

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 25, 2003

**PRESENT:** Aronson, Avilla, Bargetto-Andres, Brown, Brunn, Dauwalder, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Garcia, Jaasma, Karlstrom, Lindsay, Luo, Mayer J., Myers, Nagel, Oppenheim, Orenstein, Peterson, Rumayor, Sarraille, Sereno, Shipley, Stessman, Stone, Tan, Thompson, Tynan, Vang, Weikart, Youngblom, Zarling

**PROXIES:** Noble (Morgan-Foster)

**ABSENT:** Afonso, Ferriz, Harris, Mayer M., Paterson, Piskoti, Potter, Washington

**GUESTS:** Demetrulias, Fox, Hejka-Ekins, Hughes Klein, MacDonald, Manoharan, Peters, Poole, Stephens, Strong

**Recording Secretary:** Diana Bowman

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

6/AS/03/FAC--Policy for University Search Committees: Appmt of Administrators, FIRST READING

7/AS/03/UEPC--Academic Technology Plan, FIRST READING

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

Service Learning UPDATE

Smoking Policy UPDATE

---

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, April 8, 2003  
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

---

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm. Agenda was amended to move item 8a) to a time certain of 3:15. The agenda was then approved as amended. The Minutes of March 11, 2003 were amended on page 8, first full paragraph, "whether marginal cost does not cover the cost of funding..." The minutes were then approved as amended.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. President Hughes distributed a flyer announcing groundbreaking ceremony for Residential Life Village III. The Provost and Speaker will determine what to do with faculty in residence space in that facility. She

also mentioned that an article about the JSRFDC opening was in the CSU Leader.

The President also reported there have been requests from a number of places across campus to clarify the Use Policy for the JSRFDC that was approved last year. She will ask the Provost and Speaker to identify committee members for a new committee that will be charged to implement the Use Policy. The assumption is that there will be the shared privileges we have enjoyed in the past between faculty, staff and students.

The President further reported that the Chancellor's Office sponsored an ASI/AS/Campus Presidents budget summit and we have decided to schedule a follow up on this on Wednesday, March 26 at 4:00 pm in MSR 130.

President Hughes very briefly covered Legislative Day in Sacramento held last Monday and Tuesday. She reported good discussions with our Legislators, but did not come away feeling we were going to have improved numbers. In fact, the sense is that the situation could easily worsen with the budget. Assemblymen Greg Azarian will be here on April 4, so we might be able to get more information.

She thanked the Senate for considering her request to change the date and time of Senate meetings, and understands there were be no change. She will continue to do her best to attend.

2. Thompson stated that SEC is talking to FDC Director Schulz so the JSRFDC Use Policy can be refined and clarified.

3. Jim Youngblom, Chair of the COC advised that a number of slots still need to be filled for the 2003/2004 ballot. He asked Senators if any are interested, please speak to him after the Senate meeting.

4. Provost Dauwalder reported that the President was accurate in her statements about Legislative Day that it was a good day for us to interact with our Legislators, and that the message was not a positive one. They will continue to monitor the situation.

Related to the strategic planning process, particularly with the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee, he advised that the USGPC met with UBAC through January and February to develop a two round, three level bottom up process which we are in the midst of now. In addition, the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee gathered input from the campus community regarding the university's 2003-04 goals and that information has been reviewed. Subgroups were then created to work on the items, and then a subcommittee was created to consolidate the data. Last week a draft summary of the input was reviewed in which there were three goals and many objectives. The committee is working to create what it will be proposing as the goals and priorities for the University. Shortly after the committee's April 3 meeting, there should be a complete set of goals and priorities distributed to the University community for additional review and comment. After input is received, the document will be revised and forwarded to the President, hopefully by the end of April.

Sarraille questioned when the next round at level 1 would start, and Provost Dauwalder replied it would probably be next week for him. He should have all level 2 material by tomorrow. Vice President Stephens replied that Business and Finance is getting all their staff together again next week and hope to have something between April 1-5.

5. Thompson announced that the budget forum is scheduled for tomorrow at 4:00-5:00 pm in MSR 130. It is

an example of what the bottom up process means. There will be information sharing, sharing of ideas, and brainstorming about how to cope with our budget difficulties. He encouraged all to attend.

6. Thompson left copies of a memo and report from Executive Vice Chancellor Spence on the 120-semester unit minimum and a reminder to campuses that it is a minimum not maximum. Also there are two copies of a chart showing each campus and how many programs have been reviewed that have 120 units or more and less.

7. Thompson further reported that the Board of Trustees took action on the graduation report and he expects each campus to have a committee that will address the graduation report next year. It is still on our agenda as a discussion item.

8. Tynan reported that the FBAC discussed the bottom up budget approach. Tomorrow, an All Campus memo will be sent out from FBAC encouraging all to participate.

9. The Speaker thanked the Provost for refreshments. He welcomed Priscilla Peters, Assistant Vice President Manoharan, Susan MacDonald, Vice President Strong, Vice President Stephens, Associate Dean Klein, Vice Provost Demetrulias, and Ron Noble.

## **QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS**

None

## **ACTION ITEM**

### **a. 5/AS/03/SEC–Resolution on Student Fee Increase**

Thompson advised that information on this item is in today's packet pages 9-13. He thanked Sarraille for putting the information together for the Senate. It is now open for discussion and amendment.

Oppenheim thanked Sarraille for the figures. He voiced surprise that the student fees did not drop sharply in the early 90's as he had suggested during the previous AS discussion. Myers advised that when this resolution went out on Facnet, it provoked his department to participate in Senate business. They voiced strong opinions. A small number felt the resolution was appropriate, but a larger majority felt the fee increases are a necessity and thus there is no sense in passing a resolution objecting to them.

Sarraille stated that this is not a resolution against fee increases, but a resolution in favor of considered fee increases. If fee increases are necessary, let's make the necessity public. He sees no harm in voting for this resolution. It just asks us to look at the necessity of having an increase. Gackowski expressed his support for the resolution.

Zarling stated his concern that this resolution places the Academic Senate in a position of micro managing. He further stated he would support a resolution that expresses frustration, but this doesn't read like that. There are things in it that could be interpreted as interfering in the process. He does not support the resolution. Nagel questioned who has the authority to raise fees and Thompson replied it has to be approved by the Board of Trustees and he believes, also the Legislature. Nagel stated that if that is the case, it really doesn't matter if we ask the Board of Trustees to wait because that will have to happen. The significance

here is a symbolic one. It is to put moral pressure on the Board of Trustees rather than to interfere.

Oppenheim stated that if we look at the State university fee in 1992/93, it jumped, then compare it with this year, including the mid-year increase, it is 20% over a 20-year period, less than 2% a year. Other fees have increased more, but not these. And if we presume fees go up an additional 25% (on top of the 10%), that will stay in place unless the budget crisis continues. No one wants to see students paying more money. We could suggest holding fees down, but basically we are wasting our time with this. Before student fees are raised, we have to presume the Chancellor and Board of Trustees will look at other possibilities. Filling noted that the Board of Trustees should have done a cost-benefit for CMS, but they didn't, so why should they behave differently on this.

Stephens shared her understanding that the Board of Trustees is the delegated authority to set fees, although the Legislature could take action to overturn their action. There is no active approval. In the last four years, the CSU has said we need to increase fees, but the Legislature has said no and backfilled the budget hole. Sarraille stated that part of the reason why this is being brought forward is that the SWAS had a brouhaha where the Board of Trustees asked them to express approval of increasing fees and a straw vote was reluctantly taken that voiced approval. The Chair took the liberty of speaking for the SWAS to the Board of Trustees and Legislators prior to the SWAS vote. Ultimately when the question of fee increases was voted on, SWAS did not state that it was in favor of fee increases. In one sense, we're making a statement to prevent the Board of Trustees from assuming we are in favor by default. Sundar thanked Sarraille for the figures and expressed that this resolution is only symbolic. But, when looking at the history of the fee structure of the CSU system, the culture of California is for low fees. She agreed with Zarling's comments that this resolution should not be approved. Karlstrom questioned if anyone has tried to figure out the impact on the student body if fees are increased and Sarraille replied the last time there was a fee increase in the 1990's, there was a drop in enrollment systemwide. CSUS was in the midst of an enrollment upswing, and enrollment dipped a bit, although the exact nature is indeterminate. Dauwalder advised that another look at fee history of the CSU in comparison to the rest of the nation really shows an outstanding commitment to higher education over the years. We are now in a position where we are unable to fund that commitment. The intent is to lessen the effect on access for students to higher education. The occurrence in the early 1990's may or may not be relevant. Drop in enrollment may have been related to a lack of resources on campus. The State is trying to find a balance where we don't have to limit the number of seats. He encouraged everyone to take a look at the entire package and see what is trying to be accomplished. Rumayor questioned why bring up past mistakes others have made. Students have just had a 10% increase and now another 25% is being proposed. The Board of Trustees have not considered anything else. As a total package, we are paying more for fewer services. Students are not asking for no fee increase, just for a rationality in increases. Peterson noted even increasing fees by 25%, we are still at the bottom of the comparative institutions. It is painful to have these fee increases, but she voiced concern that students will get even less in terms of available classes if we don't raise fees. This has to be weighed against taking longer to graduate. The biggest cost for a student is living expenses and if you have to live longer here, it will cost more overall.

Oppenheim questioned the correlation between the proposed budget and fee increase. Even with that increase, we are still looking at 5-10-15% cuts. Stephens replied that when we estimate additional fee revenue, it is still around \$2 million. Sarraille urged Senators look at the total cost of education. If you look at the material on his web page, there is evidence that students at four-year colleges in California pay more than average for their total cost of education.

Question was called by Mayer seconded by Stone. Vote to close debate 26 yes, 1 opposed. Secret ballot: 9 yes, 20 no and 4 abstentions. Resolution failed.

## FIRST READING ITEMS

### a. 6/AS/03/FAC–Policy for University Search Committees

MS Brown/Filling

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus, adopt the attached search procedure policy entitled: "Policy on Search Procedures and Appointments for University Administrators".

RESOLVED: That this policy both clarify and modify the current administration search policy as described in HR 92-1.

Rationale: Current university policy on *searches and appointments for university-wide administrators* is based on administrative practice and policy language in HR 92-1, an administrative document that has not gone through faculty governance. It does not clearly designate a process for search committee formation, committee composition, degree of faculty representation, steps in the interview/selection process, and contingency procedures in the event of a failed search. The proposed policy is intended to remedy the lack of specificity in the administrative document and, specifically in the area of committee structure and procedure, to modify this document: HR 92-1.

The proposed policy is the result of long and careful collaborative discussion between FAC, SEC, the Provost, and the Assistant to the President on Equal Opportunity and Internal relations. It provides a clear and orderly process for the search and eventual appointment of administrators with university-wide responsibilities (VP's, Associate VP's, Assistant VP's, Deans, and MPP Directors). It ensures a level of participation by faculty, administration, and staff commensurate with the scope and responsibilities of the position undergoing search.

Brown stated that this item is intended to clarify and modify an administrative document from 1992 which addressed search policies, set steps, discusses structure and guidelines to clarify how committees are composed and comprised, and outlines some of the procedures that need to be followed. Part II speaks to the different types of positions being searched for. This document gives a greater faculty role in the search process.

Filling stated that the Senate needs to be mindful that this document has 2-5 years of input and negotiation with faculty, administrators, FAC, and CFA. Please give consideration to the thoughtful nature of this document. Changing it would have to go through the entire process again.

Oppenheim thanked the FAC for coming up with such a good document. Two things he noted: No. 10 (page 16), top of the second page "the hiring administrator makes a recommendation of the preferred candidate to the President or the appointing administrator." In the past, the administrator or President just wanted a list of qualified candidates and selected whom he/she wanted. This is a real step forward. Also, point A (page 16) under Central, academic administrative positions, it appears that there would be 6 faculty, 3 non-faculty for a provost committee, community representative and President's appointee. Clearly, in the past, Presidents have seen these positions as being part of the President's team and there have been a larger representative of

administration on the committee. He asked if the current administration has been brought into this, and does he have an indication the President will sign this.

Thompson reminded Senators this is a first reading item and open for discussion and advice to FAC, but not for any changes at this meeting.

Stephens noted that it may be implicit in here we are talking about EOIR, but recruitments would be run out of the Human Resources Office. The EOIR would be used only for complaints like equity. We are really putting accountability on the HR office to ensure that appointments are made correctly. She also questioned the word 'vetted' which assumes expertise. For example, if a job description for a Controller is put out, she wouldn't expect the SEC to have expertise or the search committee to have expertise as to the job description. Thompson stated he's not sure about the first part, but the initial work on this began with him and Tom Young at SEC's request. A lot of the role of EOIR in the document comes from Young. That particular word 'vetted' was looked at by Young and he said it was all right to use.

The President hesitated to respond, stating she is aware it will come to her and she will have the authority to make a decision. She does not want to skew the Senate's discussion by responding.

Sarraille advised that looking at the end of the document, SEC had discussions about the last paragraph. It was supposed to establish some rules concerning committee members being chosen to fill the position. It seems that we've lost something here. It still doesn't rule out a member of the search committee applying for the job.

Sundar asked if this meant if one committee fails in the search, those people can't be appointed to the next search committee? Brown explained the FAC assumed that the search committee members cannot be candidates for the position. We have had instances where members of an unsuccessful search committee were appointed as interims. That's one of the things this language is trying to get at. Sundar voiced surprise that this could occur.

Provost Dauwalder advised that this document does reflect considerable discussion between FAC and administration. There are a large number of points of agreement, but there are several elements that require further discussion and he would like to forward those to the FAC. Thompson explained that this has been at FAC for a while and we have been waiting for input from the administration. This is the last point at which we could get it on the Senate agenda and get the President's decision by the end of the academic year. We have consulted on this for a year and we are at the point that it is here so we can have a decision. Sarraille concurred with Thompson that issues have been worked out, except the last paragraph and it is now ready to go. Thompson asked if Senators have further comments or suggestions, please forward them to Brown or Bowman. This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

#### **b. 7/AS/03/UEPC–Academic Technology Plan**

MS Stone/Tynan

**Resolved:** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus endorse the Academic Technology Plan.

Stone emphasized that this has been through a great deal of discussion and collaboration on campus

(Academic Technology Subcommittee, Office of OIT, Off-Campus Programs Subcommittee, FDC, UEPC and FBAC). The UEPC wholeheartedly supports and approves of this plan. Tynan agreed, stating FBAC has looked at this repeatedly and consulted with several groups and asked many questions, all of which have been answered. FBAC is unanimously in support of this as well, and it fits nicely into the budget priorities document signed by the President last year. Peters, Chairperson of the Academic Technology subcommittee, advised that there is no intent here to impose technology, just to ensure that it is available for those who want to take advantage of it. The subcommittee viewed the document as a work in progress. The plan will need to be updated as technology changes. Thompson advised that we are in a first reading mode, so questions and comments are welcomed.

Weikart stated that this is a well thought out document. He asked on page 24, under tier 1, item 1, upgrading faculty computers mentions requests and evaluation of requests. This seems like a contradiction. Poole replied that not everyone needs a new computer every 3-4 years. We are trying to prevent an entitlement based on timing. The idea is to target those who will make use of advances in technology. Weikart stated his second question refers to page 25, tier 2, 4th bullet; what is the purpose of portable videoconference equipment. We already have ITV/CODEC classrooms. Manoharan replied we do have TV rooms now, but if we want to reach out to remote sites, we need more rooms. Getting specified space is very difficult. So by adding portable videoconferencing equipment, we can adapt a regular room for that purpose. Stone questioned if it would allow for two-way video and Manoharan replied yes. Weikart questioned budget page 30, section under tier 1, professional development faculty stipends for technically related course development. It is not listed in the text. Stone thanked Weikart for catching that omission. Sarraille asked if this meant the intention in applying for a computer upgrade would be a kind of sanity check to make sure the faculty member gets the right type of computer and Manoharan replied yes.

Sarraille noted he was glad to hear this is a work in progress because some details he does not agree with some items, such as a technician in every building. He suggested a floating technician. He hopes that resources will be spread appropriately. Manoharan stated that the idea of one technician in each building (one technician per ten classrooms) comes from national benchmarks. There will be a lot of 'smart' classrooms in the Science II building.

Thompson stated that this will return as an action item at the next Senate meeting.

### **c. 8/AS/03/UEPC–Program Discontinuation: BA Vocational Education**

MS Stone/Sarraille

WHEREAS: the University Educational Policies Committee recommended that the formal program discontinuance process be employed for the Bachelor of Vocational Education; and

WHEREAS: the faculty committee constituted through this process has made a thorough review and evaluation of the program; and

WHEREAS: the above committee has submitted its report which recommends program continuance, along with a series of other recommendations for improving the success of the program;

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate accept and endorse the report of the Bachelor of Vocational Education Review Committee, and recommend to the President that the program be continued; and be it

further

**RESOLVED:** that the Academic Senate endorse the other recommendations of the Bachelor of Vocational Education Review Committee:

1. Support the BVE program as a major;
2. House the BVE program in the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences (ALS);
3. Assign a Program Coordinator from the College of ALS and constitute a BVE committee comprised of faculty from the Colleges of ALS and Education; and
4. Promote and market the BVE program

Stone explained that the report the resolution refers to was put together by a discontinuance committee in 2001 who were unanimous on continuance. Last year's UEPC put forth this resolution, but the present UEPC is not in favor of this based on information from the ALS Dean (who does not want the program housed in ALS), so there is no home for this program and very few, if any, students are in the program, and it is costing us money. UEPC would like the Provost to take this information forward and deal with it. Stone reminded Senators if you vote yes, it is a vote in support of keeping the program.

Thompson reminded Senators this is a first reading item and is open for discussion.

Oppenheim stated that in an academic community, we like to think of expanding educational opportunities, which means we often keep things we should cut. There is no justification to maintain this program. The college in which it goes does not want it. Klein stated that when it first came to the College of ALS in 2001, ALS made it clear they did not want it. This program dates from early 1959 promoting vocational education. We don't have the traditional program it is preparing students for. The College of ALS recommends discontinuance. Sundar asked if this would fit with the Applied Studies Program and Klein replied that vocational education is a credential preparation program, so it prepares teachers. Applied Studies Program does not.

Nagel questioned if this UEPC recommends program discontinuance, why is the resolution written in support of the program? Stone replied that this resolution came from last year's UEPC based on the recommendation of the committee that did the report. If this UEPC recommended discontinuance, another discontinuance committee would have to be formed and another report would have to be done, which would start the process all over again. We are wanting to keep the ball moving and let the process continue till the end. UEPC hopes the Senate will vote it down and send it to the Provost.

Zarling questioned if we are recommending that faculty abdicate responsibility over programs to administrators. Stone asked if Zarling would be serving on the next discontinuance committee? Zarling questioned why we would have to redo the study and further, why we can't just amend the resolution to recommend discontinuance. Thompson advised that we can't amend a resolution to make it say the opposite.

Thompson asked that any further comments, questions or advice be sent to Stone or Bowman. This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **a. Service Learning (Fox/Hejka-Ekins)**

Thompson introduced Julie Fox and April Hejka-Ekins and asked that they give an overview of what is happening here and systemwide regarding service learning.

Hejka-Ekins highlighted resource opportunities faculty have taken advantage of or will in the future. She stated that she has used it in undergraduate and graduate classes. It gives students an opportunity to work in the community to provide needed services and it gives faculty a chance to tie that into their coursework. Further, it gives students valuable experiences to work in the public sector. It is valuable to integrate course material and develop a sense of civil responsibilities. It does help if we make it an option rather than requirement. She highlighted a few things.

--The system is committed to service learning.

--Service learning office is partially funded by the Chancellor and our campus.

--Systemwide, data shows over 900 students have been exposed to service learning courses. Here about 40% students have taken service learning course or want to.

--65-70% indicate that service learning improves their understanding of course material and community awareness. It's also seen as valuable for discovering career clues.

--The Service Learning Office will help you develop your curriculum to fit your discipline, provide training and publishing opportunities.

She announced an upcoming two-part workshop will be held at the JSRFDC to go over service learning, how we are doing, overview of what the issues are, what successes have been and then a publishing opportunity and what is available.

Hejka-Ekins lists the innovative things happening on campus regarding service learning.

--ShIPLEY stated Liberal Studies uses service learning as a requirement. The differences in students is remarkable she stated. It is a win win for their students.

--Stone uses it in Chemistry courses. It emphasizes the knowledge her students have acquired.

--Filling has general education students preparing tax returns for community members at Empire school as a part of the IRS VITA program.

Fox stated that faculty here do a lot, but we could do even more. She stated that her office is here to help faculty. Stone suggested creating a web page to put out what the Service Learning Office is doing. Fox replied that is on her agenda for the summer. Hejka-Ekins encouraged all to come to workshop.

## **b. Smoking Policy (MacDonald)**

MacDonald recapped that in September the Board of Trustees gave campuses permission to develop their own smoking policy. The committee has held fora, surveyed, developed options, received data analysis from IRPA and now are very close to having a policy. She reviewed the results of the survey. Next Thursday the committee planned to meet to make a final recommendation. But, in the meantime she received a memo from Vice Chancellor McLain asking campuses to send her their updated policy by Friday, April 4. She is here to seek any last minute reactions before the committee proceeds.

Thompson questioned the process. The Senate just acted on Posting Guidelines brought by Vice President Stephens. This sounds like this process will not go through the Senate. MacDonald replied that the

committee contained representatives from the campus community, which includes labor unions (since it affects peoples working conditions), faculty, staff and students, so it doesn't seem appropriate to come here. Thompson reminded her that all the Senate does is recommend. Stone agreed stating it would be the Senate's opinion of the plan. It is hard for us to say we're for it or against it when we have not seen the policy. MacDonald replied that based on survey results, we expect to go with a 30ft. parameter. Oppenheim questioned if she could tell from the survey if people wanted Model C (create a smoke-free campus) or Model B (establish designated smoking areas) and MacDonald replied that there was some support for a smoke-free campus, but some support for smoking. The committee is urging the President not to conclude that smoke-free will not be a future possibility, so keep that open.

Garcia questioned if funds have been identified to pay for this and MacDonald replied there are some costs related to the degree to which we provide protected areas for smokers. There are also costs associated with receptacles. They have been informally told by advocacy groups that if we change to the 30ft. policy, they would support us in providing funds for receptacles. Another issue of concern is there are currently no signs indicating behavior requests, so there would be costs associated with that. Implementation would be phased in at a rate we can afford.

Stone stated she does a lot of research on smoking and smoke does cause lots of diseases. Restricting smoking will reduce the number of smokers. This is an important message to send to our students. She stressed advocating a smoke-free campus.

4:30 adjourned.