Academic Senate
March 20, 2007

PRESENT: Afonso, Bender, Brown, Carlstrom, Carroll, Clarke, Covino, Davis, DeCaro, DeCocker, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Janz, Jibby, Johnson, Keswick, Kim, Lindsay, Manrique, Mantz, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nelligan, O’Brien, Petratos, Riedmann, Robbins, Routh, Sankey, Sarraile, Shawkey, Sniezek, Silverman, Stessman, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling

PROXIES: Sniezek (Hall), Floyd (Lawson), Wikoff (Keswick)

GUESTS: Carl Bengston, John Borba, Carl Brown, Susan Clapper, Diana Demetrulias, April Hejka-Ekins, Marjorie Jaasma, Dawn, Gary Novak, Poole, Armin Schulz, Kathy Shipley, Ham Shirvani, Steve Stryker, Ted Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

1. Call to order at 2:37.
2. Approval of Agenda-approved.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 6, 2007-approved.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

   a. ASI Vice President Andrew Janz reported that the ASI is reconsidering its motion concerning collective bargaining. A new resolution is before the Senate and will be voted on tonight.

   b. Vice President Morgan-Foster advised the campus will have a visit from a peer review team from the Chancellor’s Office related to the graduation initiative. It is part of the overall systemwide student success planning initiative. We will have approximately 6 peers here on Thursday, April 5 to learn what we do, our best practices. If you want copies of the schedule for that visit, please contact her.

   c. Stryker, a representative of the WASC Self Study Team, distributed an update on the progress of the self study. There are four inquiry circles; inquiry questions are focused on how effectively we engage our students in learning. Meetings started September 2006. A survey will be sent our next week (faculty survey of student engagement), and they are asking all of our colleagues to complete the survey. It will be on-line. The information will be extremely valuable for our inquiry circles.

   d. Nagel reminded Senators the systemwide strike vote result will be announced tomorrow. Also, a CFA Chapter Executive Board meeting will be held tomorrow. If the vote is in favor, part of the strategy is no business as usual. The idea is to put
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pressure on Administrator to negotiate by slowing administrative busy work.

e. Provost Covino thanked everyone involved in the Access to Excellence day last week. There will be a system meeting in April. Secondly, he stated he will be replacing computers listed for 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 around July. There are about 66 faculty on the list for 2006/2007 and about 36 on the 2007/2008 list. He stated by combining, they will get a better rate. Thirdly, he stated they are going to migrant to the new Microsoft Vista. Eventually, he stated everyone will be put on this system, except for those that refuse. And lastly, the latest tally on faculty searches: we started the year with 36, 14 have concluded successfully, 12 are in the process of interviews, 8 are ongoing, 1 failed and 1 closed.

f. Eudey reported the Faculty in Residence application period is open. Deadline is April 9 but if later than spring break, applications will still be accepted.

g. Thompson advised there were two faculty in his department that their computers died and the faculty bought their own. Is there a way to get emergency replacement? Covino replied yes. Those requests should come forward. Thompson asked if he could find out if any English faculty are on the lists and Covino replied he will think about the best way to get this information out.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

6. CONSENT ITEM

a. 9/AS/07/SEC—Economics to CBA Reorganization

Sarraille stated SEC felt this was a non-controversial issue. The UEPC and FBAC support the ad hoc committee’s recommendation. If there are no objections, their recommendation will be accepted.

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached recommendation of the Ad Hoc Economics-to-CBA Reorganization Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: that this resolution be submitted to President Shirvani for his approval.

RATIONALE: The Policy on Academic Reorganization requires

1) that the SEC forward the report of the ad hoc committee to the UEPC and FBAC, and that each of these committees make its recommendation to the Senate,

2) that the Senate review the proposal, the UEPC and FBAC recommendations, and the recommendation of the ad hoc committee, and

3) that the Senate forward its recommendation(s) to the President to be accepted or rejected.

Due to lack of support for the proposed move among the faculty who would be affected, the ad hoc committee recommended that the Department of Economics should remain within its present college (Humanities and Social Sciences). The UEPC and FBAC have indicated agreement with the recommendation of the ad hoc committee.

There was no objection, so the resolution will go forth to the President.

7. ACTION ITEMS

a. 7/AS/07/UEPC—Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Implementation Policies

Filling explained the University Writing Committee met last Friday and discussed the points made at the last Academic Senate meeting. There were basically two concerns: “1) under the GWAR Implementation Policy, item 10 d) WP courses include instruction and warnings about plagiarism, as well as techniques such as graded in class writing to encourage and check that students follow established practice in this regard” and the WPST exam being a prerequisite to the WP Course and if the faculty member could
waive the prerequisite. The UWC changed 10 d) to read “WP courses include instruction and warnings about plagiarism.” The rest of the sentence was deleted. The UWC did not recommend any further changes to the document.

DeCaro asked if we are still in the mentality it is up to faculty to allow students in WP course if they haven’t passed the WPST and Sarraille replied the WPST is treated like a prerequisite, so it can be excused by the faculty member. Filling added with the stipulation it is a graduation requirement so eventually has to be met. DeCaro asked if other university requirements can be waived, and if not, why is this an exception? Sarraille stated it is waivable because it is written that way. Davis added the instructor is not waiving a requirement, but waiving a prerequisite. O’Brien stated there is also a form for exception to university requirements. Eudey wanted to be clear that number 12 is still in place and Filling replied yes. There is oversight and the UWC does communicate with instructors that are outliers.

There being no further discussion, question was called and resolution passed by voice vote.

Thompson reminded Senators the English Department is offering English 3000 which is an undergraduate writing course which will help students pass the WPST. The department will be offering it during the summer and it will be a great prep for the WPST in August.

8. FIRST READING ITEM

a. 10/AS/07/FBAC—Budget Priorities Statement (Sense of Senate)

Sarraille advised this is a Sense of the Senate resolution. If passed, it will not be forwarded to the President as a University policy. It is a statement of the faculty.

It was MS Lindsay/Taniguchi:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty of California State University, 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):

· maintain or increase access to qualified students
· maintain or reduce the student/faculty ratio
· increase the ratio of tenure track to contingent faculty
· fund faculty positions to ease implementation of the Faculty Workload Agreement
· provide equity or market pay raises for faculty and staff whose pay lags significantly behind other similar institutions.
· provide competitive faculty salaries and incentives to:
  1. recruit the best possible faculty
  2. address compression and inversion issues
  3. recruit thoroughly diverse faculty
· retain and appoint sufficient numbers and quality of non-faculty staff to effectively support the core instructional mission;

· support library acquisition and operating budget to ensure access to appropriate resources for all students and faculty;

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

· 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 elimination, new programs, or reorganizations 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 2006/2007 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:
Lindsay advised that annually, FBAC puts forth a budget priorities resolution which is approved by the Academic Senate. This resolution is very close to last year’s resolution. FBAC closely examined each element from last year and weighed whether those elements were to be included, and Bullet 6 was expanded.

Sniezek questioned the 5th bullet “provide equity or market pay raises for faculty and staff whose pay lags significantly behind other similar institutions” and the 2nd resolved from the bottom “that decisions involving program elimination, new programs, or reorganizations 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 CSUS as a whole” asking if there wasn’t already a process in place for these. Also, the 4th bullet “fund faculty positions to ease implementation of the Faculty Workload Agreement” shouldn’t we either implement or we don’t. And, the 6th bullet “provide competitive faculty salaries and incentives to: 1) recruit the best possible faculty 2) address compression and inversion issues and 3) recruit thoroughly diverse faculty,” she voiced uncertainty what ‘thoroughly diverse’ means.

Lindsay replied the 4th bullet regarding implementing the faculty workload agreement, although implementation has begun, it has not reached fruition. And, we have been told in some departments, it is not possible to fully implement the faculty workload agreement for any number of reasons, largely funding related. That is why we have bullet 4. Regarding Bullet 5, although the process is in the MOU and the President has been generous in implementing the process, we must realize the number of individuals approved in any given year is based on funding available. Last year faculty applied and were deemed worthy, but not as worthy as others and did not receive a raise. So that bullet refers to that. Regarding the 6th bullet, FBAC was looking at diversity in the broadest sense, but at a minimum, diversity includes gender and ethnicity. FBAC was also thinking of other dimensions to expand diversity. The intent was we want faculty to be as diverse as possible. Bender suggested changing ‘thoroughly’ to ‘broadly.’

Taniguchi questioned the 2nd Resolved from the bottom asking if there is a process in place and if so, is it being followed. Sarraile
replied there is a policy in place for reorganization and discontinuation, but once in a while there is pressure to telescope these things so it is best to have a statement like this to underscore our concern about the process.

DeCaro added that any new program has to go through a process e.g. department, college, university, including a cost analysis. Taniguchi asked what the program discontinuation policy is. Sarraille replied programs are reviewed and a recommendation is made one way or the other. Demetrulias explained there is an executive order that governors program discontinuance and our policy meets that. Filling asked if it refers to just majors and Demetrulias replied yes, it refers to degree programs, not minors. Thompson stated he is glad people are looking at this. He encouraged Senators to look at it carefully before voting on it. It does establish our budget priorities. Shortly, we will have a revised Strategic Plan before the Senate, so this statement will help us say what faculty wants.

Nagel questioned the 3rd bullet, and wondered if FBAC would accept language that speaks to preserving contingent lecturers who are incumbent as we increase the tenure-track percentage as CFA has endorsed?

Garcia observed as we continue to emphasize research, distinction, and excellence, it seems like we should mention fully funding the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and positions related to grants and contracts, so we are in a position to secure funding and have the appropriate assistance and oversight.

DeCaro asked Nagel to clarify what language he wants regarding contingent faculty. Nagel replied his concern is if a department hires a new tenure-track faculty member at the expense of an incumbent lecturer that has been in the department a long period of time. DeCaro advised that ACR 73 speaks to that. Sarraille replied he’s not sure but thinks this is so, but he will look into it. But the issue is, is it possible for a tenure-track faculty member to be hired and replace a longtime lecturer. DeCaro advised he thought last year’s Senate passed a resolution supporting lecturers and the MOU also supports this. Brown added that the resolution had to do with language stating ‘normally lecturers would have 30 units. Tuedio stated that was a slightly different resolution. It relates to the issue that has been troublesome for chairs. It has to do with lecturers engaged in committee work and research. The sense of the AS was to support same. Nagel’s point is about loyalty. It is an interesting question for us. But like all of these priorities, it speaks to the overall component of how much would it take to do these things, and if it is possible under the kind of funding we have and with little flexibility. He asked if FBAC has a sense what this would cost. Lindsay replied FBAC didn’t have the required information to cost it out.

Carroll suggested we might word the 4th bullet stronger. Someone mentioned saying ‘implement the workload agreement’ by doing 1-2-3, which he thinks is the intent. Sarraille stated he thinks people need to reconsider what they mean by implementation of the workload agreement. This seems to be an area of debate. What we heard lately is that implementation of the workload agreement is being viewed by many as procedural, faculty filling out forms, making sure it is done and the request goes up and down the line. If we are talking about implementing the assignment of faculty time for various purposes e.g. creative activities, then we are going to have to be specific. O’Brien replied to Tuedio’s concern about cost. The SWASenate does this every year, and the priorities are never costed out. It is mostly to list critical things on the faculty radar screen. This is a path/plan where we’d like to go.

DeCaro stated as a department chair, he must follow the MOU. If there is language that contradicts the MOU, that flies in the face of the MOU and ties his hands. He stated he is just leery of doing that to anyone who is going to be a department chair. Sarraille reminded Senators this statement is not a policy to be adopted. It is not a rule. It is a statement of faculty priorities. Priorities are not always possible to achieve.

Sniezek suggested her comment has to do with if there are processes in place, she’d like to see the appropriate bullets removed. She also suggested putting the bullets in priority order. 7, 8, 9 should be at the top because this impacts faculty and students.

Thompson stated to say we have a process for something doesn’t mean it is a priority. Those are separate issues. He stated he’d like to see the 5th bullet remain. We do have a process, and if that is a priority for faculty, FBAC should state that. Sniezek replied she is not saying the process is fair or equitable, just that a process exists. The only thing would be that the pot should be bigger. Sarraille stated the process provides for someone to apply but, it doesn’t assure raises will be granted. The point of the resolution is to encourage the granting of raises. Sniezek stated she disagrees with the statement being in the resolution.

9. INFORMATION ITEM
a. Proposed Academic Advising Policy

Sarraille advised the attached Draft Academic Advising Policy has a rather extensive list of changes to the existing policy on Academic Advising. SEC decided to put this on as an information item, hopefully to get feedback from Senators and share with us your reaction to the proposed policy.

Taniguchi asked if the student service professionals listed here are part of the First Year Program Advising Office listed on page 16. If not, who are they and where are they housed? Shipley replied this policy is a product of the President’s Task Force dating back to Fall 2004. Lee Renner and she co-chaired the group. The current policy is from 1991. She stated they formatted it like Appendix I in the current Faculty Handbook, so that it would be comprehensible. With respect to student service professionals, some are in First Year Programs, some in the College of Business advising center, and with the possibility that this program could grow, there could be student service professionals in departments and colleges. This is an effort to define roles all the way through. Consensus was very difficult to achieve in this group, she stated. But one thing that came out of this is that advising decisions should be up to programs. There should be the suggestion in this policy that programs have the final decision on what kind of advising is performed. Taniguchi suggested on page 18 at the bottom of the page before Responsibilities of Student Service Professional Advisors, maybe identifying who they are and what their roles are.

Nagel suggested spelling the word ‘adviser/advisor’ consistently throughout the document. Eudey suggested if we are going to recognize student service professionals as advisors, we need to add them as well: faculty, peer advisors, student service professional advisors. Also, it is a bit confusing through e 1 and 2 which seems as if it is going back and forth between department and faculty advising. It might be good to clarify that. Also, on page 16 a2, she recommends removing the (i.e., once per year) and just say meet regularly. This conflicts with a, e.

O'Brien stated under Specific Responsibilities of Faculty Advisors, a) participate in advisor training sessions and stay current on issues related to advising with the major, it is unclear if faculty are being trained or are training. Sarraille stated it means faculty are being trained and it is mentioned in several places. Shipley clarified it is not just faculty advisors; it might be department/college advisors as well. Most departments have training already in place.

Brown questioned how Academic Advising is listed in the Catalog. Shipley replied the advising location is difficult to find, so they have asked that First Year Programs change their name to Academic Advising, although there has been no move to affect the change. Morgan-Foster stated she has no objection to changing the name.

Novak noted a technical change on page 18, 2 b) and 2 d) that talks about school and department. Since we no longer have schools, he suggested changing to colleges and departments.

Robbins agreed with Shipley there is some confusion on the name of First Year Programs. It’s difficult to find advising in the telephone directory, although the class schedule does have it listed as Academic Advising. But our office doesn’t answer all questions about academic advising so we end up acting as a telephone tree. She voiced concern about next year when the class schedule goes online, because there would no longer be a paper class schedule with the phone number for advising listed.

Garcia asked if this policy covers both undergraduate and graduate. Sarraille stated the President advised him this would only apply to undergraduates. Garcia stated with the ongoing accreditation, if we are collecting data showing the success of our advising, this would be great data to have for the graduate program.

Carroll advised UEPC is going to address this and are budgeting 1 hour, so if there are issues related to this policy, please email him with concerns. Also, there is confusion in UEPC what the ultimate goal is. Will this document be accepted as a whole or separately? Shipley stated when they began this, it was part of the graduation initiative. Then the current policy in the Faculty Handbook, Appendix I was found. So, the intent is to replace Appendix I with this. It develops an overall view of advising campus wide. It defines responsibilities in academic advising and departments. This is the beginning of the conversation, not the end. Sarraille pointed out this is pretty wide ranging and this type of thing can affect every department and every faculty member in the way they interact with their students. It is important for everyone to look at this carefully and consider how life will be under this policy.

Tan stated advising is also linked to the computer system we have or may have. At San Jose State, all GE is done by computer. She
suggested the University should invest money into improving the computer system to help advising and to also get information online for students and faculty.

Taniguichi suggested adding under goals and objectives at the bottom of page 15, top of page 16, “to assist undergraduate students to shape their curriculum to assist them in preparation for a Masters Program.”

Morgan Foster advised this campus is in the process of developing a degree audit process much like San Jose State. When preparing for the graduation initiative visit, this discussion will assist us. Lots of things that are being discussed today are in the Plan.

Garcia asked if this Plan came from the task force or from the Administration and Morgan-Foster replied there was an advising task force and they wrote an advising report, and one of the items in the report was the recommendation about how to clarify who was doing what. There was an evaluation document a while ago pertaining to undergraduate advising Boffman possibly wrote, she stated, and that can be sent to UEPC for their review.

10. OPEN FORUM

a. President Shirvani congratulated faculty for the recent recognition CSUS received from the Princeton Review. In terms of our budget, he stated our structural deficit is down to $2 million and by the end of the year, hopefully it will be down further. Next year, he stated he expects it will be $0. He stated we made our target plus a few percent, 1 1/2 to 2 percent above, with 8,450 students. We are one of five or six campuses in the CSU that are increasing enrollment. This year we received $1.7 million one-time money, and it will be permanent because we grew. He stated he is campaigning for upload of money rather than ex-post. He stated his feeling we can get it because of all the good news coming out of this campus. Trustee Farrar was here for Access to Excellence, and she reported to other trustees this was the best meeting she went to on this issues. All of this is important for our recognition.

In terms of our relationship with the Turlock community, they are very excited about what we might do together. The name change has not disappeared, also we are moving forward on other fronts with them. For example, they are giving us their sports complex as we build our new one.

Shirvani shared we have completed a couple of searches and are moving toward completing others. He stated his hope to shift library capital project forward. We may have to split it into 2 phases to lower the figures. We borrowed money to spread over several years to update the library retrieval system (electronic). They are going to do it at once and pay back over time. So there is no major impact. We are moving forward on the fundraising front, planning a major scholarship raising event, no celebrities coming, no major party, just trying to make individual commitments.

Garcia questioned where we are on the Vice President of Advancement search. Shirvani replied there is a great shortage of development officers. He stated he is very much on results not process for fundraising. Several of the CSU’s are looking for fundraisers. He has been recruiting folks from other institutions, but most didn’t want to live here. There is a search committee and they are receiving applications, and we are also searching for other people which we won’t fill until the VP of Development arrives. He stated his hope to have someone in place by Fall. Further, Shirvani advised we have just hired the Associate Vice President for Business and Finance. It took a while to find this person, but we ended up with an excellent one. She is coming mid April. We’ll be sending an announcement out soon. Mollard is coming over to work with the new Associate Vice President and will restructure the Business and Finance area to make it more friendly and efficient. The Provost will hire a new budget analyst. The Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs search showed no good results, so we are still looking for someone.

b. Jibby announced ASI President Minor will be sending an ASI election announcement out via Facnet. Please print and advise your students.

c. Mantz thanked Senators Janz and Jibby for the student’s new resolution on collective bargaining.

d. Lindsay stated he was happy to hear the President say the structural deficit will be closed next year, so it appears it is not a multi-year concern. The Provost agreed, stating it was pretty much the timeline he hoped we would have. Lindsay further stated that since it is no longer a multi year concern, it seems appropriate it should not be in the Strategic Plan. Provost Covino agreed. Filling asked if the pay equity program would be put into action and Covino replied yes.
11. ADJOURNMENT 4:25 pm