

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

May 11, 2004

PRESENT: Andres A., Andres C., Aronson, Bettencourt, Brown, Cunha, Dauwalder, Everett, Feldman, Ferriz, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Jensen, Karlstrom, Luo, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Paterson, Peterson, Poole, Regalado, Riedmann, Rumayor, Sarraille, Shipley, Stessman, Thompson, Watkins, Weddle, Youngblom

PROXIES: Jaasma (Sumser), Regalado (Oppenheim), Sarraille (Zarling)

ABSENT: Garci, Katsma, Rios-Bustamante, Senior, Tan

GUESTS: Boffman, Carroll B., Carroll J., Doraz, Edmondson, Floyd R., Petratos, Stone, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

5/AS/04/UEPC--Academic Program Review Procedures, APPROVED

6/AS/04/UEPC--Assessment of Student Learning Principles, APPROVED

9/AS/04/SA--Faculty in Residence Program, APPROVED

10/AS/04/Ad Hoc--Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures, APPROVED

11/AS/04/Ad Hoc--Policy on Academic Reorganization, APPROVED

8/AS/04/SEC--Workload Resolution, APPROVED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, September 21, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m. The agenda was amended to give a time certain of 3:45 to the Faculty in Residence Resolution. The agenda was approved as amended. Watkins explained that in the Minutes of April 27, 2004, the summary on page 7 does not reflect her opinion or UEPC's opinion. The minutes were amended as follows: "Page 7 in the packet summarizes the Vice Provost's opinion of what the changes between the old and new documents are." Page 4, third paragraph, third sentence to read "In O'Brien's department, lecturers are invited but seldom participate in department functions. Page 8, ninth paragraph, third line, delete the first 'we'. The minutes were approved as amended. Thompson thanked the Clerk and Executive Assistant for the fine minutes they produced this academic year.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The General Faculty meeting is this Thursday, May 13 at 2:30 p.m. in the JSRFDC Reference Room.
2. The Faculty BBQ is this Saturday, May 15.
- 3 "You Can't Take It with You" last performance is this weekend.
4. Aronson welcomed K. Stone, R. Floyd, T. Wendt, J. Carroll and J. Boffman.
5. The Provost was thanked for providing refreshments.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None

ACTION ITEMS

a. 5/AS/04/UEPC--Academic Program Review Procedures

Watkins distributed handouts that provide a way to see UEPC's belief that the new policy makes the process better - more streamlined. Behind the pink cover is Academic Program Review Criteria.

Feldman agreed with a previous comment from Oppenheim that the review should be done no more often than 10 years. Regarding alumni and exit surveys, faculty should specify what they want the surveys to achieve. Also there should be a possibility of dept 'customization' of the survey instruments, to help get back reasonable information.

Aronson asked if Feldman was suggesting an amendment to the resolution and Feldman replied yes. It was MS Feldman/R.Brown to add after the first Resolved clause "and that the Academic Senate recommends that the cycle be changed to 10 years."

Watkins explained that research done by the Institutional Research Office indicated the typical cycles on other CSU campuses ranged from 5-7 years.

Vote on the amendment: 17 yes, 14 no, passed.

Return to the main motion as amended. Watkins asked if the Senate was going to keep adding words to the resolution. Aronson assured her no.

The question was called. Vote on the resolution as amended passed 17 yes, 14 no.

Peterson questioned if the Senate could modify what we said to make it more consistent? The policy says 7 years and the amended resolution says 10 years. Aronson stated the policy could not be amended.

It was MS Peterson/Nagel to reconsider 5/AS/04/UEPC. Motion to reconsider passed by voice vote.

Discussion continued on the amendment to add after the first Resolved clause "and that the Academic Senate recommends that the cycle be changed to 10 years."

Peterson questioned if the body could open up the document for amendment and Aronson replied no.

Watkins advised that she did receive an email from Senator Oppenheim and UEPC did consider the 10 year cycle, but did not support it.

Provost Dauwalder reminded Senators that the academic program review process has more to it than just settlement of whether there will be a 7 or 10 year cycle. He urged them to not lose sight of what the College of ALS sees as positive changes in the review process. Floyd agreed with the Provost stating there are meaningful changes in the document.

Vote on the amendment failed with a vote of 17 yes and 20 no. The body returned to the main motion.

Thompson questioned what would happen to the APR Subcommittee if this is passed? Watkins replied that it will be disbanded.

Thompson noted that there will have to be an amendment to the General Faculty Constitution. Bowman explained that it would require an amendment to Article VI. Section 2.3 as follows: "UEPC shall, in consultation with the Committee on Committees, establish and discontinue subcommittees as it deems appropriate and necessary. There are ~~six~~ **five** standing subcommittees of UEPC: General Education; Off Campus/Distance Learning; University Writing; ~~Academic Program Review~~, Academic Technology, and Assessment of Student Learning. The name, function and membership of all subcommittees shall be published to the faculty. The Committee on Committees shall appoint subcommittee members in consultation with the chair of UEPC. Subcommittee membership shall be:

~~Academic Program Review Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at large. There shall be at least three tenured members on the subcommittee.~~

Aronson replied that next year's Academic Senate would have to either 1) consider an amendment to disband 2) change its charge or 3) have a committee that does not meet.

Thompson asked what faculty reviews are in the proposed procedures and Watkins replied it goes from the program to faculty completing the self-study and then to the dean, or if the department requests it, to a review by the UEPC, their recommendation to the dean and then to the vice provost and then provost.

Jaasma clarified that each college does its own review and any program has the right to ask UEPC to review.

Thompson queried if those procedure were now in modified form in this new proposed academic program review document and Watkins replied no.

It was MS Thompson/Sarraille to add a second resolved clause to say that "Modification to the academic program review procedures require recommendation of the Academic Senate."

Jaasma asked for clarification of the process. Aronson explained that currently there is a task force putting together all the policies and procedures and one issue being discussed is "what is a policy and what is a procedure." Thompson stated we should not have to wait for the task force to define for us the difference between policy and procedure. Just because you say something is a procedure does not make it a procedure. However, if you want committees to be able to make policy, then vote against the amendment. If we approve a policy here, any amendment should also be done here. Per the General Faculty Constitution, it is

the job of the Academic Senate to recommend to the President. Sarraille agreed stating if you look at the General Faculty Constitution, you see it is the job of committees not to make policy but to recommend to the Academic Senate and for the Academic Senate to decide whether to recommend to the President. We should preserve this thread and not let a subcommittee make policy. O'Brien stated his support for the amendment stating if fundamental changes are being done, they should be submitted for approval here. Thompson reminded the body that the President is the only one that can approve policy.

The question was called and the amendment passed by voice vote.

Return to the main motion as amended.

Riedmann stated that the last time she asked what was meant by point #5 and she was told she had to ask the Provost -- the reference was to the vice provost's opinions on page #7 in the packet for the previous meeting of the AS. Watkins replied that she did not write the comment, but thinks it means that learning objectives have to be central - instead of just an introspective process - it should focus on student learning, which she sees as the goal of the university. O'Brien stated that this statement about assessment is just someone's opinion of the document - not a part of the document.

The question was called and vote on the motion as amended passed by voice vote.

b. Assessment of Student Learning Principles

Watkins advised that no changes were made to the document. She sees a lot of flexibility in the principles. This represents a set of beliefs of what assessment is and how it should be conducted. Every instructor and program has different outcomes in mind - there are many ways to assess - a myriad of ways -- She does not see anything that dictates a particular instrument or way of doing assessment.

Feldman asked what difference will it make whether the resolution passes and Watkins replied it will probably not affect anything on a day-to-day basis. It is hard for her personally to see what the problems with assessment are since she does it all the time.

Aronson stated that the document is about our belief in assessment - how we see it in relation to WASC.

Provost Dauwalder stated that it makes a significant statement on the importance faculty places on assessment - emphasis that faculty do the assessment.

Sarraille stressed the importance that it emphasizes that external influences should not be making faculty do things they don't believe in.

Floyd stated that in 6 and 7 it talks about the role and relationship of formulative and summative aspects a department and program go through and that is helpful to make those distinctions.

Peterson felt that some goals are not very tangible - it is a problem that the document talks about all goals being very specific and measurable. She sees hints that the colleges will use results of assessment to judge faculty.

Filling noted that the IRS collects data and uses aggregates in its reporting -- They don't report on

individuals. We can operate that way without singling out individuals.

Thompson stated that this originated in the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee - they still approve it -- this document was intended to try to protect the faculty in doing their assessment rather than to have assessment procedures imposed.

R. Brown explained that if we do the kind of assessment we are being asked to do, then won't we be falling back on factual-based - simplified types of learning and knowledge.

Watkins replied that this document does not say that you have to assess what is easy to assess. She agreed with Thompson that all the people she interacted with in forming the document stressed the primary focus was protection of faculty and ownership by faculty. Sarraille concurred stating that it allows for faculty to stress what we feel important. This document will not hurt us.

Regalado stated it seems it will add more work. We are already doing a lot of things in our academic program review. Aronson replied that it is only a statement of principles, not more work. Watkins agreed stating it doesn't tell you you have to do something. It is not just about testing. It is about what we do to improve teaching. It is not appropriate that it be used to suggest that one person is a better teacher than another. She recognizes that there will be a tendency for others to use the outcomes of assessment to judge individual faculty but she points out that the document calls for that not to be done.

Riedmann suggested amending number 8. She stated she does not like the idea of it being used for college and university development. Watkins reminded the body the document cannot be amended.

Provost stated his agreement with Sarraille and Watkins - the primary role of faculty in developing assessment measures is called for in the document - He is in favor of that.

Peterson stated if that is true, we could put that into the second resolve - reaffirming the idea that assessment belong to faculty.

Filling called the question. Vote on the motion passed by voice vote.

c. Faculty in Residence

O'Brien stated at the last meeting there were comments about structure - not being enough -- then he got an e-mail about there being too much structure. He sees this as a creative program - something that will benefit faculty and students - there is no hard data - assessment - to look at. Through serendipity he received something - he said we have a faculty member who lives in one of the on-campus student apartment buildings now — Panos Petratos. O'Brien asked him to say a few words.

Petratos stated that he submitted his doctoral dissertation and came to teach for CIS at the last minute and got housing from the residence hall staff. They provided a flat which normally would have been occupied by 4 students. He then started to participate in events - events that are expertly created by staff to occupy students in good things in a diverse and multicultural manner. Life in the village is a non-stop activity -- can be overwhelming to people who like their peace and quiet. He thinks that as a student he would have liked to have had a role model such as that he is now providing -- he participated in many student activities and he organized one of them. Students wanted to know what it was like to live on a Greek Island. He made a

presentation and he felt that the students gained something.

Ferriz stated he was part of a program - he thinks that it should not be over-described.

Floyd stated his support of the concept, but voiced concern that the faculty member would not get enough release time and that there is a problem figuring out that if the position starts mid July through mid June, how it would be supported during the summer. Morgan-Foster replied that the faculty member can move into the Village mid July (rent free) but would have no program obligations until Fall.

Regalado voiced opposition to the program, stating we are in a budget crisis, staff are being layed off. It is sending an unbecoming message to staff if we support this new program. It is not appropriate at this time. We could revisit it later when we know more about our budget situation. Sarraille agreed. He stated his dismay people are considering this now. Further, there is little in the position description that actually describes what this person will be doing.

Ferriz stated it is very important to students to have a mentor living around them and it is not a lot of money. Cunha agreed stating it is a reality on other campuses. Luo stated his support. Further, the budget is beyond our control anyway, and money can always be found. It is a good concept interacting with students.

Regalado stated it sends a bad message to staff where they have their entire careers here -- we need to support them. Faculty can be role models in the classroom.

Watkins stated we are supporting students in doing this.

Cunha felt that faculty can be role models and mentors outside of the classroom and that is more important.

Riedmann stated her support because it offers a faculty member an opportunity to do more. It has benefits beyond cost.

Question was called and vote on the resolution passed by voice vote.

d. Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures

Aronson passed the gavel to Filling.

Aronson explained that the proposed policy provides for faculty to have input into the reviews of support units and for those reports to come back to the Senate as information. Since the last Senate meeting, one change was made to add the Academic Senate as one of the initiators of the review process.

Doraz stated that he looked over the document - went over the budget review process - concerned about what happens if we pass this resolution -- we become participants in something that is pregnant with redundancies -- it is like an accreditation -- student services or faculty mentor may need such examination - - staff are going to see faculty as task-masters. He asked the Senate to reconsider this and possibly carry it over until next year so it can be looked at carefully.

Stephens advised that it is not unlike the assessment document you just put into place. They don't want to make it too bureaucratic and overbearing - they want to be part of the culture of assessment.

Provost Dauwalder stated that the revision brings the Senate in on the process. The process was in place before, but this just brings the Senate in on it. It is intended to parallel the program review process.

Aronson explained that it only modifies the existing policy in a few ways. It allows for faculty input and then the results of those reviews are sent to the Senate as information. Presently there is no process that allows this to happen.

Riedmann questioned if support units are doing this kind of review now and Aronson replied yes. Stephens explained that some units have gone through the reviews already.

Feldman voiced his support stating this would help assure that support units be more responsive to the University. It is in the best interest of faculty and students to have the reviews examined by faculty to insure support units act like they are suppose to.

O'Brien stated there was discussion that it was absurd for faculty to be asked to pass judgment on other units in the university. How would someone, for example, in the cashier's office be evaluated? Aronson replied this is a review on support units, not individuals. Stephens advised it is a way to open communication.

Morgan-Foster stated her support because it is very helpful to have other people outside your unit commenting - especially faculty. She does not see it as people telling you what to do. If vice presidents manage reviews according to the proposed document, it should work.

Shipleigh asked the definition of support unit? The Faculty Mentor Program is listed. Is that a support unit? She explained that there would be a problem with volunteers trying to do this, along with everything else.

Doraz stated we already have enough to do. We need to say "enough is enough."

Andres asked what the process is for gathering faculty input and Aronson replied an open announcement over Facnet will be sent out asking for faculty input. Andres asked what opportunity faculty will have to ask regarding services and Aronson replied faculty will have a chance to respond to the preliminary report. Stephens stated that focus groups will be used to create dialogue.

Question was called and vote on the resolution passed by voice vote.

e. Policy on Academic Reorganization

Aronson explained the two changes made. On page 1, item 6, 4th line after "Provost" this was added: "after consultation with the Committee on Committees." On Page 2, item 8, "six weeks" was replaced with "eight weeks." The aim of this resolution is to provide a senate-approved process for considering reorganization and to avert the imposition of a policy by the administration.

Thompson asked if a college undergoing internal reorganization would use extant governance structure, and what would that entail in the College of ALS? Klein stated if a proposal was brought to the College, it would be taken to the Core Planning Committee.

Peterson voiced concern on the timelines. She asked if someone starts this next week, won't most of it be

resolved over the summer? Aronson replied it would have to happen during the academic year. The Provost agreed stating that according to the wording of the document the process would play out over the course of Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Question was called and vote on the resolution passed by voice vote.

f. Workload Resolution

Poole explained that dialogue in SEC last week resulted in revision to the fourth resolve. It discourages the teaching of over 24 WTU's and also recommends that probationary faculty not teach more than 21 due to their need to perform scholarship. Other comments were used to beef up the rationale — to explain the relationship between teaching and research. We chose not to change the second resolve (at least 3 units for research). We did not think it appropriate to ask for a minimum of 6 units at this time and did not want to appear to demand that all faculty perform research.

Aronson explained we could put this up as a sense of senate resolution or send to the President for approval.

Peterson suggested we could be raising the bar. She suggested adding "This resolution would be to meet current expectations of research" to the end of the rationale in the second paragraph. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Filling stated that CFA's position is there is nothing in the resolution that violates the contract - despite what Associate Vice President Wendt says. CFA is in favor of anything that can help our members stop working 90 hours a week. Sarraile asked Senators to focus on the fact that this resolution would not put in place any upper limit on assigned time for research. It simply states that certain minimums are reasonable.

Doraz noted that in some CSU's, people are teaching 18 units. He thinks we should try and get more time for research than 3 units per year. We need to have reduced faculty teaching load. Some accommodations are made for doing more research than 6 units. He taught as much as 40 WTU's in a semester once. He would like there to be a "bank" but realizes that it is not going to be easy to make it happen. He suggested we propose that teaching 21 WTU's per year is sufficient and see if the President will turn it down.

Thompson voiced that the resolution should go to the President. At least we will get an answer. We should be able to get some details of her position.

John Carroll stated he tries to get people to use reason and emotion - he came here with promises he would never have to teach more than 3 courses. Teaching has taken its toll - people have literally given their lives to this institution. We need to bring CSU Stanislaus into the 21st century -- in 1992 we were promised reduced teaching load — a max of 9 WTU's - year after year we were told we could not do it because of budget problems. We have to go ahead and do it. We were in the 50th percentile in salaries once. But the load is much more important. We cannot keep good faculty if we don't make our workload reasonable.

Ferriz agreed that we need to have a better teaching load, but normally it is done at the expense of the senior faculty.

Karlstrom stated his thanks for others for coming - thinks we should allocate more for research - there are

perennial budget crises - it is kind of a red herring.

Doraz stated that the priority system one faculty member has is to do as much research as possible so when the time comes for RPT she can say "good-bye". Tom Gentry of the Psychology Department used to say - 'if you are that good, why are you still here?'

Provost Dauwalder asked that the document be reviewed more carefully so we can come up with something the President can support. He suggested it be carried over until Fall.

Question was called and the resolution passed with two no votes.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.