

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

February 22, 2005

Present: Brown, Dauwalder, Davis, deKatzew, Doraz, Estrella, Feldman, Filling, Foreman, Garcia, Jaasma, Jacobs, Jensen, Johnson, Lawson, Mantz, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Schoenly, Senior, Stessman, Thomas, Thompson, Tynan, Young, Zarling

Absent: Gomez, Nelson, Sankey, Shipley, Tan, Tavernier

Proxies: Sutherland (Everett), Peterson (Floyd), Thomas (Weddle)

Guests: DeCaro, Demetrulias, R. Johnson, Manoharan, Sarraile, Stephens, Wagner, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

3/AS/05/COC – ACIP Representative, APPROVED

1/AS/05/FAC – Amendment to GFC V.2.0, APPROVED

2/AS/05/UEPC – Amendment to GFC VI.2.0, APPROVED

4/AS/05/UEPC – Editorial Changes for Student Academic Policies in Faculty Handbook, FIRST READING

5/AS/05/UEPC – Faculty Computer Replacement Policy, FIRST READING

6/AS/05/UEPC – Policy/Procedures for Scheduling TV Classrooms, FIRST READING

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, MARCH 8, 2005
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to Order at 2.40pm.

2. Agenda approved.

3. Minutes of January 25, 2005, p. 3: 3rd ¶, Sentence beginning "The Department of Accounting and Finance was not consulted," should read, "Few people in the Department of Accounting and Finance were consulted, and the Department as a whole was not provided the opportunity to consider the initiative before it was announced." Minutes were approved as amended.

4. Announcements

Speaker Filling announced that finalists have been identified in the Presidential Search; these were announced yesterday (2/21/05) in the Modesto Bee. Abbreviated resumes can be accessed on the CSU System website; full versions will be made available in the library and the AS office. Take advantage of this opportunity to get to know them. Open forums will occur 3.45-4.45pm, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, March 8-10. Please attend, and encourage colleagues and students to do so as well. The campus advisory committee's members, Steve Filling, Fred Hilpert, Mark Thompson, Chessie Robbins, and Jane Rogers will do their best to convey campus wishes to the Chancellor.

Filling passed around the most recent ASI newsletter for Senators review.

The Vision Statement was scheduled to be discussed in the Academic Senate on March 8, but conflicts with Presidential candidate visit. Has been rescheduled to the March 22 Academic Senate meeting; please try to attend to discuss vision and long range goals. Filling has invited students, and members of the Vision Committee will be here to hear what faculty have to say.

O'Brien announced that the Executive Summary for SWAS Legislature Day available, along with other documents.

Morgan-Foster announced that AASCU will be here on March 1-3 to study our best practices in retention. A number of meetings have been planned; schedule and study protocol will be sent to Bowman for dissemination to ASNET.

Sarraille announced conclusion of George Diehr's presentation on proposed changes to CALPERS, etc. Email will come out for copy of presentation. Filling also thanked Diehr for coming out here to let us know what we can do to respond to the Governor's challenge.

5. Questions about reports

None.

6. Consent Item

a) 3/AS/05/COC—ACIP Representative

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommends that Kofi Akwabi-Ameyaw be appointed as campus representative to the Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP) effective July 2005 through July 2008.

Rationale: The Committee on Committees feels that Kofi Akwabi-Ameyaw's previous experience as campus representative on the ACIP and his demonstrated interest in and commitment to international/intercultural programs make him an excellent choice for this position.

Filling introduced by saying the CSUS system has a fairly large international presence. The process is that we suggest to the Chancellor a person to be our campus representative. That person serves three years, and is eligible for two terms overall. Professor Kofi Akwabi-Ameyaw served Bob Anderson's remainder, and is thus eligible for another term. SEC and COC have forwarded his name for consideration.

No discussion. Consent by acclamation. Dr. Kofi Akwabi-Ameyaw's name will be forwarded to the Chancellor.

7. Action Items

a) 1/AS/05/FAC—Amendment to GFC V.2.0

Amendment to provide for a Lecturer Representative to the Academic Senate.

No discussion. Passed unanimously. This will now go to a General Faculty vote.

b) 2/AS/05/UEPC—Amendment to GFC VI.2.0

Amendment to remove mentions of APR subcommittee, etc.

No discussion. Passed unanimously. This will now go to a General Faculty vote.

8. First Reading Items

a) 4/AS/05/UEPC—Editorial Changes for Student Academic Policies in Faculty Handbook

It was MS Peterson/Jaasma:

RESOLVED: That the attached editorial changes be approved and incorporated into the Faculty Handbook; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these changes take effect upon approval by the General Faculty and the President.

RATIONALE: The duties of the University Educational Policies Committee include the charge to consult with and recommend to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs in the interpretation of the University's undergraduate curricular and instructional policies. In fulfillment of this charge, and in an effort to coordinate efforts of Enrollment Services, Student Academic Policies, and the Faculty Handbook, the UEPC desires to update and correct the Student Academic Policies as outlined in the attached. The UEPC has reviewed the recommended changes to the attached Student Academic Policies for the Faculty Handbook and have found that the recommended revisions are editorial/grammatical in nature and is forwarding these revisions to the Academic Senate as policy changes so that they may now be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

Discussion:

Peterson introduced the resolution as a series of editorial changes needed for the student resources section of the Faculty Handbook.

Feldman suggested a change to p.18, 120 units instead of 124 units.

Schoenly asked why there is no A+. Zarling explained that A+ is an overstatement, redundant. Thompson

recalled that during discussions when the campus changed to +/- grading, that A+ does not exist in the CSU system. Feldman recalled that the proposed shift to +/- grading produced a fear of grade inflation.

Peterson will take the above recommendation back to UEPC for revision before second reading.

**b) 5/AS/05/UEPC—Faculty Computer Replacement Policy
It was MS Peterson/Doraz:**

RESOLVED: That the University immediately prioritize and allocate, as stated in the Academic Technology Plan (7/AS/03/UEPC), \$150,000 annually for the purchase of new computers for faculty, and be it further

RESOLVED: That this allotment be facilitated by a system through which faculty can obtain new computers on a three (3) year cycle, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the provision of resources for this endeavor become a mandated part of the regular annual budgeting process and that non-utilized funds should roll back to the departments and colleges for use at their discretion.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus endorsed the Academic Technology Plan on April 8, 2003 (7/AS/03/UEPC). The University President approved the plan on May 8, 2003. The Academic Technology Plan, despite approval, has yet to be fully implemented. One of the high priority items listed in the Plan was to implement a system through which faculty can obtain new computers on a three-year cycle. Not only do faculty need computers in their offices, but the computers must be current enough to run software that faculty need to meet instructional and research requirements. Computer replacements every three years seems, at the moment, an acceptable timeframe with which to meet these needs.

The provision of resources for this high priority item of the Academic Technology Plan, which needs to become part of the regular budget in the next budgeting cycle, is also consistent with the Mission of the University, which claims that "we promote academic excellence in the teaching and scholarly activities of our faculty." In order to complete necessary teaching duties and increase research and scholarship expectations, it is essential that faculty have current, up-to-date technology at their disposal.

Discussion:

Peterson noted that the Academic Technology Plan passed, UEPC consulted with FBAC, and it seemed like a basic idea to support what the Academic Technology Plan means to support.

Manoharan stated that she had brought to UEPC notice two reservations to be considered here. First is the question of dissemination. Earlier technology plan had a means for dissemination. Second is a resource question. At other CSUs, they have given people resources to do installations, and maintenance. OIT does not have resources to accommodate the load this increase will cause. These reservations were acknowledged by UEPC chair, and will be taken back to UEPC.

Dauwalder reported that the President has concerns, not with the concept of supporting faculty with computers, but with the particular points of the resolution. Resolving that X amount of dollars be put in circumvents the university wide budgeting process. Senate's role is to advise, but not specifically to allocate.

We do recognize we don't know the specific extent to which elements of the technology plan have been completed, certainly not all of the plan is done. There have been purchases on an annual basis, and these seem to be uneven from college to college. Also, the resolution doesn't allow consideration of the extent to which this element of the technology plan takes precedence over other elements. He supported Manoharan's point. Finally, the President is not inclined to sign policy that will tie the hands of an incoming president. Format of resolution is not appropriate at this point. But, the concept of the Academic Senate supporting a three year replacement schedule is appropriate.

Zarling asked if anyone has a sense of how many units per year would be needed. How can we calculate how much per computer? There are low end computers that may be less powerful and useful than what one already has. It might also give us a partial answer if money is available for installation.

Thompson followed up with the provost's comments by asking for clarification that the extent to which meeting goals for ATP has not been determined. Dauwalder confirmed. Thompson continued by asking whether that left open the possibility that goals are already being met, and that we don't need the resolution?

Dauwalder clarified that he didn't think we are meeting the plan in full. Different elements are being met in varying degrees. The plan affects decisions across campus. OIT has been a part of the recent budget reductions, but not as heavily as some other units. In response to Zarling's question about how many we'd need, he asked for a current count. We'd need 260 at this point, including librarians, not counting FERPS.

O'Brien spoke to the Provost's points, they have some merit. Can we do some type of assessment to see where we are, how much we need. He also suggested that we express the need as a percentage of the budget, rather than a fixed dollar amount

Feldman pointed out that he may not want his computer replaced, especially if expected to get an inferior replacement, and he didn't want necessarily to be tracked into a 3 year cycle. Finally, he suggested that block buying would be a more effective use of funds.

Peterson clarified that the resolution doesn't say we MUST replace. Faculty would still have to do a request and say why you want it. You'd simply be eligible for an upgrade.

Dauwalder added that we need also to know how closely we are to the goal of replacing units on a three year basis. Except for Louis. Also, a large number of other elements under that plan, we should assess the whole plan and incorporate the plan into the budget. However, he conceded his major problem is a procedural one.

Sarraille asked how we make that assessment. We have inventory control, what information do we have? Which computers do people have? He added that we're a lot better about drawing up plans than getting done. If you want to get this done, get fired up and make somebody do something.

O'Brien suggested a practical aspect, perhaps by going through chairs/departments, sent to some entity that could compile the data. He added we should be careful about wishing for something, and repeated his recommendation for using a percentage of the budget, rather than a dollar amount, which gives us more wiggle room.

Manoharan spoke about inventory. We do a survey every year for the Chancellor's Office. It's difficult for

me to get reliable information; I'm never able to fully report. It's nice to get the support of this body in simply getting a real inventory. Filling interposed that AS would likely support that endeavor.

Oppenheim suggested that a much smaller amount goes into technology than is the case in other CSUs. A useful study would be to compare how much as percentage of the budget we use and compare to other schools close to us in size. If that ratio is out of kilter, maybe we should rectify it. Unless we know what the numbers are, it's hard to say we're doing a good or bad job. Need more information. At the same time, he supported the move to a percentage figure.

Thompson suggested that much of the objection to the resolved clauses could be dealt with by rewriting them to say the AS urges that this happen, put in the form of a request. If this weren't acceptable, it would be hard to say what AS could contribute to planning, as we would always be seen as circumventing. Different committees can have different priorities; AS is not doing anything incorrect by identifying our priorities. Lastly, this says we prioritize and allocate; it doesn't say we spend on something we don't need, only that we encumber the money.

Oppenheim suggested that when Presidential candidates come, we can ask what percent of the budget goes to technology at their school. If the candidate is firmly in favor, or if they have no clue, this might be something we should find out now.

Doraz, supporting Manoharan, referred to a physical inventory to designate physical location of everything. What file did that go into? VPBF Stephens indicated that the inventory places a piece of equipment within a department, in a room, but it's not directly connected to any faculty associated with any particular room.

Dauwalder asked the body to consider the policy in terms of a three year schedule, rather than specific dollars. He also reported asking for expenditure reports from the colleges. Specific details need more investigating, but his data suggest a disparity between the colleges, but also between what is budgeted for, and what actual expenditures are, for computer and technology. There is variability from college to college, but funds are going in there. He concluded by repeating that he would certainly support the body saying that a replacement schedule should be high priority.

Zarling remarked that faculty computers are not the only aspect of ATP not being implemented, and asked how this resolution came about, and why it was that faculty computers needed such urgent address. Manoharan replied that the AT Subcommittee wanted to take two elements from the ATP this year and emphasize them: Support for BlackBoard and this. The issue was deferred last year and bumped to this one. Zarling continued, asking if there were people reporting serious problems, and a history of no response, and wondered further why this issue was bigger than funding of infrastructure or technical support.

Doraz claimed his computer was seven years old, and he doesn't care. He then reminded the body that last Fall, he had recommended diverting money from the Excellence Initiative" into a new server for OIT. Johnson said she thought part of the current emphasis was a feeling of inequity across the colleges. Manoharan confessed her computer was four years old, and she was not complaining.

Schoenly stated that with faculty using computers as accomplished web masters, and professional societies using them, expansion of PowerPoint for classroom use, rapid expansion of computer modeling, the role of the desktop for faculty has expanded greatly in recent years. Stessman added that her computer was good for MSWord, and Excel, but she also needs it for calculations, in particular one to accommodate new modeling

software. She expressed surprise at what the Provost reported about giving money to colleges for academic technology and wondered how the money was allocated, and finally asked if the priority for this plan would be for new faculty computers or replacement computers, and declared her support for a three year cycle, conceding that some people may not need it.

Myers reminded the body that most new computer warranties top off at three years; after that, if you have a catastrophic failure, the department gets the bill. A three year cycle would thus make sense if only to protect ourselves from repair bills.

AVPFA Wendt spoke to the difficulty of getting hard and fast numbers, as a lot of payments are dispersed and decentralized. For example, new faculty computers go through the office of Faculty Affairs. He confessed to having a seven-year-old loaner from IT. HE also spoke to the issue of variance, noting that some faculty have a huge need, some have little or no need. He suggested rather than create a huge policy that fixes one number and cycle, that we first need to know who needs a computer. If you need one, raise your hand. Figure out the costs, rather than pick a figure.

Johnson suggested that the wording of the resolution could use work, but the spirit of it now puts faculty in a position to say, I don't need it, rather than prove why you need it. The presumption is that faculty need adequate resources.

O'Brien underscored Schoenly's point, noting a lot of diversity in usage. He also suggested decentralizing funds to the department, which knows who needs things, rather than the third floor, who usually doesn't.

Sarraille suggested that one of the reasons for a regular time-frame was to protect the organization both from users who would insist loudly on a new computer every year, and others who would not be inclined to put themselves forward at all. It's common for large organizations to have a regular plan, and the time frame can be adjusted.

Nagel questioned the ATP phrasing, and suggested it would be helpful to senators to have the relevant text from the ATP, so we can make a properly informed decision.

Thomas suggested the last sentence of rationale had a typo, and should read "In order to complete necessary teaching duties and TO MEET increased research and scholarship expectations, it is essential that...."

Thompson claimed his cob-webbed computer was fifteen years old. Petrosky claimed that English never changes. Thompson also asked to keep in mind that the idea of three year replacement cycle came from our own Academic Technology Plan, from the AT Subcommittee, and UEPC.

Comments will be directed to UEPC for revisions to resolution before second reading.

**c) 6/AS/05/UEPC—Policy/Procedures for Scheduling TV Classrooms
It was MS Peterson/Jaasma**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus adopt the attached policy and procedures document to establish a coordinated effort to give students the opportunity to access required courses and facilitate progress toward their degree without unreasonable delays.

RATIONALE: Given the need for a coordinated effort with regards to scheduling television/distance learning classrooms, the University Educational Policies Committee, in collaboration with the Off-Campus/Mediated/Distance Learning Subcommittee has addressed these concerns in the attached policy and procedures.

Without some assurance that systematic programmatic needs will be considered (or here: systematically), departments and faculty will be reluctant to offer programs that rely heavily on distance learning, some general education courses will not be offered regularly, and only a smattering of unrelated courses will likely predominate.

Discussion:

Peterson introduced the resolution as promoting coordination between Enrollment Services and the Mediated and Distance Learning Office Faculty need to get the classroom we need.

Jaasma explained that departments teaching regularly on ITV had problems with coordination. Room scheduling on campus is done prior to ITV scheduling. If one didn't get a class on TV, there were no more rooms on campus, and thus no class at all. This way we schedule all them at the same time, in the same review cycle, from the Dean to ES.

Dauwalder asked the extent to which the Deans and Enrollment Services had been consulted. Peterson conceded that not all the Deans had been consulted. DeCaro, Chair of the Off-Campus Mediated and Distance Learning Subcommittee claimed that AVPES Pugh had been regularly consulted. Jaasma added that ADALS Boffman was in on it from the start.

Mantz questioned what "unreasonable delays" in the first resolved clause was construed to mean. The idea seemed to be to streamline things to support faculty ability to provide classes, and the phrasing here might be construed to work against that support. Peterson explained that the idea was that if you don't do a course consistently, students are faced with a decision: take the course later or don't do distance education. Either option can produce unreasonable delays. Mantz clarified his point, that the language seemed to suggest that all major courses should be offered in this way, and suggested adding or substituting language about "streamlined procedures" in its place. Peterson replied they would consider the change.

Jaasma added that some departments offer whole majors at Stockton, this was done primarily to support them. DeCaro added that last Fall, Communications couldn't get one of their courses up in Stockton, because COB "owned certain days and times," and they couldn't break into the schedule, or even work around it. This defeats the purpose of Distance Education. The resolution says we're going to prioritize in scheduling, and not by college. Six weeks prior to schedule going to print, we will all know what's there and what's available. This will streamline the process.

O'Brien asked how this procedure would keep the system dynamic. If days/times are locked into a schedule, does that not impede the development of new programs? DeCaro explained that the initial schedule would be up to Norm Wagner, Director of the Mediated and Distance Learning Office, and all requests go to him. He makes decision and works with Pugh's office to coordinate, then confirm. Jaasma advised that priority at Stockton will have to be matched with other programs.

Sarraille pointed out that we're not doing enough to create enough capacity in classes and classrooms. One

can't operate things at 100% capacity; it's inefficient; we need to do something about expanding if we can't find rooms to schedule classes.

Wagner held up a piece of paper with visibly large grey areas, and claimed these were the unused times in the schedule. He claimed this shows there is lots of capacity, actually, but the scheduling needs to be more coordinated.

Regalado asked whether this would demand that each semester each chair has to write a formal argument for a course to get offered at a particular slot. DeCaro replied that department chairs would forward requests to Pugh and to Wagner at the same time. Regalado pursued, asking if a small department, such as History, gets a good response from students because of a predictable schedule, how could they compete with a large department offering a very large class?

Jaasma added that rooms aren't always used for Distance Education. But if they don't get used, they get used for on-campus courses. The new procedure will open up some more rooms.

Feldman offered a revision for the final line on p. 28, under Criteria for Scheduling, II.A., that the clause "allocate at least twenty percent of the enrollments to Stockton," might better be phrased as "give a twenty percent initial priority to Stockton students." The priority shouldn't inhibit Turlock or other students from enrolling if Stockton students do not.

Oppenheim remarked that the prioritization here is the same as we've had for years: departments that offer complete majors, then GE courses, then others. We used to struggle over the CODEC room: Business used to use it all the time, back to back in either one of the rooms. Wagner's chart indicates we're low on TR mornings: Nursing used to use them all the time at that time. If we're not using them, we're not doing the job we used to do to get people to use the system. The other thing is the idea of allocating a specific number of spots to Stockton. We used to have a maximum number of students in a course, say 25, then we'd have 15 in Turlock and 10 in Stockton. The numbers were wrong for the room, which makes students upset, which upsets the curriculum. We want to maximize enrollment, if we force enrollment low, we can't do that.

Wagner pointed out that it's not a problem with faculty not wanting to offer courses; the problem is they all want to do it Tuesday evening, and no one ever goes back and asks how about Wednesday or Thursday? It's really a coordination issue.

The resolution will be sent back to UEPC for adjustments before a second reading.

9. Discussion Item

a) Facilities: Enabling What We Value (continued)

Deferred.

10. Adjourned at 4.10pm