

<p>Academic Senate February 26, 2008</p> <p>Present: Broadwater, Brown, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Eudey, Garza, Gomula, Grobner, Hall, Hejka-Ekins, Johnson, Kavasch, Keswick, Manrique, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Ringstad, Robbins, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Sumser, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Werling, Zong</p> <p>Proxies: Bice (Clarke) Poole (Hall)</p> <p>Guests: Nael Aly, Carl Bengston, Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Roger McNeil, Daryl Moore, Gary Novak, Armin Schulz, Carolyn Stefanco, Steve Stryker, Ted Wendt, Ken Whitfield</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</p>	<p>2/AS/08/FAC—Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy, APPROVED</p> <p>3/AS/08/FAC—CSUS Evaluation Policy and Procedures for Temporary Faculty, REFERRED TO FAC</p> <p>4/AS/08/SEC—Statement on Proposed Fee Increase for Graduate Business Degrees in the CSU System, APPROVED</p> <p>Discussion: Collegiate Learning Assessment/Voluntary System of Accountability</p> <p>Discussion: Draft Report for the Capacity and Preparatory Review</p> <p>Discussion: Prioritization of the Strategic Plan</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, March 11, 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 2:38 pm.
2. Approval of Agenda-It was MSP S. Davis/O'Brien.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of January 22, 2008- It was MSP Eudey/Taniguchi.
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - a. Sankey announced there will be an all day conference on Paleontology on April 19. All are invited.

b. Eudey announced the Empire Conference is on March 13-15. Two plenary sessions are free and open to the public. All conference panels are free and open to CSUS faculty, students and staff. If you intend to bring an entire class at a particular time, please let her know. It is \$165 for people from the outside to attend.

c. Gomula, Senator from Art, related that there would be a reception and display of Dean DeCocker's art in the JSRFDC hall immediately following this meeting.

d. Interim Vice President of Business and Finance Ken Whitfield was introduced. Whitfield stated he's here to learn and observe and wants to create value on campus.

e. Eudey advised that next Tuesday is when Vicki Ruiz comes to campus.

f. Tynan stated that the Social Work Department is having its annual event on March 28 at the Ag Center in Ceres. The subject is methamphetamine in the community. Dr. Peck from UCLA and other speakers who work in the field will be making presentations. Contact the Social Work Department for more information. CEU's are available for attending.

g. Provost Covino announced that we are consulting with Noel-Levitz concerning how to market the university. There are meetings today and tomorrow with faculty and students. The purpose is to identify areas of distinction.

The provost also made an announcement relating to the budget. The Budget Consultation Committee held three open meetings. Participants discussed budget priorities and areas where cuts might be made. There were requests for additional information, and some responses have already been made. The provost and VP Whitfield are members of the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC). UBAC met recently, reviewed issues of the Budget Consultation Committee (BCC) and looked at time sensitive issues. UBAC decided there should be another Budget Consultation Committee meeting in a couple of weeks, and then UBAC should take over with its responsibility to make budget recommendations. With regard to Academic Affairs, he reviewed with UBAC that he had authorized thirty-three faculty searches, but put a moratorium on them several weeks ago. He subsequently decided to allow some searches to go forward, Out of the thirty-three, eleven searches are filled or going forward. One in CBA is filled. Out of four in COE one is filled and one offered. There are two to three in HHS, but if Nursing searches are not successful, some dollars might shift to Psychology. In HSS there are four, two with offers pending, one filled in CJ and one in History made a recommendation. In CNS two are moving forward, one in Biology and one in Chemistry. There was almost no discussion of these positions in BCC and UBAC. Regarding curriculum and schedule for next year, we were planning for significant growth, so the schedule now in draft form is considered oversized. This year we are funded for 7100 ftes, and that is our CSU target. This year we set an internal target for 7300 FTES so we could get more funding for next year. We will probably achieve 7430 FTES. Given that momentum, the schedule projected for next year is for 7600. It would assume \$3-4M more in enrollment growth money than we are now projected to receive. Therefore Covino asks colleges, faculty and chairs to look at the schedule, pull it back closer to our internal target for this year and put any savings in reserve. When we reach a point where we need to determine where to use that money, then we can act. This is the process going on in the colleges.

Schoenly asked for clarification that for next year our target is 7100. Covino agreed and replied our internal target is 7250. Schoenly asked about the signal that sends to Long Beach. Provost Covino agreed. However, it is a pullback of about 200 FTE from the number we are enrolling this year. It also provides a measure of safety meeting the funded target, and additional access to students. O'Brien stated we do have a steering committee (BCC) and it is agreed they will have one or two more meetings. He asked faculty to please come and express their opinions. We want to see where the campus will go if there are cuts. Everything is on the table. He stated he's

looking for the principles that guide us. What is sacred, what can be cut? We should protect 'human capital' and equity across the campus.

Eudey stated her assumption that FTE is for Fall, Winter and Spring. Provost Covino replied we are doing targets for the entire year which includes Summer Session. Sarraille stated that so much of our budget is salaries, that if we don't get a reduction in the projected cuts, people will lose their jobs. Unless we are willing to fight reductions, we are saying it is okay for people to be 'offed'.

Thompson asked about the timeline for hires. The first announcement of a moratorium indicated a possible one-month timeframe and he told people that, but he hasn't heard another timeline. Do we have any idea when we might have decisions to move forward on hires? Provost Covino replied he does not see a basis for a decision to authorize more. That could change, but at some point it will be too late for the searches. Thompson commented on O'Brien's previous comment. He is on the Budget Consultation Committee. He was unable to attend last Friday's meeting but read the notes and saw there was an email from a staff member inquiring about Winter Term. He noted there were a lot of inaccuracies in the email. One example: the staff member stated that because of Winter Term, faculty teach less than other CSU campuses. The idea that UBAC would make a recommendation about Winter Term is not any different than if they made a recommendation on canceling Spring or Fall Term. He stated he hopes the members of UBAC recognize that a fully consultative decision would have to come to the faculty for any recommendation. O'Brien stated there is nothing proposed, but there was some discussion of whether there could be savings. However the potential savings was thought to be small. Novak stated that it was suggested at the meeting that there were short- and long-term things that could be discussed, Winter Term was considered long-term. He said he would be very surprised if UBAC did anything about Winter Term. O'Brien stated in looking at Whitfield's numbers, it looks like our potential loss is \$2.5M. We need discussion on where the cuts would be.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. 2/AS/08/FAC—Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy (replaces 11/AS/00/FAC)

Johnson advised this brings our policy in conformance with our CBA. It establishes a timeline of 14 days.

There being no discussion, the question was called. Vote approved by voice vote.

This will be sent to the President.

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

Johnson advised that this replaces a previous policy. This also brings us in conformance with the CBA. Sarraille stated he was told someone might speak up regarding this resolution, so he took a look at it. He did notice one thing people should be made aware of in the text of the revised version, page 14, middle of page, section 4.2, last paragraph states that "department faculty and

administration must consult to make a decision regarding student evaluation of courses (see Article 15.15 of CBA).” Section 15.15 states “...Unless consultation has resulted in an agreement by the administration and faculty of a department or equivalent unit to evaluate all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated.” If you compare this language, it does not require consultation with administration. Eudey questioned if the consultation protects the instructor or imposes on the chair. Who benefits from consultation? Sarraille replied that the language in the proposed policy provides administration a way to tell temporary faculty what courses are to be evaluated. If you read contract and past practice, it is handled at the department level by the chair and faculty. This punches up the possibility of a decree from a higher level. AVPFA Wendt agreed. The caveat is 15.15's intent is that there be consultation between the individual faculty member who is to be reviewed and the chair, but in lieu of the chair then the question is who? The intent is about choosing what you are going to review. Nagel stated he wasn't at the FAC meeting when they discussed this, but did talk to R. Floyd, Chair of FAC about the consultation piece, and one problem is whether that agreement between faculty, department chair and administration applies only to temporary faculty or all in a department. There is ambiguity in the language. Hejka-Ekins added that the way it is written now is over-specified because the language is not in the CBA. Sarraille stated that he didn't want to oppose the resolution if it was what the lecturers wanted. Nagel indicated he didn't like the language, and that he can't speak for all lecturers. He suggested this was an attempt by FAC to make sense of the language. Hejka-Ekins stated FAC is open to reconsider language if concerns here are strong enough. It was MS Nagel/Sumser to refer back to FAC with respect to the language “4.2 that states that “department faculty and administration must consult to make a decision regarding student evaluation of courses (see Article 15.15 of CBA).” Nagel stated he would like to see ‘must consult’ reconsidered. Johnson asked Nagel to send suggested language to R. Floyd and it will be put back on FAC agenda.

Vote passed by voice vote.

c. 4/AS/08/SEC—Statement on Proposed Fee Increase for Graduate Business Degrees in the CSU System

Johnson stated although a straw vote was taken at the last meeting to change or add a Resolved clause, SEC was unclear as to the correct language so no change was made. Eudey suggested a friendly amendment to change the first Resolved clause to read “ That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus, strongly opposes the implementation of a system wide discipline specific professional fee for graduate degrees; and be it” .Johnson added it leaves it open to have fees established at the university level, and that is a good option. The body accepted this as a friendly amendment.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the amended resolution passed unanimously. This will be sent forward.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Collegiate Learning Assessment/Voluntary System of Accountability (CLA/VSA)

Johnson advised that this item was continued from the last Senate meeting. It has to do with recommendations of the Spelling Report, requirement of assessment processes to take place on college and university campuses and be publicized. Reportedly, the CSU is doing CLA/VSA in order to put something in place 'voluntarily' now, before something more problematic is imposed. There is a two year pilot. The last paragraph of the SWAS document (that was distributed) mentions that it was not approved with consultation of faculty. Johnson stated her belief assessment practice should be the outcome of faculty processes. She asked if we wanted to make some statement of concern about what is happening or wait until the 2 years is up and request the opportunity to be involved in the decision.

Taniguchi noted that on page 21, the CLA/VSA has spilled over into the CPR report. She stated she is the program assessment coordinator for the History Department. They are trying to look at the entire program to prepare our graduates. What we need is more education on assessment among ourselves. She agrees faculty should be involved in assessment decisions and there needs to be clear understanding of what is involved in student assessment and program assessment. She stated she is uncomfortable that the decision was made without faculty consultation and with the wording on pp 21-55 in the CPR. She stated she is not sure how to achieve an understanding of what we are doing but we have to start with involving faculty. Thompson asked what will happen on this campus relative to CLA? Provost Covino replied that it is administered to first year students and seniors. The results of the CLA's will be on a web page. Each campus will publish such a web page. All the web pages will have the same look. It will be an indicator of 'value added'. Thompson asked if this was just a system mandate with no reason given. Covino replied in the affirmative.

Sarraille added that the Access to Excellence document, the Strategic Planning document at the statewide level, states the CSU already anticipates continuing with this program (after the two-year pilot runs out). It says the outcome of the pilot will be positive so we will continue testing. Demetrulias advised the SWAS resolution says there was lack of consultation at the system level, but here there were several opportunities for faculty to participate in discussions on our campus and some faculty committees were involved. She stated we are trying to get control over what is already happening such as; do you want to continue, do you want to put them on a certain schedule? Also, she stated they compared CLA with other instruments, looked at what they did, the kind of information they yield, cost, intensity of involvement, who has been using information, for what reason. We are trying to get an audit of what we have and where we are going. Johnson stated her concern was over what happened at the system level. Provost Covino replied we were doing CLA prior to the system mandate based on consultation. Sarraille stated it would be nice to document who did what, who consulted, what they decided. Thompson asked if there had been consultation with faculty committees, or just with some faculty. Demetrulias replied she was not sure which committees but maybe the ASL. Johnson asked when Demetrulias talked about meeting with faculty, did that go up to the system? Demetrulias replied that it was not part of the process. But now since it has been administered, we are taking the summary to ASL, UWC, GE, UEPC. Johnson stated it sounds like it's okay on this campus, but do we want to say anything systemwide? Johnson stated she wants to make sure it happens at the system level. O'Brien replied the SWAS is meeting next week, so he will see what the SWAS does about it and report back. Johnson advised that Filling is attending a system conference talking about this issue so he will be able to share at the next meeting. Eudey stated we lucked out that this test is working out okay for us. It would be good for us to go on the record as to how we stand. If we are heard now we will have more power if they try to impose something again. Gomula stated that the Art Department has a goal to keep the assessment data in the

program. If the data will be published online, how does that square with the budget process? Johnson wondered, since the information is at the University level, could it be used to make decisions when allocating resources between campuses. Demetrulias stated they are careful to attend to principles of assessment of student learning. We don't collect the data by programs or college so it can't be analyzed. We need to say, this has been our experience, this has worked well and this will help in feedback if we continue in this way. Johnson stated her hope it is a pilot, but it didn't sound like a pilot in the system Strategic Plan.

Johnson will let Senators know when the results are posted.

b. Draft report for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (Davis/Stryker, time certain 4:00)

Steve Stryker and Scott Davis were asked to attend so they could get input on the draft report for Capacity and Preparatory Review. Stryker stated they are finishing up a draft of the first of two reports for the WASC re-accreditation process. Within the next month they will finalize and send in for publication. They are collecting input over the next week. The report goes to WASC in July and we are preparing for their visit in October. By then WASC will have read the report, so there should be no surprises when they come to campus. The inquiry circles that drafted essays will continue to work into next year. Based on this report review, they will draft the final report, which is an effectiveness review. They will collect data from various groups and do an evaluative report next year. The second visit will be in 2010. He stated he would be happy to have volunteers to join the inquiry circles during the next phase of review.

O'Brien stated he read it and it is beautifully written, but his only concern was that it painted too bright a picture. For example, there is nothing about our budget constraints or parking issues. So his question is: is that the document you want to highlight - who we are without any self criticism? He stated his concern: if we write a document that says we are perfect, how do we move forward from there? Maybe we should point out weakness we can work toward repairing rather than let them find weaknesses. Stryker replied the reports are divided into two parts. We are not supposed to do an evaluation in the first report. We are suppose to do a capacity review and setting up the stage for our evaluation. It will attempt to evaluate where we are and where we are not doing well. We have tried to describe capacity, not where we want them things to go. But in the next phase we will make objective evaluations even in areas where we are not doing well. It will be a self critique. He stated if anyone wants to participate in that discussion, join an inquiry circle. Thompson indicated his appreciation of the way that RPT elaborations were described and said he thought it would be useful for years to come. He asked if there was discussion of what part of our space is classroom space. Davis replied no, there is a question about space allocation. We make a claim that there is a process for looking into space allocation. The effectiveness of those decisions will be in the next report. Stryker added we can address the question of whether the faculty thinks space allocation is done right. Some of the data that has been collected has not been examined yet. About elaborations, we describe the process that each department has of creating elaborations and that they have all addressed RSCA. We might want to follow up by examining elaborations for patterns that exist, gaps, ... look at different types of RSCA. The next question is, we got a system in place that is elaborations, but is this system working as we hope? Thompson stated his question was not about process or decision making, but about how much of the space we have added is classrooms.

Schoenly asked to what extent can we elaborate on the Workload Plan. Does WASC care it was originally a grievance and whether we resolved it? Stryker stated his feeling is no. Every campus is wrestling with these kinds of issues. They might want to know what we have come up with in dealing with generic problems across the system. S. Davis added we could say we had a problem and found a way to resolve it. That is good information. Stryker advised that WASC groups do not get into budget and workload. It is not part of what they are looking for. We have highlighted change since the Workload Plan and it has huge implications of RSCA and teaching loads so we will say what we think is appropriate: how it affects our teaching. We can't say everything about all these topics. They are looking at things that impact the quality of student learning and quality of outcomes. Schoenly stated it seems somewhat counter intuitive that WASC asked for a definition of scholarship and then does not wonder how we are going to fund release time to do scholarship. Demetrulias explained about one of the elements from the last WASC review. RSCA was identified as a primary area. We do need to evaluate the extent to which we support RSCA. There is also a set of required data elements we have to bring forward. We have to report whether we have the capacity to offer programs at a reasonable level. Someone on the WASC team will have a budget background. We do need to address ways we support RSCA, through description. The finished product cannot be more than 30 pages. We do need to think about what the important messages are. Stryker added that in order to answer accurately about RSCA, we will want to make certain we have feedback from the RSCAPC. Sarraile asked about some text in the report that seemed to imply that the Faculty Workload Agreement had been re-negotiated in 2007, which is not the case. He will follow up.

c. Prioritization of the Strategic Plan

Johnson referred to the spreadsheet that was attached to the agenda. She summarized input the task force received from committees, a few faculty, and the ASI. She stated she received suggested priorities from most of the faculty committees, received comments from individual faculty, staff had indicated priorities, and the ASI. Staff input is summarized on a separate spreadsheet. This topic is brought forward so faculty have the opportunity to recommend priorities for action in regard to the Strategic Plan.

The "Strategic Actions" listed on the spreadsheet are those that received three or more mentions. If we want to participate, we could say which ones we think are most important right now. COC wanted assurance before they participate and before any specific activities were identified, that the Strategic Plan Work Group would come back to the Senate. The Work Group has every intention of coming back, but COC wanted something from the administration saying that. They liked some Strategic Actions but not all the bullets (Activities and Effectiveness Indicators) under them. They were concerned the administration might use them for goals of which they did not approve. Hejka-Ekins stated she was on the previous Strategic Planning Committee, and now we have another one and lots of work - so is it going to be used, and how will it be used, and will it be tied to budget decisions? Morgan-Foster agreed stating this is the fourth strategic planning process she's been involved with. However, the intention of this Strategic Plan is that it will guide the campus direction. Johnson stated we have the Strategic Plan Work Group because we wanted to make sure faculty have the opportunity to provide input. It is important we participate.

Johnson asked Senators to look at the Strategic Plan and the strategic actions and come back with a position on the issues. Talk to your department and participate in the process.

Continue to the next Senate meeting.

- d. Final Exams on Reading Day/Last week of class - carryover.
 - e. Workload - carryover.
8. OPEN FORUM
 9. ADJOURNMENT 4:23.