

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

January 27, 2004

PRESENT: Andres, C., Aronson, Bettencourt, Carroll, Cunha, Dauwalder, Everett, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Garcia, Jensen, Karlstrom, Katsma, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Paterson, Peterson, Poole, Riedmann, Rumayor, Sarraille, Senior, Shipley, Stessman, Thompson, Watkins, Weddle, Youngblom

PROXIES: Clarke (Feldman), Sarraille (Zarling)

ABSENT: Andres, A., Brown, Ferriz, Harvey, Helzer, Nelson, Regalado, Rios-Bustamante, Tan, Young

GUESTS: Jaasma, Thomas, Ruud, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

FOUNDATION MTG REPORT

16/AS/03/FAC--Review of Interdisciplinary Chairs/Coordinators/Directors, REFERRED TO FAC

1/AS/04/SEC--Support for Prop 55, APPROVED

17/AS/03/FBAC--Resolution on Budget Priorities, REJECTED BY PRESIDENT

20/AS/03/FBAC--Policy on Campus Distribution of Lottery Funds, APPROVED BY PRESIDENT

ALLEGATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC & ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT, DISCUSSED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, February 24, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

The Speaker asked for a moment of silence for Colleen Kerr, a staff member who recently passed away, as well as the daughter of Jane Diekmann.

The agenda was amended to add 8. c) Allegations of Scientific and Academic Misconduct. The agenda was approved as amended.

The Minutes of December 2, 2003 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Speaker thanked Provost Dauwalder for providing refreshments.
2. A memo regarding CSU Academic Technology Initiatives from Executive Vice Chancellor Spence is attached.
3. A memo regarding Delta College Lower Division Course Offerings at CSU Stanislaus-Stockton from Dean Morgan is attached.
4. Speaker Aronson reminded Senators that Instructional Institute Day is February 12. A flyer is in the mail.
5. Vice President of DUR, Bill Ruud was welcomed.
6. CSU Community Service Learning material is in the Senate Office.
7. Flyer announcing Search for position of Faculty Director of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning and position of CSU Service Learning Scholar is in the Senate Office.

REPORTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

a. Foundation Report (Thomas)

Thomas reported the Foundation has held two meetings this semester; one in September in Stockton and one in December, on campus. The impression he got from the meetings is that Foundation members are truly behind the University and want to support us. Highlights from the meetings: 1) working on improving the Magnolia Mansion; they have raised \$85-95,000 for this purpose, 2) talked about how they can support the Nursing Program, specifically getting behind Kaiser Permanente partnership. The next meeting is in April at the Monterey Plaza Hotel. Any concerns faculty would like him to take to the meeting, please let him know.

Thompson inquired if there is talk that someone from the Foundation Board would come to an Academic Senate meeting, and Thomas replied no, but it could be arranged. Thompson stated that it might be a nice perspective to have a community member from the Board attend. Thomas will follow up. He further noted that faculty often give presentations to the Board.

- b. Sarraile and Provost Dauwalder updated Senators on recent UBAC meetings.

ACTION ITEM

a. 16/AS/03/FAC—Review of Interdisciplinary Chairs/Coordinators/Directors

Floyd explained the changes to the document that came from the input from the last Senate meeting, as follows:

The college dean shall initiate a performance review of the interdisciplinary chair, coordinator, or director at regular intervals, but in no case later than the beginning of his or her third year of a three year term. The Dean shall invite from each department that has courses taught in the subject program a minimum of one faculty member to participate in the review committee. This committee will serve in a consultative capacity to the Dean. As part of the review, the committee may solicit evaluative information from the tenured and probationary members of the relevant departments. In cases where more than one college is involved in an interdisciplinary program, selection of the dean who will be responsible for the review will be based on the college that provides the most courses in the program. Any tenured or probationary faculty member may submit evaluative information to the review committee.

He urged this be put forward because reviews are coming up. FAC will be developing a Policy for Interdisciplinary Chairs/Coordinators/Directors, but did not want to tie it to this.

Provost Dauwalder questioned the definition of what a interdisciplinary chair is, and do all have three year terms? He further questioned the second to last line of the document "In cases where more than one college is involved in an interdisciplinary program, selection of the dean who will be responsible for the review will be based on the college that provides the most courses in the program." Is the intent to refer to the number of courses taught during the period under review and Floyd replied that FAC did not want it to be too prescriptive, but yes, that is how it would be interpreted. Dauwalder questioned what programs have interdisciplinary chairs and Floyd replied he is aware of Honors, Cognitive Studies, and Agricultural Studies. Filling explained that the working definition of an interdisciplinary chair would be to have a program, but no permanent faculty. Dauwalder suggested having the definition of interdisciplinary chair spelled out. Thompson questioned if we are under pressure to send this forward. If not, it should be referred back to FAC for clarity. Dauwalder also suggested FAC look at term of office. He suggested in the first sentence saying 'the beginning of his or her third year of service' rather than 'the beginning of his or her third year of a three year term.'

Consensus to refer back to FAC for clarity.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 1/AS/04/SEC—Support for Proposition 55

Aronson explained that this resolution was pulled together from a variety of sources. She urged Senators to consider moving to a second reading so action can be taken today.

It was MS Filling/Riedmann

RESOLVED: That CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate supports Proposition 55 - the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004, as a way to fund facilities needed by California's elementary, middle, and high schools, community colleges, and public universities, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate urge California voters to support Proposition 55 in the March 2004 primary election; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate urge campus administrators and the campus community to take immediate action to increase public awareness of the importance of Proposition 55 to public education in California; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate forward this resolution as an attachment to the Yes on 55 Form that states "We support Proposition 55-the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004."

RATIONALE:

Specifically for CSU Stanislaus, Proposition 55 will provide \$7.75 million for equipment and furnishings in the CSU Stanislaus Science II facility, which features 115,000 gross square feet; updated classrooms, laboratories, and equipment for 857 students; offices for faculty; a new observatory; a greenhouse; and an animal care facility. The building is scheduled for occupancy in Fall 2007. The bond will fund microscopes, spectrometers, centrifuges, refrigerators, freezers, cabinets, chairs, and desks to make the building functional.

Proposition 55 will infuse \$690 million into the 23-campus CSU system, which represents 19 percent of the CSU total capital need over the next five years. This bond will fund the following in the CSU:

- S Facilities to support the CSU's surge in enrollment over the past 10 years;
- S Vital life-safety and seismic improvements;
- S Modernization of classrooms and laboratories;
- S Renovation of aging facilities;
- S Completion of projects begun under Proposition 47.

This \$12.3 billion general obligation bond is intended to (a) relieve overcrowding in schools, (b) accommodate expected new enrollment, and (c) repair aging public school facilities from kindergarten through college.

California university and colleges are severely overcrowded, with more than 700,000 new students expected to seek enrollment at a California college or university by 2010. The California Postsecondary Education Commission estimates the state will need to spend approximately \$1.5 billion per year through 2010 to maintain existing higher education facilities and to provide for expected enrollment increases. Prop. 55 will provide \$1.15 billion a year for two years to address this growth.

Prop. 55 will give students more access to technology, including laboratory equipment and computers they need to match academic programs in other states, and to compete in the modern workforce. It is a direct investment in the local economy, which will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs and add billions in local economic activities throughout California.

Prop. 55 contains strict accountability provisions, including independent annual audits, cost controls and other requirements that guard against waste and mismanagement, and Prop. 55 funds can only be spent on school repair and construction.

Questions and Concerns:

S This proposition is important to the campus. It will fund millions of dollars to buy equipment for the new Science Building.

S If the bond does not pass, Facilities has no back up plan for funding.

S It could be viewed as self serving.

S No one will know if we support it or not.

S If the \$15 billion bond is not passed, we have an ‘Armageddon’; the interest rate would be too high on any bonds. The more we ask people to vote up bonds, the more we could lose support for saving the budget.

S It is important for people to be educated on this issue. There are big stakes for our campus, the central valley in general, K-12 and community colleges. The central valley is growing fast, but no funding to support it. If Prop 55 does not pass, we can put it back on, but it could be years.

S Voters do like some guidance. From a public finance perspective, people perceive paying for large capital investments make sense over time. They may be open to this, and we should encourage them to vote for it.

S Our response will be added to the list of other campuses supporting it, so people will see our support.

It was MS Thompson/O’Brien move to waive the rules and go to second reading. Passed by voice vote.

Further Discussion:

S The proposition supports the University and education throughout California.

S Investment in education will help the problems in California.

S How can upgrading our facilities be viewed as self serving?

Watkins called the question. Vote passed with one no vote and two abstentions.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. 17/AS/03/FBAC—Resolution on Budget Priorities

At the December 2 meeting, the Senate passed 17/AS/03/FBAC—Resolution on Budget Priorities. The President did not sign it, and her letter explaining her reasons are on page 9.

After much discussion, this resolution was referred back to FBAC for further deliberations.

b. 20/AS/03/FBAC—Policy on Campus Distribution of Lottery Funds

This resolution was passed by the Senate on December 2 and approved by the President. The President has sent out over facnet the process for applying for lottery funds, per the resolution. The COC has been asked to recommend faculty to the Lottery Fund Review Committee.

c. Allegations of Academic and Scientific Misconduct and where we go from here

EOIR Brown reported that the President convened a group regarding the recent allegations of academic and scientific misconduct. They were asked to propose certain goals and avenues and to implement those approaches. One suggestion was to hold brown-bag forums. The goal is to give people an opportunity to hear what has happened, what is the impact, and how we can move ahead. The session would be open to all constituencies, including the press. There has been concern how it impacts us as workers and students. This

will also be discussed in open fora. Also, there would be discussion as to how to move beyond, what have we learned, and it will give us a chance to see whether steps can or should be taken to develop pedagogical approaches. Maybe as a governing body to look at course content, maybe a GE requirement at the Senior level. Also, due process can also be discussed. Maybe at some point to develop a series of media workshops. There was consensus among the ad hoc group we need to do something for all of us to come together in response to the challenges that have occurred. All of this is in draft form at this time.

Aronson explained that the forums might also explain what due process is, what the procedures are for dealing with the issue. She explained that discussions have just begun but the committee wanted the Senate to know we are beginning to think about it. Other people will be added to the discussion as we go along. She invited Senators to send suggestions, concerns to Brown or her, so it can be taken back to the group. This is only information now at very early stage of development.

Questions and Concerns:

S We currently have procedures in place for this kind of thing. No other action is needed.

S The President declined to sign a resolution calling for reaffirmation of academic freedom. The present climate might be a good one in which to develop a joint statement affirming academic freedom.

S It seems there are at least four views of the purpose of the brown bag forums: make us whole, engage in policy making or prelude to policy making, bring about reflection on academic honesty, and public relations. Is it a purpose that we show the world that we take these things seriously?

S What were the criteria used for selecting the ad hoc group? The faculty governance process was not used e.g. COC appoints faculty. Aronson advised that she started having conversations with the President last week about this. From that we decided we would pull together some people on a short time frame to begin to think about what we can do. Together the President and Aronson came up with a small list of people we thought critical. Some people that were asked were not available. That group gathered last Friday. If policy is involved, it will go through faculty governance. Morgan-Foster clarified that this group was pulled together only for brainstorming, not policy formation. Aronson agreed stating the group is asking Senators to think about from their own perspective what they think should happen on campus.

S There may be a problem with bias being introduced at fora which could affect the adjudication of the matters later.

S Was it ever considered by the ad hoc committee that we simply let the process work? Morgan-Foster replied that there was some thought about that. However the thinking was that there should be a forum because people want to talk about the issue

S There are concerns among faculty that should be discussed that do not relate to current events. Issues that are rightfully the kind of issues faculty should be discussing, but might not have been for a while such as ethics and academic honesty.

S This is in response to recent events, not to underlying concerns.

S Let's not say what we are or aren't doing in the Press.

S If recent discussion of academic honesty on facnet is truly a reason for people wanting to hold a forum, then other issues which have received comparable attention on facnet should be discussed too, such as whether facnet ought to be moderated.

S What is the role of Facnet? Maybe it should be a list serve for official documents.

S It doesn't make sense to initiate any discussion until the investigation is completed and facts presented.

Aronson and Brown explained that they came before the Senate to share the early stages of where this workgroup is in its thinking, so they could get input to see what the next steps should be. They will reconvene the group and discuss this input and Facnet discussions to see what the appropriate processes and

next steps are, if any.

OPEN FORUM

Peterson advised that CFA and the Faculty Development Committee are sponsoring a faculty night at this Friday's CSUS basketball game. Free tickets are available at the Faculty Development Center.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.