

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
November 23, 2004

PRESENT: Brown, Davis, DeKatzew, Doraz, Feldman, Filling, Floyd, Garcia, Jaasma, Jacobs, Jensen, Johnson, Lawson, Mantz, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, Oppenheim, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Sarraille, Schoenly, Shipley, Stessman, Tan, Thomas, Thompson, Tynan, Young

PROXIES: Demetrulias (Dauwalder), Thompson (Foreman)

ABSENT: Estrella, Gomez, Morgan-Foster, O'Brien, Sankey, Senior, Tavernier, Weddle

GUESTS: J. Klein, A. Schulz, M. Stephens, R. VanderMolen, T. Wendt

17/AS/04/SEC--Commendation for Ron VanderMolen, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

18/AS/04/SEC--Renomination of Kathleen E. Kaiser, FIRST READING

13/AS/04/UEPC--CVHEC Transfer Associate Degree Proposal, FIRST READING

19/AS/04/USPSC--Vision Statement/University Values, FIRST READING

Divisional Excellence Initiatives/University Excellence Incentive Award, CARRIED OVER

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, December 7, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to order at 2.41pm.
2. Agenda was approved as submitted.
3. Minutes of 11/9/04 were amended as follows: page 4, 6th full ¶, the wild distortion beginning, "It is important to point out," should read, "Global learning should be considered in the context of what general knowledge we consider a person to have as part of a BA." Page 6, 2nd ¶ after "Discussion," delete "that were comparable and compare." Minutes were approved as amended.

4. Announcements:

Speaker Filling thanked the Provost for providing refreshments.

Immediately following the meeting, there will be a reception here for all faculty granted tenure and promotion as of September 1, 2004, sponsored by the Faculty Development Committee and the California Faculty Association.

5. Questions on Reports:

Speaker Filling reviewed the Provost's report on Summer 05, noting that the term will be under YRO rules and on state support, which means that the FTES will be counted in program totals and that 10-month faculty teaching the term will be paid at 1/30 of their salary per WTU. The Speaker recommended review and consultation with faculty colleagues for further discussion.

6. Consent Items:

a. 17/AS/04/SEC–Commendation for Ron VanderMolen

It was M/S Oppenheim/Regalado, on behalf of the Department of History, the Senate Executive Committee and the Emeritus Faculty Association,

WHEREAS, Ron VanderMolen has served CSU, Stanislaus with distinction since 1969; and

WHEREAS, Ron VanderMolen has displayed high academic standards and excellence in his teaching and scholarship; and

WHEREAS, Ron VanderMolen has unflaggingly shown his support for a central pillar of the Academy, namely the Stanislaus State library; and

WHEREAS, Ron VanderMolen has held numerous positions with the Department of History, including seven years as Department head, the longest tenure in the Department's history; and

WHEREAS, the General Faculty has elected Ron VanderMolen to numerous positions of trust over the years, including the position of Speaker of the Faculty in 1991/92; and

WHEREAS, Ron VanderMolen will complete his status as a member of the Faculty Early Retirement Program in December, 2004; therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus extends to Ron VanderMolen its thanks, appreciation, and respect for his work as a member of the CSU faculty since 1969; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate, on behalf of the entire campus, wishes Ron VanderMolen many years of health and happiness, and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus bestow on Professor VanderMolen the title

Custos Historiae, Amicus Senatus.

A spontaneous standing ovation indicated unanimous approval.

In his remarks, VanderMolen thanked the Senate, and offered two stories for contemplation. In one, a Chancellor who had just received a vote of no confidence attended an AS meeting. After his remarks, he asked if there were any questions. A senior professor of History interjected, "When are you going to get out of here?" In the second, VanderMolen offered the proper answer to the young faculty who asks, "What do I do here?" "Whatever faculty tell you. It's a medieval idea," he concluded, "but keep it up."

b. 18/AS/04/SEC–Renomination of Kathleen E. Kaiser as CSU Faculty Trustee

It was M/S Thompson/Floyd,

WHEREAS, Professor Kathleen E. Kaiser has been an honored faculty colleague for the last 32 years at California State University, Chico and has been recognized for her outstanding teaching and advising, successful grant writing and scholarly activities, and her remarkable record of service to students and faculty; and.

WHEREAS, Professor Kaiser has long been dedicated to the principles of shared governance and academic excellence as reflected in her fifteen years of service to the CSU, Chico Academic Senate and her twelve years of service on the Academic Senate, CSU; and

WHEREAS, Professor Kaiser has served in significant Systemwide leadership positions and developed a broad knowledge of California's system of higher education through her participation on the Executive Committee of the ASCSU, the GE Breadth Committee, on which she served as chair, the Academic Affairs Committee, on which she served as vice chair, and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates where she worked with colleagues from the University of California and the California Community Colleges in developing intersegmental transfer and articulation programs in the state; and

WHEREAS, Professor Kaiser has demonstrated time and again that she is a dedicated and trustworthy colleague who has the ability to articulate and represent the faculty's perspective in shared governance but recognizes, understands and values the necessity to work collegially and constructively with other bodies who have also been entrusted to carry out the Master Plan for Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Professor Kaiser in her first year of service as Faculty Trustee visited 14 campuses, attended 9 graduations, was the first trustee to accompany the CSU Maritime Academy's T.S. Golden Bear on cruise, including presiding at the 'at-sea' graduation, serves on four BOT committees and as a CPEC alternate, and was recognized by CSSA as the Outstanding Trustee of the Year in 2004; and

WHEREAS, Faculty Trustee Kaiser has been an effective voice for students, faculty and staff on the Board of Trustees and has become a respected force on the board that should be continued for another term; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus supports the renomination of Professor Kathleen E. Kaiser for the position of California State University Faculty Trustee.

Sarraille raised two issues. The first was a concern about Kaiser's reputed inaction during the Board of Trustees vote to raise student fees and to approve the Chancellor's request to effectively make the compact floor the ceiling as well. Trustee Kaiser did not speak against either action. The second was that this issue is better treated as an action item, with deliberate discussion and reflection about issues and other possible candidates, rather than a consent item.

It was M/S Thompson/Johnson to move the item to First Reading. Motion approved without dissent.

Discussion:

Myers asked whether there were other candidates, or whether the position was uncontested. Filling indicated he was unaware of any other candidate. Oppenheim asked what the selection process was. Thompson replied that a nominating committee takes a slate of candidates to SWAS, who vote up two candidates to the Governor, who then makes the appointment.

Feldman asked for a statement from Kaiser, specifically addressing what issues she feels are crucial to the CSU, and what intentions she has about them. This would give us all a better sense of her philosophy and what she would like to accomplish, and if we approve them, we empower her agenda.

AVPFA Wendt spoke of knowing Kaiser as a faculty colleague for 24 years, and respects and admires her as a strong and articulate faculty advocate, and as someone who will pick her own battles.

Doraz asked if it were possible to get a voting record, and whether the candidate philosophy could include responses to issues we're concerned about.

Oppenheim noted that we're making this awfully complicated. This is a lot of research someone has to do, and will undoubtedly uncover things that someone will dislike. SEC approves her as a strong faculty advocate; let's not let this get us into a morass.

Regalado asked what the time frame was; Filling replied the end of the calendar year, and added the discussion would be worth it, if we can make it in time.

The stillness of senate contemplation of this last distressing bit of news was suddenly interrupted by the startling mechanical intrusion of a cell phone's ring.

Filling will get the following information for the next meeting, if it exists: statement of Kaiser's philosophy and stand on issues, past voting record, and whether other nominees have been named.

7. First Reading Items

a. 13/AS/04/UEPC–CVHEC Transfer Associate Degree Proposal

It was M/S Floyd/Peterson,

Be it resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus accepts the positive recommendation of the

University Educational Policies Committee and expresses its support for the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium Transfer Associate Degree Proposal; and be it further

Resolved: That the effects of this proposal on CSU Stanislaus enrollment management be reviewed annually, and that CSU Stanislaus maintain the right to terminate the agreement with adequate notice to students and parties to the agreement.

Rationale for Resolution:

The intent of the proposal is to facilitate preparation of students transferring from one of the CVHEC Region V California Community Colleges [Bakersfield CC, College of the Sequoias, Cerro Cosa CC, Columbia CC, Fresno City College, Merced JC, Modesto JC, Porterville JC, Reedley JC, San Joaquin Delta JC, Taft JC, West Hills College]. The proposal specifies that proper completion of one of the two options for Transfer Associate Degree will provide students with guaranteed admission to the universities party to the agreement [CSU Bakersfield, CSU Fresno, CSU Stanislaus, Fresno Pacific University, UC Merced or University of the Pacific. Importantly, the proposal stipulates that admission is not guaranteed to impacted programs.

This proposal streamlines the course unit transfer process for participating students, and allows them to effectively and efficiently prepare for university while earning an Associate Degree at their community college. The proposal has been reviewed by and is recommended by CSU Stanislaus SEM, UEPC, and Academic Affairs.

Floyd advised that this issue was here last year and approved, and is back due to a renegotiation of the minimum GPA in Option Two (raised to 2.40, from 2.00). Peterson added that it was a modest improvement; the idea still is to guarantee admission if the student performs certain things.

Feldman asked if the guarantee of transfer student placement would put us into a situation where we deny incoming first-year students. VP Stephens reported that the CSU's first obligation is to qualified transfers, regardless. This won't affect that.

Thompson asked about the process, specifically about the duration a student must be in the program to qualify. Floyd recalled a procedure with both paperwork and advising. Filling pointed out that the file date indicates the current semester, with specific course content involved. Peterson added that they have to go through counseling; the program is designed to be encouraging to students moving through the AA process: if you go through and receive the AA with the GPA minimum, you will be eligible for transfer.

Nagel asked what the difference was between normal acceptance of qualified transfers and this guarantee, and there was further discussion about the purported rationale of the program, until Peterson pointed out that the program is already approved, the only item under discussion is UEPC's raising the minimum GPA to 2.40.

Item will be back for action next meeting.

b. 19/AS/04/USPSC–Vision Statement/University Values

It was M/S Petrosky/Floyd

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the campus vision and core values developed from the inclusive visioning process conducted in 2003-2004 as presented by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

RATIONALE:

The University focused on creating a vision statement and clarifying our core values in 2003-2004. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee and the Visioning Subcommittee oversaw a very inclusive process which gathered input from the internal and external campus community. Over 500 members of the campus community participated including students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni and community members. The mission, vision, and core values will be used to guide the university in the coming years.

Campus members participated in many open exchanges to share their educational values and thoughts about the past, present and future of the University to create the vision. The collected information was reviewed by the Visioning Subcommittee to identify emerging themes. Six general themes and supporting ideas were identified from the rich contributions in preparation for the next cycle of campus review. Students, staff and faculty gathered to review and provide additional input on the six themes in two open sessions held at the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center and on the campus quad.

Lastly, the Visioning Summit, facilitated by Dr. April Hejka-Ekins and Dr. Gene Murti, was conducted in May to create the vision statement and define our core values. Representatives from all areas of the campus, alumni, and members of the external community enthusiastically engaged in exchange about the final themes. Participants reviewed the themes to create the vision statement and core values. The Visioning Subcommittee developed a final draft based on the summit recommendations.

Vision Statement

We engage and develop inspired, knowledgeable and responsible citizens of an evolving and interconnected world.

University Values

In order to achieve our mission and vision:

- We inspire students to demand more of self than they do of others, to attain new knowledge and challenge assumptions. We expect students to be fully engaged, responsible citizens with the ethics, knowledge, skills and desire to improve self and community.
- We value learning that encompasses lifelong exploration and discovery through intellectual integrity, personal responsibility, and global and self-awareness, grounded in individual student-faculty interactions.
- We are a student centered community committed to a diverse, caring, learning focused environment that fosters collegial, reflective, and open exchange of ideas.
- We, as faculty, elicit, nurture and enhance the different voices of our selves, students, and communities

through deliberate engagement, continual discovery and ongoing transformation.

▫ We, as staff and administrators, contribute to the learning environment by demonstrating the knowledge, skills and values that serve and support the University's mission.

▫ We are a center of learning, intellectual pursuit and cultural engagement. We serve our students, communities and state by creating programs, interactions and partnerships that respond to the region's diverse needs.

Discussion:

Boffman noted that the movement is different from an early draft distributed for discussion; new language revises for clarity.

Thompson asked about the import of the Vision and Values statements; specifically, what would this enable us to do, and what are we unable to do without it. Boffman replied that the SPSC initiated a new five year review cycle, as part of which they reviewed various documents and goals. In going forward with the new cycle, they needed a vision for this and a process for future cycles. Boffman also noted the widely inclusive nature of the visioning process, and the multiple opportunities to articulate where we wanted to go.

Nagel asked whether departments were beholden to the statement, and if so, how one would show compliance. VP Stephens replied that the statement was not prescriptive for activities, and added that in large organizations, this kind of overall communication was essential. These documents provide cohesiveness to the organization. The Mission Statement is short, but meaningful; the Vision is more inspirational, the values remind us of what we want to live and work for. Seems high-minded, but large organizations need common language to keep the parts together. Regalado asked Stephens to confirm whether departments were bound to the document. Stephens relied that the purpose of this was not to tell faculty how to teach, that this was reflected in five year reviews at a much higher level.

Kim asked whether the values could be grouped by constituency: a different set of values for faculty, students, staff, admin, etc. Peterson objected, pointing out that the document is meant to articulate a common set of values, a common vision. Johnson pointed out that discussion should be limited to the endorsement or no of the statement, and not trying to tinker with it. Thompson agreed, saying no change to the statement is contemplated.

Nagel pointed out that some faculty may be suspicious of openly ambiguous language. Thompson asked about the idea behind the repeated use of the word "engagement" in the statement. Boffman elaborated on engagement in the learning process by faculty, students, and other members of the campus community. Doraz offered no objection, and asked the body to vote and move on with it.

Brown asked if there was any effort to incorporate a local flavor into the Vision and Values. Boffman responded that serving the Valley was the whole point, but that the way we serve the Valley was in serving the interconnected world. Brown asked if this suggested we cater to the world. Stephens responded that our students become responsible students of the world.

Garcia asked what future decisions were contingent on the Vision. Stephens suggested it would influence

the selection of faculty, the level and kind of research done here, as well as curricular options.

Regalado asked whether, with a new President, there wouldn't be a new Vision. Nelson complained that he still didn't get it. If the entire world knows the CSU as a teaching-oriented institution, isn't this like affirming the sky as blue? There's nothing really here, other than advertising copy. Boffman pointed out that the Strategic Plan is guided by this Vision, which in turn guides curricular design. This is background philosophy for the new Strategic Planning process. Kim asked what committee was in charge. Boffman reiterated that the University Strategic Planning Steering Committee was in charge, who created a Visioning Subcommittee for wider participation in the developing of the Vision and Values statement. Kim noticed that the statement said "draft," and wondered whether this indicated that the contents were still subject to change. Someone pointed out that technically everything here is a "draft" until approved by the Senate and the President.

Discussio having subsided, Filling warned that the item would be back for action next meeting.

8. Information Items

a. Divisional Excellence Initiatives/University Excellence Initiative Awards

No new information, other than the one-year addition to time base for the AS clerical staff responsible for UEPIC Subcommittee clerical support will be made permanent.

Adjourned for the Tenured and Promoted Faculty Reception at 3.48pm.