**Academic Senate**

**March 6, 2007**

**PRESENT:** Bender, Brown, Carlstrom, Carroll, Covino, Davis, DeCocker, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garza, Grobner, Hall, Helzer, Janz, Jibby, Johnson, Kim, Lawson, Lindsay, Manrique, Mantz, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nelligan, O’Brien, Petratos, Riedmann, Robbins, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Shawkey, Sniezek, Silverman, Stessman, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Werling

**PROXY:** Sundar (Clarke)


**Recording Secretary:** Diana Bowman

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7/AS/07/UEPC—Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Implementation Policies, TABLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/AS/07/GC—Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership Program, FIRST READING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSED AND REFERRED TO FAC, Academic Search Procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

Tuesday, March 20, 2007
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

---

1. Call to order at 2:38
2. Approval of Agenda-approved
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 20, 2007-page 9, sentence to read “This could pertain to workload equity.” Approved as amended.

4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

a. Sarraillie announced we have a new Senator from Psychology, Lisa Carlstrom replacing Todd Nelson.

b. Sarraillie reiterated the invitation to take SEC’s request for concerns about search processes to constituents and ask for their concerns. Please take these discussions to your departments and help us get as much input as we can. Especially ask those serving on search committees.

c. An African American tenure-track search was cancelled in the Department of Ethnic/Gender Studies. That is an item of interest.

d. Nagel reminded all CFA members to vote on the strike authorization. Polling places are in the Library and also electronically. Voting continues through Thursday.

e. Covino reminded Senators there is an open meeting this Thursday 10-12 at JSRFDC Reference Room to discuss the Access to Excellence CSU Strategic Plan and everyone is invited. Representatives from the Board of Trustees and Chancellor’s Office will be here. He will summarize the outcomes of smaller meetings they’ve had and further discussion to ensue.

f. Thompson stated, as Chair of the FAC, he is trying to put a message together to the General Faculty saying thanks to the AS
for their overwhelming support they gave to amendments to the General Faculty Constitution and also thank the General Faculty for their support and ask that Senators let them know our gratitude. It is important to let people know that the standing committees of the AS and GF can do their jobs they’ve been elected to do.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None.

6. ACTION ITEM

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

Davis explained that in checking further, the correct word is ‘graduation’ not ‘graduate.’ So, it should read ‘Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).’ E. Kim stated in his department, they have strong concerns regarding number 10D “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.” His department recommended striking this language. Davis stated this is only a suggestion, not a requirement. Kim stated putting it in writing is what we see as an issue. Davis replied the policy cannot be amended today, just the resolution. Sarraillie agreed. That means we vote it up or down. Garcia stated a colleague discussed this with him and the concern was that it is too prescriptive and doesn’t acknowledge that all faculty members are doing this work. Further, we are setting a precedent if we include that language. Eudey asked if the intent of 10D is to have instruction about plagiarism and the balance is an example. How much is policy and how much is example? Davis replied the intention is that courses include instruction about plagiarism. Part of writing is knowing how not to plagiarize. The designated WP courses should include discussion of plagiarism. Riedmann agreed with Garcia’s comments that it is too specific and impinges on academic freedom. Garcia advised that is not his observations but a colleague.

Filling stated the reason plagiarism is in this is because that was the number one request when we talked to faculty about WP courses in general. It was in response to requests, not what the Writing Committee suggested. Carroll stated UEPC discussed these proposed set of policies at the last meeting in response to what we talked about here. One concern that kept coming up was whether students would be free to take a WP course for non WP credit. Under this policy, is it allowed? Filling replied students need to pass the WPST before taking the course. If they want to take more than one WP course, nothing prevents that. Sarraillie stated his impression that technically the requirement for passing the WPST and the requirement to pass a WP course are independent. If a student has satisfied all requirements for graduation and that student has taken a WP course and passed the WPST, but it came after taking the WP course, the evaluator would still stamp all right on the graduation approval form. Robbins agreed. What they see in Academic Advising is the student has completed the WP course and has not taken or passed the WPST. They have to do both. The evaluator will grade them if they do it in reverse order, but that is troubling for students. We see students with selective amnesia concerning WPST. There is no way to separate a WP course from its WP distinction. There is no mechanism for non-WP passing of the course. The whole trick is that the WPST was put in place as a screening test. It is very basic, and should be passed prior to WP course taking. It will show up on the transcript as a WP course if they pass with C- or above.

Brown questioned if instructors let students in without taking the WPST. Until that is stated in the document, he stated he was inclined to vote against it. Either it is a screening test or a prerequisite, but it can’t be both. Robbins stated it says in the Catalog they have to pass the WPST before being admitted in a WP course. Sarraillie stated although it is not a good idea, the instructor still can waive this and allow the student to enroll. Mantz stated at the last meeting it was pointed out that under ‘Frequently asked questions about the GWAR,’ number 5 states “as with any course prerequisite, the instructor has the authority to allow a student to take the course without having taken the WPST.” It goes on to list reasons why instructors should do this rarely, if at all, so it seems it is discouraged, but as a matter of policy, it is allowable. Manrique added that under number 3 of the policy, second sentence states “Instructors have the responsibility to withdraw students who have not passed the WPST.” These are very important courses and skills and we need them to display those skills to future employers. Riedmann asked if number 3 contradicts number 5 and Sarraillie replied that is a point of prerogative on the part of the instructor. Carroll stated it really is not a contradiction. It says ‘have the responsibility’ not ‘must.’ Brown stated he doesn’t see how any screening test we can hold students to if we allow this loophole. Why should the ELM or EPT be in effect? He stated it’s a mistake to make the screening test and prerequisite synonymous. Thompson stated his understanding is what students satisfy is the GWAR and to satisfy the GWAR, they have to have both. The other suggestion is we do have the capability to withdraw students before the instructor ever sees the roster, so students could be
allowed to register and then someone else could dump them out.

Tuedio stated he always reads ‘responsible’ to mean it was up to the faculty member and that nobody else would. This puts the responsibility for that act in the faculty’s hand. He wondered if we are still convinced that this is a screening test, and the relationship of the screening test is setting precondition in order to pass the WP course or whether we are thinking of turning this into a proficiency test. He noted that several other CSU campuses have a proficiency exam rather than a screening test, and perhaps we should investigate changing our GWAR implementation.

Davis responded to Thompson there was one semester scores couldn’t be put into the computer fast enough and so they didn’t show up on the roster and students had to bring in a paper and show the instructor they had passed the WPST. Bender questioned if our screening test is different that other schools. Some schools only require a test not both. Davis stated of the ones she knows, the exit exams expect much higher levels of writing than our WPST. We are looking for very basic abilities to carry an idea through a very short essay. Thompson stated he thinks it might be helpful if more faculty would score WPST exams so they would know what we are dealing with. It is a floor not a ceiling and it is not a writing proficiency test but a screening test. The point is to try to assure faculty and students that students have a minimal level of writing competency before advancing in their coursework. He stated his concern that students that can’t pass the WPST is a clear signal they will struggle.

Carroll stated there are two issues: plagiarism and whether we think the WP and WPST should be taken in a certain order or both before graduation. He suggested a straw vote first. Robbins stated that compared to classroom instruction where there may be no in class writing, we check identities of students when taking the WPST. Students are writing for 90 minutes and we know they are actually doing the writing. And there is lots of history with transfer students not having basic competencies, so that is what 10D is probably speaking to.

Straw vote: The WPST should be a hard requirement and students can’t take a WP course before passing the WPST. 30 yes and 6 no.

A straw vote was suggested regarding having a prescriptive about including 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.

Davis stated if it does pass and there are still concerns, send them to the Writing Committee for further discussion. The document can be revised later.

It was MS Nagel/ O’Brien to table to the next AS meeting.

Eudey asked if it could be tabled until the Writing Committee meets. Sarraile ruled that out of order.

Vote to table to the next AS meeting. 24 yes and 13 no. Passed.

Send comments to Filling or Carroll.

7. FIRST READING ITEM

a. 8/AS/07/GC—Ed.D. in Instructional Leadership Program

It was MS Sniezek/Nelligan

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate endorses the proposal for the Ed.D. Instructional Leadership Program; and be it further

Resolved : That this be effective for Fall 2008 upon approval by the President.

Rationale: On February 15, 2007, Graduate Council approved the Proposal for the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), Instructional Leadership program. The advent of the state and federal accountability acts and the less-than-adequate achievement of P-14 students in the region served by California State University, Stanislaus, make preparation of qualified instructional leaders urgent. The retirement of current leaders and the limited opportunities to train future leaders only exacerbate the problem. The passage of SB 724
authorizes the California State University to offer Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership in response to these factors. A needs assessment conducted in spring 2006 clearly demonstrated strong interest in such a program among regional educators. The concept of “instructional leadership” draws from several disciplines in education including administration and more pedagogy-oriented fields. As a result, the program is multidisciplinary in nature, providing doctoral candidates with a broad range of preparation for improving student achievement. This three to five year graduate program consists of 27 units of core course work, 21 units of specialization course work (P-12 and community college), and 12 units of dissertation for a total of 60 units.

Discussion:

Borba presented a brief overview. The objective is to provide a doctorate in instructional leadership, and to help other educators raise student achievement throughout the Central Valley. The program is 60 units, there are 9 courses of core course work, 27 units that all students take. Once they complete the core course work, they take a written qualifying exam, then continue on to complete an additional 21 units of course work in an area of specialization: P-12 leadership or community college leadership. Dissertation is 12 units. This program can be completed within a 3 1/2 year period. It is expected that most students will complete the program within 4 years. If not, students have to apply for an extension (2 extensions, 1 year each). Borba gave special recognition to Dawn Poole for developing the budget proposal and developing the course schedule for the first 5 years.

Garcia questioned at what point do students start their dissertation and Borba replied as soon as they pass the written qualifying exam and start specialization coursework they can start on their dissertation, probably the middle of their second year. The dissertation could be completed in one year, but it will take a total of 3 1/2 to 4 1/2 years to complete the program. The Chancellor wants students to be able to complete the program in 3 years, but WASC requirements will make completion longer. Taniguchi asked how many people are on the dissertation committee and Borba replied 3, with 2 faculty members (core faculty) and the third one must be a practitioner. O’Brien questioned with your criteria for admission, the last point was a letter from the employer, does this mean you only admit full time employees? Borba replied no. There is another option open for students. They can prepare their own document that shows or addresses how they will be able to complete the work and meet the challenges of the program. But, we do want the employer to support them. Eudey stated that a year ago Borba mentioned there was a requirement to have 6 units outside of the college. Is that still a requirement? Borba replied we allow students to transfer up to 12 units to the program. But they don’t have to take anything outside of the college.

Garcia stated that as a graduate faculty member, he couldn’t agree more with Borba’s introduction and the enunciation of the crisis we find ourselves in. It seems that part of the need is for pressing the status quo. Page 6, Section 2.1, third line speaks to guaranteeing safety and orderliness. He questioned the word ‘orderliness.’ Educators and leaders are great at getting students to be orderly but not good at critical thinking and that stems from our educational leaders. He stated he would like to remove that word. Borba agreed to remove the word ‘orderliness.’ O’Brien asked if they could handle 20 dissertations a year, and Borba replied they believe that 20 is as far as they can go. Originally, they looked at 15 but the advisory group wanted 30 and we told them we would agree to 20 if the application numbers warranted it. Borba stated admission will be very competitive.

Thompson stated on the distinctions between core and adjunct faculty, is that system guidelines or local determination? Borba replied it is system guidelines. You have to apply to be a core doctoral faculty member. It can only be for five years. So, faculty would have to re-apply every five years. The Doctoral Executive Council will make recommendation for core and affiliated faculty to the program director who will recommend to the dean.

This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

8. OPEN FORUM

   a. Academic Search Procedures

Sarraille read a list of concerns regarding searches:

- Administrator tells search committee that a candidate is not sufficiently well-qualified. Search committee disagrees strongly.
- Administrator prevails despite apparent lack of understanding of "how things work" in the discipline of the candidate.
Administrator moves candidates "higher on the list" without sufficient consultation with search committee, or despite strong search committee recommendation to the contrary.

- Administrator reviews and/or interviews applicants without participation and/or knowledge of search committee.
- Administrator acts in the name of the search committee without its knowledge.
- Sudden and not-well-explained search cancellation(s)
- Candidate favored by search committee suddenly and inexplicably withdraws application after interview with Administrator(s)
- Administrator declines to offer position to any candidate recommended by the search committee
- Too many levels of approval and inadequate communication between levels.
- Insufficient staff support for searches.

Missing steps & steps not done in optimal order:
- A preliminary round of screening by phone is discouraged, yet this is an efficient and effective way to shorten the list.
- Reference checks should be done before candidates are brought to campus.
- Training of committee members and others involved should be more comprehensive. Everyone should know their role in the process and the system should work overall without having to stop and train folks in the middle of the search.
- There should be a way to get money for meals up front. It's a hardship for faculty to pay for meals first and get reimbursement later.

Garcia stated he has been asked by the faculty in Social Work to speak on their behalf and move that SEC move this issue to the Faculty Affairs Committee where a thorough discussion can be had that will also protect people in the process. Garcia stated there needs to be a forum where people feel comfortable talking about these issues. This may well be connected to a larger problem. Motion was seconded by Taniguchi.

Motion to refer to FAC passed by voice vote.

Garcia stated he has been asked by the faculty in Social Work to speak on their behalf and move that SEC move this issue to the Faculty Affairs Committee where a thorough discussion can be had that will also protect people in the process. Garcia stated there needs to be a forum where people feel comfortable talking about these issues. This may well be connected to a larger problem. Motion was seconded by Taniguchi.

Question was called. Motion to refer to FAC passed by voice vote.

Thompson stated there might be people here that wish to speak to this issue, and although the above motion was passed, they should still be able to speak.

Miller-Antonio stated that most here know about the Ethnic Studies search for an African-American Studies scholar which was in process, we had strong candidates, and it was suddenly cancelled on Friday pm. Sarraille advised SEC had lunch with the President today and this came up and we aired our concerns about it. One thing was suggested as remedy in the future is to communicate more fully with departments and search committees. IfSuddenly the administration feels a drastic change should occur, it is best not to take action without first getting the advice of members of the search committee and have a chance to reconsider. Thompson advised they have two items on the College of HSS Chairs meeting tomorrow. One part is about searches in general and the second is the cancelled search in Ethnic/Gender Studies. He suggested other college level groups also have it on their agendas. This may well be something that would benefit from college level input. Please send input to FAC.

Wendt stated since a lot of the bullets Sarraillie listed seem aimed in his direction, he wished to respond. He sent a list of search committee memberships for the last two years and asks that you speak with them, especially the chairs. He stated he can’t recall an occasion where the chair of a search committee called him and he didn’t respond. The first page of the recruitment manual asks that folks let him know of changes that might be helpful. One of the suggestions was to 86 phone interviews. Now, of course people want to do it they can, but it is not required. Any suggestions, he will incorporate them. What is problematic is that when his office runs into trouble with the process, it is usually that the department chose not to avail themselves of their workshops or phone us for help. So he agrees there needs to be better communication, but it needs to go both ways.

Jaasma, Interim Dean of HSS stated that regarding the Ethnic Studies search, the cancellation of the search was based on a reassessment of the college program and resources. We took a look at growth and asked that Ethnic Studies’ growth did not warrant an additional position. She will be meeting with Miller-Antonio this week to discuss strategies to help the program grow.

Russ voiced concern about process. How do you terminate a search when you have candidates coming for an interview? This review
should have been done before the position description was even done, not during the search process. And then we look at what position was cut. Ethnic Studies. There is a severe shortage of black faculty on this campus. We only have one black female faculty member here. To have this position finally open and then cut it at the last minute, we need to question. She stated she would like support around this table for reopening that search. If we don’t put resources in this program, it can’t grow. There was general applause for Russ’ statement.

Sniez added the process is very different than it was a year ago or even a year and a half ago. The President just reported that Princeton Review identifies us as one of the best. Given that, why is the administration not trusting faculty? She stated she wants the administration to trust that faculty knows what we are doing when serving on search committees. It was not this way 4 or 5 years ago.

Eudey stated regarding the Ethnic Studies position, although there is a reassessment about resources going on, the Ethnic/Gender Studies Department did an external review and the external reviewer made the point that an African-American position was required for the program to grow. Note, that position also addresses Native American Studies issue. The department has been building and working towards that the last five years. Much like the Gender Studies Program that couldn’t grow until we had a tenure track faculty member hired. Gender Studies has now doubled in size. Clearly what we do works, so why not do it? Suddenly in the middle of a search, we are told it is cancelled. That is bad timing and bad management. Taniguchi agreed that the way things have changed has directly to do with process. Nothing destroys confidence more than an administrator shutting things down after we have followed the process. It creates bad working conditions. She stated the system of process has to go both ways. The search was approved at many levels, funded, advertised then the whole university owes it to the good of students to fulfill the requirements of the entire process.

Covino stated he first wanted to speak in general to how well the process in place seems to be working. He is heartened since he came here in the number of searches and the quality of candidates he has seen, there are 30 this year and 20 last year. Many departments have been able to hire their first choices or someone who is eminently well qualified. He stated he has authorized every hire recommendation that has come across his desk. Apart from local concerns about certain issues which can be further discussed, he is seeing great candidates and great hires. Everyone here is doing a wonderful job of attracting candidates here and that is no easy thing to do these days.

Marshall stated she would like to speak to the search for the Dean of the College of HSS. There were candidates brought to campus, and in fact, brought for a second interview. Someone was offered the position but turned it down and it is unclear why the other candidate was not offered the position. She stated she felt the search committee came up with great candidates, and then the search fell apart. She stated there was an email this week that stated the search committee was reconstituted and Dean Novak was listed as the Chair. Why was he chosen: 1) he is a dean and 2) he is not a member of the College of HSS. Provost Covino replied the Dean of HSS search was just as frustrating for him as the faculty. He stated he is struggling very hard to conclude the ongoing searches. He interviewed and spoke with folks at follow-up visits, one can’t go very much further in explaining reasons without inappropriate disclosures. But, he stated he certainly considered everyone’s qualifications in great detail. He stated he needed to make that call and he did. He realizes he’ll make decisions that make some people unhappy. Relative to the current search, he did reconstitute the search committee, attended to the policy in place. Fifty percent of the members are faculty, he consulted with COC, he asked Dean Novak to chair the committee out of respect for his longstanding service as a faculty member. The Chair is a facilitator, not a primus voice. He knows the committee went through a lot so he figured bringing in Novak was giving them the latitude to deliberate. This is a search committee structure he has confidence in and we will see how it works.

Thompson, speaking as member of the College of HSS, stated that when he looks at the list of how the committee has been constituted, we now have a thorn which is HSS. We had no other MPP Dean Search Committees. Maybe this can ‘help the committee’ but there needs to be a recognition that this feeds a perception of distrust of faculty on the part of administrators. Second, this is about communication. He stated when he looks at the policy and looks at how committees were constituted, those were foregone to have a faculty trusting committee, and now after a failed search, just for my college colleagues, it seems like that is being pulled back. Carroll stated he hears some saying that we should really be focusing on a general picture of success. It seems that there is at very least a perception of a pattern of abuse of faculty rights, from paternalism to autocracy. He stated he felt a little better after SEC’s discussion with the President, the focus was genuine transparency and real communication. If those things happen in the future, that would be a good thing and those will be the criteria he will apply when he sees what happens with these searches.

Demetruilas stated she wanted to address whether MPP or faculty serve as Chairs of search committees. We go through cycles. At one time only MPPs chaired search committees. It was to be a facilitator. Under other Provosts and Presidents, we had both. There
is no particular pattern. Garcia stated he wants to make sure his motion doesn’t get lost. In terms of spending a good deal of time addressing search procedures which is a serious issue, but the belief that this might be a symptom of broader issues of trust and dialogue and communication should not be lost.

b. Course Proposal from English

Thompson announced that the Department of English is forwarding a course proposal for English 1000 that will be a baccalaureate level course. Our intention is to no longer have students placed in remedial course in English. These students will be placed in English 1000 and will get credit toward degree, but will not satisfy GE A2. This proposal will go to the College of HSS Curriculum Committee. Hopefully Fall students will be placed in this new baccalaureate class.

9. ADJOURNMENT-4:25