

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
November 9, 2004

PRESENT: Brown, Dauwalder, Davis, DeKatzew, Doraz, Estrella, Everett, Feldman, Filling, Gomez, Jaasma, Jacobs, Jensen, Johnson, Lawson, Mantz, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Sarraille, Schoenly, Senior, Stessman, Tan, Tavernier, Thomas, Thompson, Tynan, Weddle, Young

PROXIES: Peterson (Floyd), Thompson (Foreman), Tynan (Garcia), Noble (Morgan-Foster)

ABSENT: Sankey, Shipley

GUESTS: Boffman, Bunney-Sarhad, Demetrulias, Findley, Hughes, Klein, Pugh, Ruud, Schulz, Stephens, Stone, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

Procedure to Implement 9/AS/93/FAC,
REPORTED--TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO GF

ACE Review and Strategic Action Plan,
DISCUSSED

Vision Statement, **DISCUSSED-TO BE FIRST READING AT NEXT AS MEETING**

Divisional Excellence Initiatives/University Excellence Incentive Award, **DEFERRED TO NEXT AS MEETING**

16/AS/04/SEC–Resolution to Rescind
5/AS/98/FAC–Resolution on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, **APPROVED**

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, November 23, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:40 pm.
2. The agenda was approved as submitted.
3. The minutes of October 26, 2004, page 4, 4th paragraph to read "Nagel mentioned that the Subcommittee on Evaluation is considering that student evaluations". The minutes were approved as amended.

4. Announcements

1. The Speaker thanked Provost Dauwalder for providing refreshments.
2. Thursday, November 11, is a "White Day" (Veterans Day), so there are no classes.
3. Sarraille observed that the calendar shows the day before Thanksgiving as a white day. He asked if this was correct. Filling replied yes. Peterson stated that UEPC was able to add this as a white day because the academic workdays added up as equal.
4. The next AS meeting is November 23. At the conclusion of that meeting, a reception to honor those that received tenure and promotion will be held. Please encourage your colleagues to stop by and congratulate them.

5. Questions about reports

1. Nagel inquired about a reference in the Provost Report to "moving away from strict compliance of the 'forbidden four'." He asked what the 'forbidden four' are. The Provost replied that there are four classifications of students identified throughout the CSU that do not have a high priority for admissions. Pugh further explained that although they are qualified students, they just have a lower priority. They are 1) lower-division transfer students with less than 56 credits, 2) upper division students who have 56 credits but are deficient in one or some area, 3) second B.A. students, and 4) unclassified post-baccalaureate students. Thompson noted that when we are over enrollment targets, they are referred to as the forbidden four, but when we are under target, they are the forgiven four. Thompson thanked the Provost for giving Senators this information, adding that Enrollment Management seems to mean different things to different people; sometimes it's about the composition of the student body and other times a function of the budget. The Provost agreed, but noted that most discussions in the present context involve budget and numbers.

2. Mantz inquired who moderates ASNET; Thompson admitted it was he.

6. Information Items

a. Procedure to Implement 9/AS/93/FAC

Thompson explained that after asking for input at the last Senate meeting and conducting considerable consultation, SEC came to the conclusion that criteria for accepting an alternative evaluation instrument is in 9/AS/93/FAC, which states that, if specified in department elaborations and approved by the URPTC, an alternative instrument can be used in place of the IDEA. The only thing left is a procedure for proposing the alternative instrument. What came out of the discussions was a 6 step process, identified in the procedure. The major concern is protection of faculty if departments use an alternative evaluation instrument. Step three states that if you have an alternative instrument, the individual faculty member still has the option to use IDEA, but can also choose to use an alternative instrument, as long as it is in the department elaborations and approved by the URPTC. He further explained that the Academic Senate Office is not responsible for recording or compiling statistics and if a department form is used, the department is responsible for its reproduction. However, all evaluations will be turned into the Senate Office for storage until after the term's end, as IDEA is now.

Filling explained the two handouts 1) SATE instrument faculty requested and 2) Teaching Behavior Inventory. The latter is for information only. If faculty are interested in a compilation mechanism for number 2, please let him know and he will share it.

Filling stated that at this point the SEC did what the Ad Hoc Committee did not do and that is to create a

procedure for departments to adopt an alternative evaluation instrument, creating as much flexibility for departments and faculty as possible.

The procedure will be sent to the General Faculty, Deans, Department Chairs, URPTC and the Provost.

b. ACE Review and Strategic Action Plan (ACE Team, Bunney-Sarhad)

Linda Bunney-Sarhad, Director of Global Affairs, explained the Global Learning for All Project. She stated she wanted to bring her plan to AS because it's in the final stages and the Academic Senate will determine what is next. CSU Stanislaus was selected by the American Council on Education to participate in this study, the principal focus of which was to assess whether we provide a global education for all students, and not just for international students, or students participating in international studies. Bunney-Sarhad shared a number of statistics suggesting that despite the wide cultural richness of the area, students are at a substantial risk for neglecting this essential part of their education. The Global Learning for All project aims to rectify this situation by proposing Global Learning Goals broad enough to apply campus-wide.

Schulz presented the Global Learning Goals, to be incorporated campus-wide. These include four categories: Multiple Perspectives, Interdependence, Equity/Living Responsibly, and Sustainability. He would like AS to ask UEPC (and GE Subcommittee) to look at how the four areas could be guaranteed. Having disciplines look at their courses to insure the four areas would be included is one way, but the concerns are that there is no one class that ensures this awareness for all students, and a "cafeteria-style" menu of options often ensures that many students simply evade it. His concern is that students could walk away from here with a degree and never have a global perspective.

Peter Ping Li explained the New Vision and some ideas for action, tracing some "Salient Facts," and "Extant Assumptions," and suggesting a broadly defined common issue combined in "Emerging Perspectives Toward a New Value and Vision" to ensure that our curriculum matches our vision.

Doraz asked if this is an attempt to build a department made up of multidisciplinary teams from other nations and Bunney-Sarhad replied yes, that could be one approach. Doraz noted that he is already including a multidisciplinary perspective in his classes. Bunney-Sarhad replied that many faculty are doing it, but they have not been identified; part of the project is to emphasize what we are already doing, and encourage others to do more. Doraz stated that many publishers require globalization to be built into their textbooks.

Thompson referred to Li's handout on "Extant Assumptions," noting the use of 'we.' What does 'we' refer to. These are not the assumptions of faculty. Further, on the present AS agenda is a 'Vision of the University.' What is the connection of the two? Also Schulz mentioned GE Subcommittee. What is the connection to General Education?

Stone (last year's GE Sub Chair) replied that the GE Subcommittee tried last year to implement the Four Learning Goals, but then thought it might limit them to one GE Area, so right now the committee is in the process of studying a way of possibly reorganizing the goals to explicitly incorporate global learning into them. Stone asked Davis (current GE Sub Chair) if he could elaborate, but he could not at this time.

Feldman suggested that if they administered to the same students questions about California and the United States, he would expect no big difference. It is important to point out the general knowledge a person is

expected to have when they earn a BA. He stated this minimum knowledge should not merely be international, but should also apply to our own back yard Bunney-Sarhad stated global issues are different now than when she was in college. Now the picture is bigger than comparing one country to another country. Issues are international and extranational, including immigration patterns, health, etc., and these issues have local effects that need to be understood.

Regalado stated that the History Department is already doing this. He stated his support, but we only have so many staff that can do this. The Provost needs to be encouraged to hire additional staff and resources to do this. Bunney-Sarhad suggested using an infusion model like the faculty in the History Department have done and ask them to help. We have the expertise already, so we can infuse knowledge into our courses.

O'Neil asked what the next step was, where the ACE team would like this to go. Filling stated his understanding is that the ACE Project is simultaneously sitting at UEPC, GE Subcommittee and is headed to the ASL Subcommittee and returning to FBAC for exploration of how we can do the things Regalado suggested. It will then come back to the Academic Senate. This report starts the conversation.

Bunney-Sarhad advised that the survey is available for those that would like a copy. Just contact her.

c. Vision Statement (Boffman)

Boffman explained that the goal of the Visioning process was to articulate a vision for the University for 2010 and beyond that was widely inclusive. The Vision should be a statement that is short and pithy, but contains rich ambiguity in order to engage and motivate the reader simultaneously to learn about the past, discover the present, and to suggest possibilities for the future. A wide range of participants engaged in multiple activities over a year, including meetings, retreats, online discussions, a Vision Quest public forum, and a Vision Summit, at which the many themes emerging from these discussion were boiled down into the material for six "Core Values" and a "Vision Statement." Boffman then asked for AS endorsement of the Vision statement.

Filling explained that the Vision Statement represented an incredible effort on behalf of an extraordinary number of people. The question to endorse will be a first reading item at the next Senate meeting. Please send any input to Boffman.

Thompson asked how the Vision Statement works with the Mission Statement, the Strategic Plan and the Pathways to the Future document: how much overlap do they have, how do they work together, and why do we need a Vision Statement outside the Mission Statement and Strategic Plan? Boffman stated the Mission Statement clarifies our purpose and the Vision Statement describes who we want to be, where we are going. The Mission Statement clarifies our inspiration; the Vision and core values become the background for strategic planning.

Filling asked that Senators consult with their colleagues and come back in two weeks to discuss this as a first reading item.

d. Divisional Excellence Initiatives/University Excellence Incentive Award

Filling advised the President is still in the decision-making stages and it is premature to discuss this issue. It will be deferred until the next Senate meeting.

7. First Reading Item

a. 16/AS/04/SEC–Resolution to Rescind 5/AS/98/FAC–Resolution on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

It was MS Thompson/Petrosky

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate rescind 5/AS/98/FAC.

RATIONALE:

Per 5/AS/98/FAC, the campus adopted the Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (SATE) for administration jointly with the IDEA instrument during the 1998/99 academic year. The resolution also called for an Ad Hoc Committee to complete a reliability and validity study for the SATE instrument. The resolution further stated that by October 1999, the General Faculty would vote on which instrument to retain. This resolution was passed by the Academic Senate on April 28, 1998 and accepted by the President on May 26, 1998.

At the April 16, 2002 Academic Senate meeting, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee advised they were not able to read the data supplied by IDEA for the reliability and validity study and hence could not complete the study. At the April 30, 2002 Academic Senate meeting it was recommended that another Ad Hoc Committee be formed to resolve the IDEA/SATE controversy. After much discussion at the May 7, 2002 SEC meeting, it was decided instead to form an Ad Hoc Committee to work on procedures to allow departments to adopt alternative instruments for use in RPT. At the February 25, 2003 Academic Senate meeting the Ad Hoc Committee presented its report which consisted of: looking at the IDEA instrument, looking at alternative instruments, surveying other CSU's, asking for input from department chairs here and trying to come up with ideas of what to do relative to this instrument. The Ad Hoc Committee did not fulfill its charge to develop procedures to be used so a department could use an alternative instrument.

At the October 19, 2004 SEC meeting, it was decided that this issue be brought to the Academic Senate for a broader discussion. At the October 26, 2004 Academic Senate meeting, there was much discussion about the use of IDEA, whether IDEA is the appropriate instrument for use in RPT decisions, the frustration of not having a procedure in place if a department would like to use an alternative instrument and it was asserted that having multiple evaluation instruments would not create a burden on the URPTC or Provost. Based on these discussions, the SEC developed a procedure to implement 9/AS/93/FAC.

Since procedures have been brought forth to implement 9/AS/93/FAC which allows departments to use their own alternative evaluation form, one alternative obviously being the SATE instrument, it is no longer necessary to have a faculty vote choosing between IDEA and SATE.

Discussion:

Thompson stated that the issues raised by Weikart and others over email are valid issues. But, the resolution stated that we would run SATE along with IDEA. IDEA would take the information and compare it for validity. More than one committee tried to do this, but the problem was they could not get readable information from IDEA, so they could not do it. The idea of voting to replace IDEA with SATE as campus wide instrument was contingent on this validity study. That is why we did not vote.

Tan asked for clarification about the validity and reliability study. Thompson explained it was to take a selection of questions of SATE and IDEA that were comparable and compare to gauge the validity comparatively and that never happened, due to a lack of data from IDEA.

Filling stated that SEC's point of rescinding the resolution is that we now have procedures in place enabling departments to use any instrument they want, so there's no reason to vote on what instrument to use.

Peterson questioned if we need a resolution to remove a resolution and Filling replied yes, 5/AS/98 was voted on by the Academic Senate and approved by the President.

It was MS Tynan/Doraz to waive the rules and go to a second reading.

Nagel stated there is some controversy in his department to putting SATE and IDEA to a vote, so he would oppose waiving the rules.

Vote to waive the rules passed by voice.

There being no further discussion, vote to rescind 5/AS/98/FAC passed by voice, with one abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.