

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**Academic Senate Minutes****March 7, 2006**

Present: Andres, Dauwalder, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeKatzew, Garcia, Hall, Janz, Kim, Lawson, Manrique, Mantz, Nagel, Peterson, Petrosky, Poole, Riedmann, Reneau, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Senior, Stone, Tan, Thompson, Weikart, Werling, Zarling

Absent: Afonso, Brown, Nelson, O'Brien, Mercier, Petratos, Tavernier

Proxies: Carroll (Sanchez-Walker), Garza (Jacobs), Lynch (Minor), Neufeld (Shawkey), Olivant (Morgan-Foster), Schulz (DeCaro)

Guests: Burns, Demetrulias, Elmallah, Eudey, Jaasma, Mayer, Murray-Ward, Stephens, Shirvani, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman/Margaret Ramos

1/AS/06/GC/UEPC--Resolution for Registration Priority, APPROVED

2/AS/06/SEC--Recommendation on College Restructuring, APPROVED

3/AS/06/RSCAPC--Amendment to 12/AS/83/FAC--Sponsored Programs Administration Policy, FIRST READING

MPP Recruitment, Selection and Appointment Policy, DISCUSSED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, March 21, 2006
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Meeting was called to order at 2.40 pm.
2. Agenda was approved.
3. Minutes of 2/21/06 were approved as presented.

4. Announcements

- a. Speaker Petrosky invited all present to a farewell reception for Provost Dauwalder at 4pm today in FDC.
- b. De Katzew invited all to the upcoming Empire and Border Cultures conference, March 16-18 in the FDC. There is no charge to attend for students, faculty and staff (you must pay for meals). Plenary Speakers are Philip Levine (USC) and Yen Le Espiritu (UC San Diego).
- c. S. Davis asked all to please join the Department of English and the Office of Student Development and Leadership in welcoming award-winning critic and poet Leslie Heywood, who will be here 3/8/06 reading

selections from her book "The Proving Grounds" at 5pm in South Dining.

5. Questions on Committee Reports

Stone announced an agreement on a timeline for implementation of the Workload Agreement. Sarraille asked if it is okay to just drop this on AS as an information item, or do we want to vote on it, wanting to ensure there were no objections. There being no comment, Sarraille asked to be put in charge of taking it to the chairs, and asked for a copy highlighting the changes made.

6. Action Items

a. 1/AS/06/GC/UEPC ñ Resolution for Registration Priority

S. Davis offered a friendly amendment to the first resolved to read:
"That the current registration priority, as printed in the Schedule of Classes, be revised to the following:"

Peterson reread the amended version.

There was no discussion; the resolution passed unanimously by voice.

b. 2/AS/06/SEC ñ Recommendation for College Restructuring [ALS]

C. Davis asked if, after approval of restructuring, departments could still decide to realign later. Peterson added that COB is contemplating a realignment to include Economics; a Task Force is being formed to consider it. Shirvani responded that was absolutely okay.

Zarling added if that decision is purely at the discretion of the department. Peterson replied it was the same process (task force, study, report, committees, etc., then to AS), and not simply automatic given the whim of any department.

Manrique noted that ERFA realized it is difficult to align things perfectly, but would prefer to have four colleges of comparable size, and expressed special concern about a separate college of music, art, and theater.

Janz reported that ASI thanks and acknowledges the work in the proposal, and that the ad hoc committee went above and beyond its assigned task. They have received assurances from administration about funding, and Weikartís report from FBAC was also reassuring to them. ASI hopes the realignment will prove beneficial, and hopes AS will move forward.

B. Carroll asked about the status of "unclassifiable" programs (interdisciplinary, etc.), and asked if their disposition would be decided by the Academic Senate. Wendt admitted to a lot of discussion about those programs in committee deliberation, and noted that the report recommended and acknowledged that attention should be given to them. The committee felt that it was going to be an issue, and urged that it be addressed after realignment, and shepherded at highest level of the University. Eudey added this includes labs and other services. Shirvani replied that these kinds of things would be under the Provostís oversight (rather than any of the Deans). Dauwalder added there was still a good deal of discussion and consultation to be done on the mechanics of the realignment.

Speaker Petrosky allowed a request for a secret ballot.

Resolution passed by secret ballot: 33 yea, 5 nay, with 1 abstention.

Shirvani added thanks for the effort and support of everyone during the process, and especially to the committee. Dean Elmallah thanked the President.

7. First Reading Item

a. 3/AS/06/RSCAPC ñ Amendment to 12/AS/83/FAC ñ Sponsored Programs Administration Policy

It was MS Schoenly/Nagel:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA) policy to replace the current Research and Sponsored Programs Policy (12/AS/83/FAC), which conformed to CSU Chancellor's Office Executive Order 168 (EO 168).

RATIONALE: On January 7, 2004, (under the authority of Section 2 of Chapter III of the Standing Order of the CSU Board of Trustees and Executive Order 698, issued under the authority of Title 5, Division 5, Article 1, Subchapter 6, [42400 et seq] of the California Code of Regulations), the CSU Chancellor's Office issued Executive Order 890 (EO 890), Administration of Grants and Contracts in Support of Sponsored Programs, which supersedes CSU Chancellor's Office Executive Order 168 (EO 168). All CSU campuses were instructed to complete preparation of written policy and its compliance directives for administration of Sponsored Programs in accordance with EO 890. All campus Presidents were to respond to the Chancellor no later than July 1, 2004. This policy relates to all University and Auxiliary organizations and any faculty/staff/students of CSU Stanislaus engaged in applying for, awarded to, and/or administering any Grants, Contracts, and Sponsored Programs.

Discussion:

Schoenly offered a handout with colored revision notes from various consultations, and acknowledged the amendment was several years in the making.

Poole observed that the language under cost-recovery of allowable facilities and administrative costs (3.5.4) provides for the department to be penalized for individual faculty behavior, and did not seem like an effective way to handle the situation.

Burns replied the language was consistent with EO890, and they had collaborated with directors in developing this line. All campuses have had experienced faculty submitting proposals directly to a sponsoring agency without including F&A, and without securing outside approval. Institutional policy says faculty have to route through internal; at that time we can address all those issues. Line is for those who submit without any prior institutional knowledge, and without a proper fiscally viable budget.

Poole agreed with the problem, but insisted that it still seems unfair to punish the department for the actions of one faculty. Werling asked in the real world, how often someone gets approval before routing it. Burns replied that normally, one routes at the time, if they've followed the procedure. But there have been instances without that routing. When the faculty wants to incur costs, it goes to BF, and we have no record of it. We're trying to figure out the most equitable way to recover cost. Stephens added that individual faculty don't have the right to unilaterally contract the University, but sign stuff all the time; this line was an incentive for faculty to go through the routing process. Burns asked if the line could be revised to say the University holds the individual PI accountable, and reserves the right to decline the award or renegotiate the budget in these cases. Poole agreed.

Sarraille asked if the language was from EO890 or was ours. Burns replied that the need for the policy was in EO890, but that we altered it to suit the needs of our campus.

Speaker Petrosky asked the sponsoring committee to take this as advice for revising the document for

second reading next time, and advised the body to "bone up for a nice hairy discussion."

8. Information Item

a. MPP Recruitment, Selection and Appointment Policy

Stone advised she thought we had a plan, but it is still in discussion. Last year, AS had a resolution approved but it was sent back by Hughes. FAC redesigned a new one, but Shirvani asked to discuss it outside of AS. At the heart of the contention are three issues: ratio of faculty on search committees (faculty want 50%), SEC/COC consultation before naming faculty to search committees, and SEC review/consultation on position descriptions.

Demetrulias said she thought there was concurrence and agreement that changes were already responsive to faculty concerns. Were there other issues? Stone replied yes, but the main one is percentage of faculty on search committees.

Thompson admitted to being the one who brought it up, and observed that this issue was a contentious one in past Senate sessions, and didn't think SEC should unilaterally adjust something worked out on the floor.

Shirvani asked if the faculty position was that every single administrative position needs to be cleared through AS with a resolution. Stone replied no, that faculty governance wanted to retain review rights, and on academic administrators only. Thompson clarified that "academic administrator" would refer to "Provost" but not "VP DUR," as examples.

Shirvani agreed to the distinction, but felt this was another issue of faculty micromanagement. He is willing to agree to 50% participation on search committees as a step to demonstrate collegiality, but does not want to cede position descriptions to an up or down vote in Senate. That is the domain of the search committee, and faculty on the committee can revise if necessary.

Stone offered that if the position description and request for faculty come together, SEC with COC can consult on both at the same time. Sarraille added that "review" isn't formal approval, and said at issue was more of an exchange of information. Qualifications, duties, etc., are liable to change; show us and allow us to give feedback before publishing. We can help. Shirvani conceded that these are details that can be dealt with in SEC.

Adjourned at 4pm.