

<p>Academic Senate April 29, 2008</p> <p>Present: Bender, Bice, Broadwater, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Floyd, Garza, Gomula, Grobner, Hall, Helzer, Jibby, Johnson, Kavasch, Keswick, Lawson, Manrique, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Poole, Ringstad, Robbins, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Stessman, Sumser, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Werling, Zong</p> <p>Proxy: Mobley (Janz)</p> <p>Guests: Aly, C. Brown, Demetrulias, DeVries, C. Floyd, McNeil, Moore, Novak Petrosky, Riedmann, Schulz, Stefanco, Wendt, Whitfield</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</p>	<p>3/AS/08/FAC—CSUS Evaluation Policy and Procedures for Temporary Faculty, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>12/AS/08/SEC--Policy on Shared Governance During the Summer, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>13/AS/08/FBAC--Resolution in Support of University Services and Classroom Instruction, APPROVED</p> <p>DISCUSSION: RPT Concerns/Faculty Workload</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, May 13, 2008 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>John Sarraille, Clerk</p>
---	--

1. Call to order at 2:38 pm.
2. Approval of Agenda-approved.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 15, 2008--page 4, strike the sentence on page 4, "A better word might be bitter." Approved as amended.
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
  - a. Taniguchi reported that Department of History graduate students swept the awards at the recent Northern California Conference of Phi Alpha Theta, the national honor society in history. Giving formal conference papers, our students placed first, second and third. Universities in our conference include San Jose State, Chico State, U.C. Berkeley, University of the Pacific, and Santa Clara University, among others. Also, History undergraduate Kayla Canelo, spurred by a Winter Term class on the Japanese American Internment, has made a successful proposal to the Turlock Fairgrounds Board to allow the construction of a monument within the fairgrounds to commemorate its use as an Assembly Center -- a prison -- for Japanese Americans during World War II. The Board designated a garden area with benches by the North Gate as the appropriate site. Fundraising for the memorial has begun.
  - b. O'Brien advised that the statewide academic senate's Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee (FGAC) performs lobbying and promotes legislation. This year the committee decided to concentrate on the state budget issue. Members put together a brochure and visited many legislators in Sacramento recently. They feel the visits went well. The California Faculty Association also contributed a brochure. It explains possible economic

affects of proposed CSU budget cuts. The consensus among statewide senators and CFA leaders is that arguments based on economic considerations are the most persuasive in the current political climate. O'Brien distributed samples of the brochures.

c. Jibby announced that there was only one contested in the just-completed ASI elections. Six hundred students voted. Andrew Janz was re-elected President.

d. S. Davis announced that the 37<sup>th</sup> annual Faculty Beer-B-Q will be held on May 17. Please mark your calendar and buy your tickets from the 'usual suspects': (Econ Dept 3338, S. Filling 3773, W. Doraz 3512, C. Mercier 3456, K. Stone 3570, and S. Davis 3883).

e. Covino advised he has completed a process to assure that Academic Affairs and the colleges are solvent. Enough money is left in AA for a one-time reserve to fund some equipment purchases for colleges. He will ask deans tomorrow to propose equipment needs that can be purchased within the next few weeks and he will make equipment for faculty research a priority. He stated he hopes to devote up to \$75,000 to \$100,000 for this. Secondly, our Extended Education Program has improved UEE revenues to the point that he expects to have \$75,000 to \$100,000 in UEE profits by fall. In support of priorities in the Strategic Plan, and recognition of high interest in faculty research, he will allot those monies for assigned time for faculty RSCA, which he hopes will allow for 15-25 sections of assigned time. He has also asked LAC whether it wishes to devote a portion of RSCA funding not subject to Chancellor's office regulations to faculty assigned time. He stated this might give us another \$30,000 or \$60,000. Such plans remain tentative until we find out more about the state budget. He wants to roll the plan out in fall and spring and would like to have something like \$1 million for assigned time for faculty eventually. There should be more if we can get grant money later. Filling asked if he would be interested in directing funds to uncut sections of courses and Covino replied we are currently funded at 7100 FTES and targeted at 7250 FTES for 08-09. He stated he doesn't see a good reason to increase class availability beyond funding limits. We have already exceeded targets and continue to erode quality of programs. This sends the wrong message to Sacramento regarding our capacity to run classes with insufficient funding. He stated he considers faculty research a high priority, as does faculty.

f. Morgan-Foster announced the Career Fair is tomorrow.

g. R. Floyd advised the second of two faculty conversations on Post Tenure Review will be held tomorrow morning at 8:30 am at the FDC Reference Room.

## 5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

## 6. ACTION ITEMS

a. 3/AS/08/FAC—CSUS Evaluation Policy and Procedures for Temporary Faculty (replaces 15/AS/07/FAC)

Floyd related that, at a previous Academic Senate meeting, senators asked that FAC further discuss the sentence below. FAC complied and the result was unanimous approval of the indicated amendment.

**Under 4. Process, 4.2** third paragraph, the word "may" was added and the word "must" was deleted.

Department faculty and administration ~~must~~ may consult to make a decision regarding student evaluation of courses (see Article 15.15 of CBA). In the absence of such an agreement, the affected faculty member to be evaluated and the department chair must consult. If there is disagreement on which classes should be evaluated, the faculty member would pick half and the chair would pick half.

There being no discussion, the question was called. The resolution, as amended, was approved unanimously by voice vote. It will be sent to the President with the senate's request to take action.

b. 12/AS/08/SEC--Policy on Shared Governance During the Summer

Thompson advised that the *Resolved* clause and Rationale had not been changed since the introduction of the resolution at the previous AS meeting. There being no discussion, the question was called. The resolution was approved unanimously by voice vote. It will be sent to the President with the senate's request to take action.

c. 13/AS/08/FBAC--Resolution in Support of University Services and Classroom Instruction

Schoenly advised that at the last Senate meeting, the resolution was referred back to FBAC for further consideration. FBAC met on April 23 and conducted a thorough discussion. FBAC examined notes from the Senate meeting and,

in accordance with a suggestion found therein, made the amendment indicated below. It was the consensus of FBAC that the resolution did not have an adversarial tone or malicious intent. FBAC also discussed the rationale and decided to make no changes. It was noted that if the resolution is approved, only the *Resolved* clause goes to the President for signature. The amendment was passed unanimously by FBAC. The resolution now reads:

Be it Resolved: ~~That the Academic Senate urge the~~ That the President to give priority to faculty and staff support over MPP positions when considering budget reductions.

Discussion:

Covino stated he is strongly in favor of prioritizing faculty and staff support in considering budget reductions but will be voting against this resolution for the reasons he stated at a previous meeting. His objections have more to do with the framing of the resolution and rationale, rather than the spirit. Nagel replied that the spirit of the resolution is to give priority to all faculty and staff. The resolution does not discriminate between permanent and temporary faculty and staff. He expressed gratitude for that.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. The chair called for a secret ballot. The motion passed with a vote of 36 yes and 4 no. The resolution will be sent to the President with the senate's request to take action.

## 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### a. Retention, Promotion and Tenure Concerns/Faculty Workload

Sarraille advised that prior to the meeting, in various fora, uncertainty was expressed over whether this topic is a proper one for discussion in the Academic Senate. For this reason, a document has been distributed that explains the roles of academic senates and the CFA. RPT Policy is very central to what senates deal with. Also, it is alright for the AS to comment on matters with which the CFA deals. In fact senates are encouraged to do that. In the discussion we are about to have, it will be alright to discuss RPT policy, but not alright to discuss merits of individual RPT cases.

Thompson stated that an email went out to Senators regarding this issue. SEC discussed it at length at its last meeting. The handout shows that the Senate is permitted to discuss the issue. We are quite sure that the CFA does not feel we are stepping on its toes.

Filling, wearing his CFA hat, stated he spent a lot of time on the phone this week talking to colleagues, some of whom have been here a long time, some not. Their concern was over the Provost's input to RPT files. The majority of junior faculty were approved, but there were disturbing statements from the Provost in the letters he sent: statements of requirements such as substantial publication in nationally recognized venues, nationally recognized peer-reviewed venues, substantial external grant funding - requirements that were not in departmental elaborations. URPTC did not look at some of the files because faculty were not up for a full review. Another example, a junior faculty member serving as program assessment coordinator was told she must show progress toward publication, but these words are not in her elaborations. Junior faculty are disturbed over the ratcheting up of expectations. It does not make sense to raise the bar in this manner. Because of these concerns, CFA produced a statement (distributed) with suggestions on how faculty should deal with this 'new reality'.

Sarraille stated he noted with interest the Provost's announcement that money may be forthcoming to support research in the future. However that doesn't take care of the past, or make up for telling people today that, because of some out-of-the-blue criteria, there will not be a positive decision from the provost on a faculty status case. What do we do now about these decisions?

Peterson stated she talked to people in her department and they are concerned that the current trends will change the university's mission. When most of us were hired, the main emphasis was on teaching and that was the appeal of this institution. When going through the hiring process, one person spoke with administration and was told of their expectations of research, and it was not in the elaborations. The stories she is hearing about expectations seem unrealistic given where we are now. Further, she is confused: although it is important for people to be active in research, it is not the main goal to change this into a research institution. Also, two weeks ago in the last AS meeting the Provost said no one complained about the cutbacks in faculty hiring, but in her department they were upset because when they were told they could not complete the hiring process, the department had complained. The Dean complained too. So the idea faculty would rather have money for research over tenure-track hires or classes is

not true. That is not our goal. Covino clarified his comment in the minutes regarding advocating for positions: Faculty did advocate clearly, as did the deans. What he was referring to was that when UBAC got to the point of making recommendations to the President, they expressed a desire to gather additional information rather than argue for positions.

O'Brien stated it is unfortunate we are here again having this discussion because he thought the matter was settled last year. He agrees with Peterson this is not UC Stanislaus, and he did not come here expecting that. He has been looking at various missions statements e.g. in the Strategic Plan, in various departments, the CSU system and they all say teaching is paramount. He agrees. We should do research, but what should be the mix? The language we got in the handout from Filling does not seem apropos to most faculty. Finally, he stated that it saddens him to see fellow faculty slaving for six years, working toward the stated goals, and then to get 'that letter'. It is demoralizing. Other reviews says you are making progress, but you are slapped down at the end. He stated his concern that there is much law regarding the treatment of employees, and to do an about-face on a long term employee may put faculty, departments and the university in jeopardy. They should consult legal counsel.

Eudey stated she has had good conversations in discussion circles about improving teaching by doing research. Looking at elaborations, the criteria give focus to how people engage in their disciplines. Some publish in open-source publications, sometimes for political reasons, doing a lot of valuable things that are not necessarily going into nationally-recognized journals. There is value in what they do in terms of the mission of our university. We should focus on our elaborations in the RPT process. Also we need to focus on what research means here. The enhancement of student learning is important. Faculty should also get credit for other things besides RSCA, such as chairing and serving on faculty committees.

Dean Brown stated he appreciates the hard work of faculty peer review committees and their interpretation of elaborations. He said he has seen the kinds of statements Filling quoted earlier. Faculty in the disciplines know what faculty's accomplishments and achievements are. Peer review committee reports contain encouragement for junior faculty to publish. This does not come just from administration.

Werling stated the issue in his department with the letters they got back is not only the possibility of extra work, but the question of what the extra work is. What is meant by terms such as "nationally-recognized" and "peer-reviewed"? If you are going to change the elaborations, at least define them well. Further, there is the appearance requirements such as "attracting significant grant funding." What is this? Does it mean enough funding to complete one's research, or more than that? It sounds as if one must fund one's own promotion or tenure. The terminology is vague. It reflects nothing in the elaborations.

Poole stated that when we began discussing the workload agreement, it was about making requests for time to do research. It was not seen as a one-size-fits-all formula. But now it seems the effort is to make us all fit the same pattern. We have to be aware people choose variations, and departments value that.

Sarraille read from the Principles, Criteria and Procedures of RPT stating 'A faculty member has the right to be evaluated according to elaborations in effect when he or she was hired or to which the faculty member subsequently has agreed.' It is not legitimate to add new elaborations onto faculty after they are hired. Also, as stated in the PCPRPT, elaborations have to be approved by URPTC.

Stone voiced concern about the must-publish, must-bring-in-grants attitude. Faculty may drop important work and concentrate on a research agenda or a "me, me" approach: "We must produce, we must get grants, or we won't be promoted." People will leave or take the tack: "If it doesn't help me, I won't do it."

Filling responded to Dean Brown's statement. He sees the entire university rather than just the College of Education. Department chairs and department RPTC's had significant problems with what the Provost put in his letters.

Young stated when she looks at elaborations, she looks at them as a contract or an agreement on what the requirements are. Once it leaves the department level and you have the recommendation of the department, is the elaboration honored at the higher levels or are there subjective, unspoken criteria at a higher level? Schulz stated his hope that there are not other criteria. Elaborations are the domain of a discipline and department. They are set up as guidelines for faculty to use to help them meet expectations in areas of service, scholarship and creative activities. They vary from department to department. URPTC members encourage the candidates to pay attention to the elaborations. When conducting faculty reviews, URPTC members are reading outside their disciplines. Schulz

cautions them to honor the elaborations and constantly keep them in mind. URPTC sometimes encourages the development of elaborations. If elaborations are changed, it doesn't mean the candidate cannot use the old elaborations they were hired under. But if a department votes new ones, you are in a way giving a voice saying he/she will live under the new ones. Covino agreed. Riedmann stated the most-used phrase by URPTC is 'what does it say in the elaborations, what are the elaborations?' Further, the committee was very careful always basing their conclusions on elaborations. C. Floyd agreed with Schulz and Riedmann that elaborations were their guidelines. He likes what Eudey said about connecting teaching and research. They don't expect R1-type elaborations.

Schoenly added that the Naraghi building was built for teaching, not research. The labs are for teaching, the offices ... everything. If we receive site visits from granting institutions, we can't show them where we would put research equipment, and we don't have facilities to support research. He is concerned what WASC will see when they get here, and what the outcome will be of their review of our facilities.

O'Brien asked Schulz if he considers elaborations rubrics and Schulz replied that they are not exactly rubrics. He considers a rubric to have a numerical equivalence. Elaborations are criteria.

Dean Moore stated the key thing for him not mentioned is what happens after the recommendation goes to the faculty member. If language doesn't fit with process, then dialogue should happen. If anything is inappropriate, faculty have the means to rebut that. Thompson stated we realize we are in mid-process, but we have limited time. There is a need to have a discussion.

Demetrulias said this is a very important issue, and we should continue to discuss. This came up in the last two WASC reviews. WASC encouraged us to have greater clarity and definition of research. That led to development of elaborations as a way to give clarification, definition and guidance to personnel decisions. They are not so clear as to obviate professional judgment by departments, deans and the provost. They are not rubrics, but category, and that gives latitude. Departments should look at elaborations and see if there are ways to build on strength and add greater clarity. They cannot be so precise as to reduce evaluation to counting. Thompson clarified we had elaborations before the last WASC review, but Demetrulias replied we developed them after a WASC review. Thompson disagreed, stating there was a previously instituted requirement for elaborations.

R. Floyd stated due to the nature of her job, around this time of year she gets calls from distressed colleagues. Colleagues are concerned over the letter they got from the provost saying responses had to be in writing. In the past she has suggested to faculty that they make appointments to go talk to the provost. She asked the provost if they could do that now. Covino replied yes, there is an open invitation. R. Floyd suggested that should be made clear. It is very important for faculty to have a place to go to talk about their concerns one on one. They felt pretty disempowered. Schulz added there is a ten-day time period for rebuttal. UEPC also sets up dates to meet with faculty. URPTC and provost reviews happen in parallel. He strongly encourages the faculty members to respond to the letters if they have concerns.

Petrosky responded to Demetrulias with an anecdote. Six years ago, while going up for accreditation, he went to a conference. The agency was deciding to be mission-driven and encouraged people to create criteria. At the conference, they divided up college representatives into subgroups by category, and assigned someone from an R1 institution to lead each group. That is ignorance or arrogance. At the February 2006 retreat, we addressed mission creep. We need to assert and keep on asserting the differences in mission between a teaching and a research university, and that one is not subordinate to the other.

Riedmann agreed with almost everything. For her, what came up as the bottom-line issue is faculty governance/shared governance. To what extent does a department have control over their own elaborations? Sarraile replied the URPT policy says the department votes on its elaborations, submits them to the URPTC and once approved, they become the law of the land. Riedmann asked if they are not intended to be trumped by administration and Sarraile replied no. All levels of review use the elaborations.

Thompson shared content from e-mails that had been sent to Speaker Johnson. One asks what is the role of each level with respect to recommendations. What does "abide by elaborations" mean? How much latitude is there to interpret? Who decides on the relative importance of each item in the elaborations? From the English Department: the language "nationally recognized" seems to denigrate participation in local and regional scholarly activities, such as the study of second-language acquisition. It has been standard operating procedure for a long time that in order to overturn levels of faculty review, there has to be a clear and compelling rationale.

Wendt said he was confused. There has been talk of elaborations and interpretation of elaborations. Elaborations are general categorical statements. They almost beg for interpretation at every level, and it is done at every level. When Filling says things are not mentioned in elaborations, that is not surprising, because they don't say much. For the most part, faculty are doing good research. It is okay for the provost to put things in letters encouraging faculty to do scholarly work and seek grant funding. Perhaps it is the role of the provost to be cheerleader for those aspirations. We do not aspire to be an R1 institution.

Riedmann replied to Wendt that URPTC does interpret. However when we interpret elaborations, we look at the specifics of the file and we judge whether those specifics meet the general elaborations. There is not a time when we would take it upon ourselves to add specifics to the elaborations.

Filling replied to Wendt's comment that it is alright for the provost to be a cheerleader. This is not an apt term for what the provost put in the letters. He expressed dismay that a junior faculty member was deprecated for taking on the role of assessment coordinator. Most of our colleagues work 60 to 80 hours per week. They are productive. If the discipline, department chair and dean differs with the provost, something is wrong.

Schoenly asked if we know the members of the WASC team. Demetrulias stated she will send the list out. They are from the Association of American Colleges and Universities. Schoenly wondered whether the fact that we are going to be evaluated by representatives of R1 universities tells us something about where the university is going. Demetrulias replied we don't select the membership, although we can object to conflicts of interest.

Novak stated his agreement for the most part with what has been said. It is a very healthy dialogue. Last year we had a discussion on elaborations. He has served on many URPTC's and depending what year the person comes up, the outcome may depend on the ability of the URPTC members to evaluate what is in the person's file. There needs to be a discussion in departments about whether elaborations are really telling faculty what we want. URPTC accepts elaborations and does not necessarily comment on them. There should be a broader discussion and establishment of clarity in the elaborations. C. Davis reminded Senators when faculty receives these letters, they are frightening. There needs to be a process that is less frightening and adversarial.

Filling suggested Senators carry this discussion back to departments. Take the time to find colleagues that have concerns and suggest they contact Sarraille, Filling, and Giventer, who will represent and advocate for them as fully as possible.

b. Budget Cuts

Taniguichi advised that the History Department has concerns about rising costs of facilities. Payment is made from department O&E funds. We need to reduce costs. Let's plan a timeline for discussion next year and a resolution on the issue. By facilities, she means costs for the use of rooms, equipment, technicians, and so forth.

8. OPEN FORUM

9. ADJOURNMENT at 4:18 pm.



