter it to require the administration to make a report over the summer on the costs of these kinds of publications--costs should be readily available. This will address the issue of concern that originated the resolution.

The Senate wondered whether shaming is an effective mechanism.
Thompson asked that further suggestions be forwarded to the Clerk. A, perhaps revised, form will return from the SEC at the next AS meeting.

**b - 14/AS/02/UEPC Resolution to adopt the A,B,C,N/C grading option**

It was MS Stone/Aronson

RESOLVED: That California State University, Stanislaus adopt the A, B, C, N/C grading option for use only with remediation courses.

RATIONALE: The A, B, C, N/C grading option will offer a letter grade incentive for students enrolled in remediation courses. It is suggested that providing students with the opportunity to earn a letter grade will foster greater effort for a higher level of achievement.

Stone stated that this resolution results from the Math Department suggestions about remediation courses and student efforts. It was brought forward by the English Department who suggested that GE courses have the same grading scale. UEPC debated, brought it to the AS for input, then decided that the grading scheme should only be for remedial course. This could affect financial aid, and recall that a D does mean passing. If a GE is CR/NC then D's might become C's. Stone clarified that letter grades in remedial courses would not figure in the GPA.

Maria [math] asserted that letter grades make a difference to students - They like seeing the letter grade and will work harder. It may not impact all students, but no doubt that it does impact some. Rios, student, stated she doesn't see the point of this grading option- If we are told that the remedial courses don't count for GPA, students won't try if that is the case.

This will be a second reading at the next AS meeting.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**a - Modification of Upper Division Admission Requirements**

Thompson stated this will be a 2nd reading item at SWAS in early Nov. It is going out to campuses for comment/advice.

Shipley stated this change will keep Liberal Studies majors in college longer. Optimal time for students to transfer for us is 56 units. If we go to 60, students will have to repeat some coursework. Thompson noted that the rationale has been changed asked if Shipley could provide some written rebuttal for use in the SWAS discussion.

Shipley explained in liberal studies, students do GE, liberal studies and a concentration as well as CCTC requirements. These requirements say those things must be done. We tell students to do CCTC at the same time as general education, major, and concentration. Most of our liberal studies majors don't want to spend any more time here than necessary. Students who stay more than 56 units at CCs can meet commission requirements can take classes, but then they'll come here and have to take more classes/more units.

Another part of the process is that students can do credential prerequisites as part of undergraduate work,
which is more efficient for them. Concurrent enrollment doesn't help us--they need to be our students. CCs have articulated programs with us, and we are working with the CCs to make things work. The CCs want to keep students for 70 units. The argument is that units are cheaper at the CCs.

Thompson thanked Senators for guidance on this issue.

b - Academic Technology Plan

Thompson stated that FBAC will be forwarding something soon.

Filling explained the origin of the Academic Technology Plan and noted that it is the product of much faculty work. Thompson reiterated that FBAC will be bringing something forward in the near future.

c - Facilities and Parking (VP B&F Stephens, time certain: 4:00)

Thompson introduced VP Stephens for a brief presentation about facilities and parking. Stephens distributed a booklet--the 1st page is a 5-year look. Note that we do have to say that there will be changes in the intervening time. Science II is totally dependent on prop 47. Also, point out union renovation is dependent on student union fees.

2nd page - projects currently under way. Infrastructure is the most annoying project we will be doing. There will be equal opportunity for disruption. Physical plant is working to provide info as much as possible about sites of digging etc.

Final page is recently completed projects.

Parking fees for most employees are covered by collective bargaining agreements. We can change fees for students and MPPs. At present, rates are equal across all classifications. We'd like to keep things that way, but we are not able to save $ to maintain and add parking. We are still only thinking about surface parking rather than a structure, which is about 5 times as expensive.

We don't expect change in the next several years, so we are looking at ways to finance construction as we do with housing. This is doable, but end up paying about twice as much.

Thompson stated that we'll have this for discussion at the next AS meeting. VP Stephens and Dean Morgan will be coming to talk about Stockton as well.

Stephens introduced Robert Gallegos, noting that he is doing a wonderful job as Interim AVP of Physical Services.

d - Chancellor Reed

President Hughes thanked the Speaker for providing time with the AS. The Chancellor really wanted time to address faculty. Chancellor Reed joined the CSU officially in 1998. It has been a highly productive period, and we at Stanislaus are really grateful for his assistance.

Reed discussed items he has been spending time on in last few months:
Growth and Access to the CSU: The budget cycle and university cycle do not mesh. More students means more faculty/staff, hence parking/space problems and the past year has been a real challenge. We started out managing a 4% enrollment increase. We went back to Governor Davis and asked for more when we noted 5% or more increase, in May revise he added ~20M$ when everyone else was being cut.

We didn't have a budget at the start of the academic year - gridlock....So we opened without a budget, but we found out we had a 6.9% increase in enrollment, 21,000 extra students this year over last--6,000 more than we were funded. All campuses scrambled to provide services and courses. That is our biggest challenge. Tidal wave II is here. We need to grow 4-5% level per annum for the next 5-8 years. We'll be over 500k students, so capacity will be a real challenge. One problem is non-uniformity of growth across the state. San Diego crisis, Fullerton, Long Beach, Northridge, San Jose State, San Luis Obispo, are already close to or at capacity. We are trying to figure out how to manage this system as well as capacity while maintaining our focus on quality. We are negotiating service targets with presidents now. Expectation is that targets will be hit this year, so when he recommends a budget to BoT next week there will be a significant $ for growth.

Also need to increase operating budget to facilitate growth. The Partnership agreement we are supposed to have was shortchanged ~$100m this year, not counting the 6,000 unfunded students.

Libraries and services are important. Thanks to the Modesto Bee for strong editorial educating Californians about how important prop 47 is. Some good news is that on Friday the CTA agreed to spend 1.5m on 47 campaign in the LA basin.

In July called provosts and business interests together to discuss CSU and the ups and downs of economies anticipated in the next 18-24 months. We want to be prepared, and wanted to hear from business what we are doing to prepare grads for workforce. Also, trying to have a virtual conversation with lots of people. There is a website now: csuadvantage.org We want to have the virtual conversation between now and Christmas, then share with campuses and see how we can prepare strategic plan for CSU and get it funded.

Importance of masters degree that CSU provides. CSU is not funded appropriately for masters programs. We only have one marginal cost rate, which is not fair. We need your help with getting Sacramento folks to see why we need differential funding.

31 October we will be doing BoT AY 03/04 budget which will include ~$400m increase, and it is important that we show everyone what the needs of the CSU are.

Fees are not likely to be raised, but nobody knows. Likely nothing will happen until spring when everybody looks at the budget. We can either cut services or increase taxes and provide services. If there is an expectation that CSU continue to provide access and enrollment as we have, then it must be funded. We can't go further than we are absent additional funding.

The proposed budget includes ~1200 searches this year and a healthy increase to readjust salaries. $18m to reduce class size.

Weikart asked about reducing class size - Either keep teaching load and have smaller classes, or reduce load
and have same size classes. Is reduced teaching load on the table?

Reed replied that's a campus by campus managed decision. Everyone knows the basis we're funded for. If
departments want to fiddle or mix/match, that's their decision. Problem comes with marginal funding
formula. If we all lower teaching load and do not take more students, that won't work.

Regalado, as a department chair, queried about the status of tenure.

Reed replied that tenure will continue in this nation and in the CSU as it has in the past. He does want to
strengthen the post-tenure review process. We have other more structural problems in recruiting faculty, one
is marketplace. We're not as competitive as we should be. When he came here, he wondered why CSU
didn't have an alternative retirement system; he proposed and sponsored with Cardoza but the proposal
didn't fly. That is a structural hindrance, not having portable retirement. Cost of living and cost of housing
are also hinderances. We're trying to build housing for faculty at SLO, SJSU, Fullerton, etc. as an incentive
to bring faculty here.

Reed added that he was pleased to hear what employers said about graduate education. They really like the
CSU graduate programs because they are related to the work people do.

Harris asked where is new faculty recruitment is going to fall based on budget?

Reed stated the reality is we'll recruit 1200 faculty this year. We will be in the high 70s% success rate. It's a
lot easier to recruit in certain disciplines, not in others. Will look at that again next year.

Thompson asked the Chancellor to address the use of academic technology.

Reed replied that in August he asked provosts to discuss academic technology. We have a tremendous
investment in infrastructure and are going to complete that project to make CSU one of the best wired
systems in the country. He wants to leverage that for the academic arena. He believes we can build greater
access/capacity if some courses use technology. If we can gain 3%, that is just better. Also he really
believes that we can offer higher quality if we can merge technology into our instructional program and that
we shouldn't offer courses that are not better than what we do now. Academic technology will help us focus
more on learning than teaching and can provide increased access.

Reed stated he was at JSRFDC today and saw plans for labs to assist faculty- -that will be the future. Do not
think technology will replace how we provide instruction, but it will enrich it and provide alternatives.
Maybe we don't need to have students in class every day of the week. Maybe the other day we can use the
seat for another class, mixing modes of delivery. It will be very interesting to be a faculty member and teach
the class both ways and see how students do, how they feel about it. We need to think through how we
accommodate students that are not interested. Almost every job our graduates take will require technology
use, so we will be training them better.

Sarraille pointed out that 19.5 to 1 changing to 18.5 to 1 is student-faculty ratio, not class size. The average
class size is ~25.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.