

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

November 22, 2005

Present: Afonso, Brown, Dauwalder, Davis C., Davis S., Deaner, DeCaro, DeKatzew, Filling, Garcia, Jacobs, Janz, Jensen, Kim, Lawson, Manrique, Mantz, Minor, Nagel, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Riedmann, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Senior, Stone, Tan, Tavernier, Thompson, Weikart, Werling, Zarling

Proxies: Filling (Lawson), Neufeld (Shawkey), Mercier (Sutherland)

Absent: Bargetto Andres, C. Davis, Morgan-Foster, Nelson,

Guests: Boffman, Bruner, Demetrulias, Kelly, Murray-Ward, Roe, Shirvani, Stephens, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

Workload Implementation Timeline,
DISCUSSED

21/AS/05/FBAC--Budget Priorities
Resolution, FIRST READING

22/AS/05/GC--Masters of Science or
Professional Science Master's Degree in
Ecology and Sustainability, FIRST
READING/REFERRED TO
GC/FBAC/UEPC

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, December 6, 2005
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to order at 2.42pm.
2. Agenda amended to add (7b) 22/AS/05/GC; approved as amended.
3. Minutes 11/08/05 p. 7 "K. Davis" should be "C. Davis"; approved.

4. Announcements

- a. Speaker Petrosky thanked the Provost for providing refreshments, and Filling and Stone for lugging them in.

5. Questions about reports

- a. Nagel inquired about an item in FBAC on loss of fees for winter term.

Weikart explained that students pay an annualized fee systemwide, which is distributed back to campuses based on enrollment. Most campuses split the year in thirds or in half; our program splits it 45.5%/9%/45.5%. Because we enroll about 1200 fewer undergraduate students during Winter than we charge according to the ratio, in effect we lose \$1200xWinter Fee, or approximately \$270,000. We don't get that cash; the others do, and we should.

Thompson inquired further when we did the calculations, did we assume that without Winter, FTES would go elsewhere? Weikart replied no; fees are not calculated by FTES, but by units. We have our full-time students paying for Fall and Spring classes at a lesser fee than other CSU campuses, so we are losing money. FBAC is thinking about recommending a decrease in Winter Term fees and an increase in Fall and Spring fees, in order to make up some of the money lost.

b. Regalado asked about a note in the GC report about a proposal for a separate graduation ceremony for graduate students. Anything else on that? Why is it not feasible? Garcia replied that the issue hasn't formally come to GC; they got word about it and started a discussion. Many members raised concerns about their own plans for various ceremonies, and a change would interfere. GC decided it was best to have the discussion first, then act.

6. Information Item

a. Workload Implementation Timeline (Dauwalder)

Provost Dauwalder reported that over 2004-05, a task force comprised of three faculty and three administrators came to an agreement resolving a grievance filed in Spring 2004. We are waiting for final signatures from statewide; CFA statewide has confirmed, and he tried to confirm systemwide administration as well, but it is not clear. It should be signed and sent within a week; he is confident we will have approval. The Workload Agreement recognizes and clarifies Article 20 of the contract (workload). The article has always allowed us to do what we designed in the agreement, but we had to develop processes to implement it. Implementing the agreement needs to work through the governance process; it is at FAC now. The actual agreement is on line; he recommends everyone read it all.

Dauwalder distributed a sheet explaining Part IIB: Workload Components. This description should allow us to move ahead within the constructs of the bargaining agreement, and gives our definition of annual workload for "average faculty" within each of four areas: Direct Instruction (60-80%), Indirect Instruction (20%), RSCA (up to 20%), and Professional Activities (up to 20%). The description is designed to allow flexibility from faculty member to faculty member, and department to department. It recognizes that some assigned time is funded, and some unfunded. It gives a variety of opportunities, in areas all recognizable by the contract. Dauwalder added that the agreement recognizes some additional parameters; in particular that instruction is our primary responsibility, and that we have to deal with enrollment responsibilities.

Dauwalder met with Interim Dean Boffman and some CALS Chairs. Boffman has asked chairs to describe how they will begin to implement the agreement within their department. Some adjustments will need to be made: some can be addressed in the curriculum, and some may lay in providing more fiscal support. For most departments, it will probably be a combination. It is going to take a few years to get there, but it is important to begin implementing the system as we plan for next year.

In essence, the agreement suggests a process. Each faculty member makes a plan that is reviewed by the department and the dean, who gives initial approval. There is a chance for appeal within college before it goes on. The college then adjusts the schedule to incorporate as much as possible. Once targets are settled,

we can move on to final approval. There is a level of accountability: at the end of the year, the faculty member writes a short report on what they did with assigned time; this report may affect future decisions.

Sarraillé underscored the CFA feeling that the plan is a way for individuals to create a vision for workload distribution. To plan how much time we will be doing different tasks within 30 units, or to plan how to distribute those 30 units among those tasks. He recommended that first, we think how it ought to be, then with colleagues, figure how we want it to be. The agreement is a model for how to work with your department and higher administration. If you need additional resources, this is how you justify them. Ask for time and resources at the same time.

Sarraillé reported that FAC has suspended work on the timeline. FAC proposed a timeline and the Provost suggested something different. FAC then suggested the Provost get with departments and figure out what it might be. He asked for an update on progress. Dauwalder reported he had met with CALS department chairs for that discussion. He realized we would have to work through this year to figure it out; we will need to see what it is going to cost us. We want to get this in place, but have competing elements.

Sarraillé urged that we need a timeline, we need dates for when things need to happen, and asked for renewed efforts for this. Dauwalder replied he had asked departments to begin this in ESO2. Boffman added that she asked chairs for a 1-2 pp description of what they would need, what would need to change. We want to understand where we'll need more support. She asked chairs to look at the whole picture and tell us what they'd need.

Filling noted that the program seems foggy, that we know there are no additional resources, and we're told that's not an issue. So we have a foggy program with no stuff to do it with and no idea when it can be done. He stated a concern that this is a lot of paperwork, and wants a commitment that if we have to fill out paper, we can support what we're filling out paper for.

DeCaro assumes that Categories 3 and 4 are weighed against Category 1. Dauwalder confirmed that you'd need to pay attention to it. He's asking departments to take a look at their curricula and figure out what you need to do it. DeCaro reported that his department talked about how this could be implemented. They figured they have a given number, WTUs or whatever, and then they'll negotiate among faculty to make it work. Boffman noted that if you can do it without outside support, go for it. Most can't however. Either way, they need a number. Dauwalder added that some departments can't make it work without making changes to curriculum they shouldn't make to the program. Stone reported that Chemistry is working like crazy, packing students in, working harder in order to make a case for getting more help. We're stretched thin, she said, on creativity especially. Why not simply lower the target?

Riedmann asked for a clarification of "additional support." Dauwalder said it was dollars to replace tenure/tenure-track faculty in a class who are doing other duties. If the department is large enough, they might pool funds and dedicate it to a TT hire. Chemistry's report to the dean may be that they can't do more; either way, the dean needs to know what we can and can't do.

Mantz said the model looks like widgets in a perfect world, and wondered if he doesn't put down all the activities he's doing, are they just not getting counted, and conversely, if they're not accounted for, is he not allowed to do them?

Sarraillé said that clearly some departments need more faculty, and need them sooner than later, clearly. He

acknowledged that was one of the resource issues. He also pointed out that the workload plan was designed by Larry Giventer, who had in mind something very simple for faculty to fill out in like five minutes. He said it was not the task force's intention to cause a lot of hassle about all the work you do. We know you work 60 hrs a week, we're not going to solve that. The idea is to give you one day a week to do some research. We've been told we have to teach 24 units a year, period. That's not true. This says you can teach less, but we know we're still working overtime.

Filling asked if implementing this agreement would invalidate the CFA/Chancellor agreement to limit the tenure/tenure-track v adjunct faculty ratio to 75:25. Dauwalder replied they were not throwing away the ratio, but the process has to occur. The contract specifies that an appropriate administrator will identify workload for each faculty member. That's the assigned workload we're trying to define here. Research is part of your job, but is not clearly delineated. We recognize that some spend more time on it, and want to account for it. Nagel asked folks to keep in mind that local CFA and administration spent a lot of time putting this together. But he also recognized that this agreement doesn't acknowledge adjunct faculty labor. Our contract specifies 30 units of Direct Instruction, but we do in fact work far more than that; even our office hours don't count.

Wendt asked to underscore that the document emphasizes that there is no one single model. The task force wanted to allow for ranges and give the possibility for unique situations; that caused any ambiguity in the document. It also recognizes a status quo: we hand out humongous amounts of assigned time, not just toward RSCA, and we want to recognize those things. It is possible to document it better, even if it is impossible to totally quantify it. This system gives us the flexibility to make it work. Trying to recognize those things that contractually we have to recognize.

Mercier noted that with this plan for additional support, it seems like we're asking for money before we see what money we'd need. Wendt said we don't know until you tell us. He added a request that the body recall that when this was first brought up, Senate members wanted us to allow for flexibility.

Sarraillé pointed out that this system was in essence adversarial: there is a conflict between those who allocate resources and those who want to attain them; these are the rules of engagement. It is the responsibility of the department to go out and get them. To do that, you have to figure what you want, what needs to happen, and push for those. If we support each other, we can get somewhere. The alternative is to get nothing and be told what to do. Also, he repeated, Senate needs to put down what the schedule will be; when things will happen. Need to firm that up, that the follow through is there. If not, not enough will get done.

DeCaro recalled that nothing in Article 20 guarantees release time, so the task force did it. But they did it in the context of existing resources, of departments looking at targets and figuring out how to reassign. The possibility of new additional resources never came up; this is not a part of the original agreement. Boffman said she basically agreed, but noted that most departments actually can't do it; they're going to need help. Dauwalder added if the department can do it alone, great; if not, we'll need additional resources, and we need to know what those will be.

Shirvani said the reality is that the teaching load is too high, and we can't resolve it overnight. But we need to get it going to get it done. Speaker Petrosky can join him in these discussions, then bring to the SEC and on to the Academic Senate.

Thompson asked that if anyway figures a way to sort it all out, that they spread the news.

Sarraille will email the URL for the complete text of the Workload Agreement to Asnet.

7. First Reading Items

a. 21/AS/05/FBAC: Budget Priorities Resolution

It was MS Weikart/Sarraillé

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty of CSU Stanislaus affirm the commitment of the CSU to public access to affordable high-quality instruction, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty's major priorities for institutional budget allocations are those essential to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus, including (with no relative ranking implied):

S maintain or increase access to qualified students

S maintain or reduce the student/faculty ratio

S increase the ratio of tenure track to contingent faculty

S fund faculty positions to ease implementation of the Faculty Workload Agreement

S provide equity or market pay raises for faculty and staff whose pay lags significantly behind other CSUs

S provide competitive faculty salaries to recruit and retain the best faculty possible

S retain and appoint sufficient numbers and quality of non-faculty staff to effectively support the core instructional mission;

S support library acquisition and operating budget to ensure accessibility to appropriate resources for all students and faculty;

S support academic equipment, technology and infrastructure budgets to fully support the teaching, research and creative activity, and service functions of the university;

S support professional development and travel required for such development; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate, the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee, and the faculty members of the University Budget Advisory Committee should serve as the Faculty's representatives in the budget planning process and should participate in all budgetary discussions and decisions through the entire process of budget planning, allocation, and re-allocation of the university budget, including the apportioning of its budget among specific university divisions, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the University Budget Advisory Committee should continue to function to advise the administration on fiscal decisions, and be it further

RESOLVED, that decisions involving program reductions or new initiatives be made only after consultation with appropriate faculty governance committees and include open and consensual processes that consider the viewpoints of all affected parties, an analysis of the costs and benefits, and the effects on CSU Stanislaus as a whole, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the priorities above shall apply to academic year 2005-06 and all subsequent years until further notice.

RATIONALE: The faculty of CSU, Stanislaus want to affirm our budget priorities, which can contribute to strategic planning and everyday budget decisions. The first two resolved clauses deal with priorities for the institution, and the next three involve procedures to ensure faculty input in decisions related to the budget.

Discussion:

Weikart explained that the first two resolved clauses outline our budget priorities, the next three describe budget processes, and the last resolved clause applies this statement until further notice.

Nagel asked the maker to consider, in reference to equity market pay raises, that the pay lag for lecturers is viewed more adequately in terms of community college pay.

Petrosky requested the body review the resolution, discuss it with constituents, and prepare for a vote next time.

b. 22/AS/05/GC: MS/PSM in Ecology and Sustainability

It was MS Garcia/Schoenly

Be it Resolved: That the Master of Science or Professional Science Masterís degree in Ecology and sustainability be approved for implementation in Fall 2006; and be it further

Resolved: That this degree proposal be sent to the Chancellorís Office in January 2006 for review and approval by the Board of Trustees in March 2006.

Rationale: The Curriculum and Resources Committee of the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences; the Interim Dean of the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences; and the Graduate Council approved and support the implementation of the Masters of Science or Professional Science Masterís Degree in Ecology and Sustainability.

Discussion:

Roe explained there are many definitions of ecology and sustainability; this program has a biological perspective, concerning the distribution and abundance of different organisms. The program will have two concentrations: and MS in Ecological Conservation and a PSM in Ecological Economics. The overall goal of the program is to provide students with knowledge, understanding and tools to gain employment or to go on to doctorate study in fields that contribute to solutions to environmental and sustainability issues in the state and the globe. The program is in line with campus vision statements. The program has been several years in development. CSUS is one of four Biology programs with no MS. Most programs have either Biology or Marine Biology. The Chancellorís office is demanding something unique from new MS programs. There is no CSU program in Ecological Economics. Our department is also interested in a joint

doctoral program with UC Merced. Their program would synergize with ours; but ours will be different, unique, and necessary.

Kelly distributed an addendum to the proposal describing the environmental setting. He pointed out that the program is sorely needed, not just here but statewide. CSUS one of few that has no graduate program in Biology, and there is a demonstrated need in particular for one in environmental conservation and sustainability. This program will go far beyond the six county service area. Our population is expected to double in a decade. Myriad issues in the area would be clients of the program. The ESRP works on a routine basis with a dozen government agencies; folks all over would routinely hire from the new program. Our BA students are great, but we're dropping them into the deep end of the pool; this program would give them essential training and tools they need to work effectively. The program would be a credit to the institution, and will bring students to us, not just from around the state, but nationally and globally. Ecological Economics is a very good angle as well. The program is a bigger market for Biology, but agencies need folks with a background in economics and ecology. With the population growth expected, the need will only increase. We have a serious opportunity to make an impact.

Sankey opined she was thrilled with the proposal, but noted there is no prerequisite for a Geology class; one goal is "interaction of physical and chemical," students will need geological background for this.

Peterson voiced several concerns. First is procedural. Usually, before it comes to AS, a proposal goes to UEPC for consultation. UEPC's recording secretary talked to Roe and suggested it might be okay, but she is not on the committee; there was no real consultation in any way. The proposal was sent out on email, but without sufficient time for review. Second, there are no resources for the program. Economics was turned down for a new hire, so the faculty member committed to this program can't teach it. Also the proposed CALS split may exacerbate any coordination problems. If the President supports the program, we would like to know where the money will come from.

Weikart also admitted some concern. On the whole it's great, a necessary program and it's high time we had an MS in Biology. Funding is one issue. But we can't get the program online by 2006 anyway. The document also does not show how the program will compete with UC Merced. They have an MS and PhD; the proposal should address any overlap and what that means.

It was MS Weikart/Riedmann to refer the item to UEPC.

Kelly reported that he met with Trainer, the director of the research institute at UC Merced. They're only up and running, their emphasis is on soil science. They don't have faculty in environmental ecology. Also, theirs is a PhD program; we're hoping some of ours go there. If we had a Master's Program, it would help in developing a joint PhD program.

Shirvani offered personal congratulations to Roe and Kelly for their vision. He supports it, but has no idea whether the money will work or not. He noted that this Winter, after restructuring, we can establish priorities for the next five years. The Program has to go to the Chancellor. He offered to sit down with the Provost and VPBF Stephens and create a P&L sheet for it. He noted that not every program makes money right away. The need is there for professionally oriented graduates, so it is not competing with UCM, but complementing.

Demetrulias noted that as the University has matured, our constitution has shifted. The current constitution

delegates authority to Graduate Council, so this is not a procedural violation. We have tried to consult in both bodies. The constitution says they will create a close liaison and consult on policy, but it has never required one program to go from one to the other. She wouldn't want to see the program tabled or derailed because of an alleged violation of procedure, because there is none. Also, we have to say when it goes to the Chancellor that we will commit resources for delivery. Step one is to get the Chancellor's approval, then we get funding. If we delay, we delay for another year. This is a program with a high demand in local industry, and asked the body consider it from curricular issues, not from resources.

Roe pointed out that resource needs are summarized in the proposal. Biology can do the first year limping, beyond that they'd need help. They want to start next year: they have a group of students interested now; the Dean of CALS has indicated she can help with library funds for this year only; in Fall 07, Biology will move into the new science building; there are new undergrad emphases coincident with that move; in short, they need to get up and going. Biology needs faculty with expertise in restoration ecology. They have a person at the ESRP who can teach the course next year; after that there is no guarantee.

Peterson acknowledged that maybe this was technically not a violation of procedure, but she didn't want to make a practice of allowing things that we can't pay for, especially when we can't afford what we need now.

Thompson asked what the response from FBAC was. Weikart said they never saw it until Monday morning. Thompson added that FBAC's charge includes advising the University on resource allocations, and this sounds like a case for that. He added further that this is coming to Senate along with many other things that have to be rushed. Further, that someday we may need to consider an Ed.D. proposal, and if UEPC isn't in the flow for that review, we would need to make a change. Speaking to the motion, after a First Reading, the item is automatically referred back to the making committee anyway (GC). He suggested an amendment to refer to UEPC and FBAC at the same time as GC; the amendment was accepted as friendly. The item would be brought back as an Action item.

Regalado claimed it makes sense to review for resource holes. The thing is great on principle, but it would be unwise to bulldoze a curriculum with these kinds of holes. Referring can patch up the holes, make it stronger.

Demetrulias noted that in fifteen years of sheparding these kinds of proposals through the process she has never had to go to FBAC; why now? The issues raised are legitimate, she added, but do we need to send this proposal to every committee on campus?

Garcia spoke as GC Chair, noting it was never the intention of GC or the faculty to cheat the system. The proposal was actually reviewed on a number of levels. They appreciate and value UEPC and FBAC, and could use their input, but do we have enough time to do that? Weikart reported FBAC would next meet on 12/1; but Peterson reported UEPC would not meet until 12/8, after the next AS meeting.

Schoenly said his understanding was that new programs must identify needed resources, then craft a document with a good faith understanding that resources would be forthcoming. Resources are never up front. What then would returning the item to committee accomplish?

Dauwalder also spoke against the motion to send to three committees simultaneously. He supports the ongoing procedure, where it returns to GC where they can consider it, consult with UEPC and FBAC if they

desire to do so, but continue to honor the system now in place. Things need to move along.

Sarraillé noted that as a member of FBAC, the committee was not told about this. Normally we would hear from the Chair-elect of GC (a member of FBAC) about this type of proposal being considered. And because SEC was bypassed, we did not hear about this until the Friday before this meeting.

Dauwalder said the whole issue reflects multiple years of budget reductions; five years ago, we never would have had this discussion. Also, keep in mind that TT hire decisions were made figuring an increase of only 0.8%.

Roe claimed they were between a rock and a hard place. They need an approved program before they can seek money for it. Now AS wants money available before the program is approved. The format is supposed to determine whether the program has academic merit, then if the University approves, that's where the money is appropriated.

Zarling asked for confirmation of the status of the item when it returns to Senate. Petrosky ruled that it is in First Reading status now, and if it is returned to committee, the power to bring it back rests in those committees. When they decide to bring it back, it will return as a Second Reading item, for action.

Manrique endorsed the proposal and the resources comments made by the Provost.

A secret ballot was requested for the motion to return to the three committees simultaneously, and votes were 16 for, 14 against, with 4 abstentions.

The item is referred to FBAC, UEPC, and GC simultaneously.

8. The Open Forum was cancelled to eat turkey.

Adjourned at 4.27pm.