Academic Senate  
November 6, 2007

Present:  Bender, Bice, Borba, Bowers, Brown,  
Colnic, Covino, D. Davis, S. Davis, Deaner,  
DeCocker, Dempsey, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Floyd,  
Garza, Grobner, Hejka-Ekins, Janz, Jibby, Johnson,  
Keswick, Manrique, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson,  
Petratos, Ringstad, Robbins, Sankey, Sarraile,  
Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Stessman, Taniguchi,  
Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Younglove, Zong

Proxy:  R. Floyd (Lawson)

Guests:  Carl Bengston, Carl Brown, Diana  
Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Roger McNeil, Gary  
Novak, Ted Wendt

Recording Secretary:  Diana Bowman

Sense of the Senate Resolution: Request to Division of  
Business and Financial Services and the Budget  
Personnel in the Academic Affairs Office to assist  
FBAC in performing longitudinal five-year analysis of  
administrative (MPP and other) positions and  
organizational structure.  PASSED WITHOUT  
DISSENT

Discussion:  CSU Common set of talking points for  
Board of Trustees, CONTINUED

Discussion:  College Constitutions

Discussion:  Online posting of elaborations,  
CONTINUED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

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

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraile, Clerk

1.  Call to order at 2:38 pm.

2.  Approval of Agenda MSP Eudey/Nagel

3.  Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 23, 2007 page 3, change to access to college constitutions.  MSP Taniguchi/Davis

4.  ANNOUNCEMENTS
   
a.  Johnson reported she attended the faculty/staff picnic and everyone had a great time.

b.  An ad hoc committee in the College of Education has asked SEC to establish a university-wide committee to consider a partnership with Aspire Public Schools.  If you are interested in taking part in this discussion, let SEC or COC know.

c.  Johnson reported that, at the last Senate meeting, she was asked to provide information on the Diversity Committee.  She received a report on their November 1 meeting and emailed it to ASNET.  The Diversity Committee is currently an ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate, but we need to discuss what happens after this year.  Some have suggested the senate make it into a regular committee The topic is on SEC’s agenda for future discussion.  She stated she would like to encourage faculty serving on other committees such as UBAC to send out reports to faculty so we are aware of what is happening around campus.  Further, Senators should stay in touch with their department faculty and let them know what is going on.

d.  Provost Covino reported Dean Brown is retiring this year so he has met with the College of Education faculty to discuss a national search and the search committee.

e.  The Provost also announced that the Governor is asking all state agencies to propose a 10% budget cut.  However this request does not apply to the CSU or UC.
Provost Covino announced that today on campus we have representatives from the system talking about "transforming course design." It is a project designed to improve student learning through the use of effective technology. In the state compact, we expect next year a 1% allocation ($30 million) for technology for the CSU. The CSU expects to use some of the 1% to fund "transforming course design" projects. There will be intra- and inter-campus projects. We made a proposal for a hybrid model of upper division GE. It did not receive a promise of funding. However, we did get a seed grant for the proposal. We have been asked to nominate as many as 4 courses that could be candidates for participation in inter-campus projects. Funding would include commensurate faculty assigned time. The Provost added that one might consider nominating high-enrollment, low-success courses. He mentioned cooperative teaching as a possible enhancement. He stated he will meet with chairs and SEC to get input about this. Implementation is desired for next Spring.

Concerns voiced:

- In courses where you have lack of success, what is the reason for thinking that technology is the answer? Reply from Covino: The idea is to explore ways that technology can help, however the involvement of the teacher is important.
- This sounds similar to ideas of Carol Twigg head of the National Center for Academic Transformation at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Reply by Covino: Yes, this is related. She leads seminars on course transformation.
- Will this be administered totally by the CSU? Reply by Covino: Yes, there will be two kinds of committees; a core committee of faculty that want to work on projects and a CSU faculty committee that reviews progress.
- What is really meant is we are going to give money to faculty to redesign a course and measure their success by whether the grades go up.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

a. Schoenly distributed a handout entitled "Academic Affairs ALS Reorganization". If you have any comments or questions, please send to FBAC.

Comments:

- Where did the savings go?
- Wouldn’t it cost more like $110,000 more per year?
- There are really increased costs. The budget reserve is really undesignated funds. It is money that could have been used elsewhere and now it can’t. And eliminated positions (three listed) are separate and not really savings related to the reorganization.
- If you look at only the cost of reorganization, it may be a $500,000 cost, no savings.

Covino stated when he arrived here, the reorganization had taken place and he was made aware there was money in budget reserves in Academic Affairs to allow for recruitment of permanent deans. This is what is represented in the handout.

Taniguchi agreed these three positions are separate from the College of ALS reorganization, but asked if they would ever come back. Covino replied as far as he knows, currently there are no budget lines for these three positions. But we can’t rule out that sometime in the future they may be added back.

Eudey stated she served on the College of ALS Reorganization Committee and there was a lot of conversation that we could afford the deans because we were cutting other positions. But there have been new positions created, so overall in the last two years she asked where we stand in the total change in administrative costs. Schoenly advised that FBAC discussed the three eliminated positions and found they really aren’t eliminated. There are people in those positions with different titles, possibly lower salary, but are acting in the same role. Flores agreed stating there is a Director of the Graduate School rather than a Graduate Dean. Covino explained the Associate Director of the Graduate School is now the Director, so his duties increased. Hamlet was Assistant to the Dean of Stockton and he is now the Director and assumed some of the previous dean’s duties.

Nagel asked if the $611,000 figure on the handout went to pay three, or four interim Deans and Covino replied four. Thompson asked for the meaning of the line labeled “Founding Deans Increase.” Covino replied they are additional dollars spent to hire the founding deans, for example salaries that were higher than interim deans.

Filling asked how the people that assumed additional duties are able to keep up, since they already had full time jobs. Were more people hired to assist? Also what were the deans promised about having associate deans? Covino
replied the founding dean’s increase is just for the deans, not associate deans. Filling added the document is not accurate because we have associate deans. He asked for an overall analysis. Covino stated there are different, college-by-college approaches to deal with associate and assistant deans, dependent on college budgets. Faculty currently serving as associate or assistant deans are all faculty getting release time. We do a report on release time each year. Filling again requested a more accurate document and Covino concurred. Sarraille suggested doing some tracking of total funding going to administration and instruction. Schoenly replied FBAC is talking about the history of MPP, total amount going to MPP to see how that looks over the last 5 years to see if the numbers are increasing or decreasing. When we look at MPP numbers we won't see the cost of faculty assigned time going to administrative work. That should be measured. Look at faculty activity reports to see if there is assigned time for associate deans and see if it is taking away from instruction. We need to get a clear picture of the true costs of things.

Schoenly advised that earlier in the semester, FBAC did request from VP Stephens a five-year MPP schedule of positions. Further, assignment of faculty time for assisting deans does have a cost. Hejka-Ekins stated her support for Sarraille’s request, and added it is important that FBAC and AS sees where the resources go. Schoenly suggested a sense of the senate resolution to request further information.

It was MS Schoenly/Taniguchi:

Resolved: That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus requests that the Division of Business and Financial Services and the Budget Personnel in the Academic Affairs Office assist FBAC (to the best of their resources and abilities) in performing a longitudinal five-year analysis of administrative (MPP and other) positions and organizational structure. This analysis should include financial impacts and costs, both incurred and foregone; and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus also requests that FBAC direct special attention to the impact of the College of Arts, Letters and Science reorganization.

Discussion:

Eudey suggested that budget costs are very important but that is only the beginning. Salary and budget savings or expenses are only useful in how they support the mission. Many people have increased workload because of cuts we have made. Maybe they should be undone. We need to pay attention to what we have lost and what we have gained by these cuts.

Hejka-Ekins stated that it is important to note that money is power. How money is used and how we understand the budget is a very powerful thing to understand. We are saying we are going after knowledge of the budget. It is important and serious and FBAC should be able to do that because it is their charge.

Bender questioned why the need for a resolution. FBAC requested it, and that information should be available to them. Schoenly replied we are still waiting for it. FBAC also wants to link College of ALS reorganization to MPP schedules.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the Sense of the Senate resolution was approved without dissent by voice vote.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. CSU Common Set of Talking Points for Board of Trustees

Johnson recapped discussion at the last meeting. Everyone was supposed to think about the discussion and come back with other ideas.

Taniguchi suggested in additional to inviting the Board of Trustee members here, we should also invite Legislators. If we want to make changes to the system dealing with the Board of Trustees, we might not be as successful as dealing with Legislators. Johnson asked Senators if they would like us to pursue the idea of inviting a legislator and perhaps a member of the Board of Trustees.
Borba asked what the objective would be and Johnson replied when she attended a systemwide member of faculty chairs, a report was made by some members of SWAS who are in communication with the Board of Trustees and they indicated faculty are not held in highest regard. Some of the comments made by Trustees took some of us by surprise. Because they were so negative, we started a conversation discussing what we could do. Faculty chairs thought one way to reach the Trustees would be to have a common message. The objective is to try to enable Trustees to understand our needs and get rid of their negative perception of faculty, and try to find ways to affect the opinion they have. Borba stated his opposition stating if the Trustees wish to improve relations with faculty and the Trustees, they have to extend their hand; they have to make the effort. Further, he stated based on his experience, it will not work. Leadership has to wish to improve the relationship. It also shows a sign of weakness on our part. Further, he stated he doesn’t want to see us undermine what CFA has done for us.

Sarraille stated it could be an educational opportunity for participants and also might help legislators learn more about our issues and needs, although he agreed with Borba it won’t change the minds of the Board of Trustees. Borba stated we would be better off working with the legislators based on what seemed to work last year. It was the Legislature putting pressure on the Chancellor and the Trustees to get negotiations moving. If we work with the Legislature, we would have a better chance to achieve our objectives and goals.

Thompson recalled when he was Speaker, they invited a Trustee, Executive Vice Chancellor to visit, and Chancellor. So, he disagrees with the statement it won’t work, because if we don’t do it, it will remain an untested hypothesis. Also, he stated he does not think it will undermine the CFA. We have a good working relationship with them. Further, he stated it’s not so much we wanted to reach those people, but we wanted to invite them to see they are just people of whom we can ask questions. Borba stated it is very difficult for education boards to take positions that don’t reflect superintendents, Chancellors and so forth. They will support the Chancellor. It will take something very dramatic to change their minds about the Chancellor. Maybe a big event like corruption exposed in the media is what it will take to make changes. Tynan stated her agreement with Thompson, that whether or not things change if we invite them is irrelevant. It is a good way to communicate with each other and making an effort is important.

At this point Johnson suggestion SEC should take back the ideas brought forward and work on them and come back with a suggestion.

Defer until next time.

b. College Constitutions

All college constitutions were sent out over ASNET. Bowman sent excerpts explaining how the colleges amend their constitutions.

c. On line posting of elaborations

Johnson explained that we are going through the WASC process. A report that came out of the previous WASC accreditation process said we needed to address the way the research, scholarship and creative activity are used in RPT decisions. We were asked to define research, which we did, and we were asked to provide evidence on how we evaluate RPT. The evidence of how we use RSCA is in the elaborations. A lot of the information WASC will use will be online. Someone suggested that the elaborations be put online. If not password protected, they would be there for all to see. SEC thought we should ask faculty how they feel about posting them.

Davis asked what does URPTC say. Johnson replied she has not asked them. Petratos suggested there could be problems from viewing outside the campus. Eudey stated URPTC had some discussion about this and no objections were raised there. She stated she had been on campuses where these things were posted and also at places where they were not. If each department is comfortable with posting, then that seems all right. Nagel agreed asking what possible harm would there be having them online? Petratos stated there huge differences among departments at other university’s. We could get comments/criticism from other institutions. Sarraille agreed with the comment that there is the potential for unfair judgments and criticism. But the bottom line is this is probably the kind of thing departments should decide. He stated it is not a good idea for an outside group to post elaborations of departments; he is in favor of giving department’s the power of veto. Schoenly stated he is not surprised there are differences between departments at other campuses. One thing that drives differences is workload.

Johnson voiced two issues: 1) you can put elaborations online and they don’t need to be visible to everyone. They could be made available for WASC only. Demetrulias agreed it can be done, but it is a bit more complicated. Or 2) Johnson suggested we could have elaborations available internally so we could use them when we are writing our
own elaborations. C. Davis stated she is not comfortable with completely public posting, but it would be useful to have some ability to share the information on campus. If other universities want to see them, they could make a request. Floyd stated her agreement with C. Davis and Sarraille. She would like to be consulted if there is a move to post to the world.

Thompson asked if we decide to be proprietary as we can be, what are we actually required to give to WASC in terms of providing elaborations? S. Davis replied WASC doesn’t require anything from us regarding elaborations. The Inquiry circles looked at the RPT process and said we have made progress in department elaborations and here are some examples. This is how we demonstrate our value in research. Demetrulias added the RSCA definition is used in personnel decisions and we have to respond to WASC. It has to be evidence based. We have to show them what we did to respond to their concerns. For example, WASC would be told whether we provide information about expectations to applicants and new faculty, but WASC does not tell us what we have to provide. Tuedio stated this is a public university so he is confused why we would be concerned about how these things are received. Maybe posting them would bring us to a different level of consciousness. The document represents our principles and priorities of our academic program and we should be proud of it. We should not be concerned how it is done at other campuses. Sarraille stated on the other hand, it is not necessarily fair to allow others to pick what to say to the world about you. If someone other than you is going to pull some things out of your resume and put those on a billboard, it makes one uneasy and no one else should do the editing. Colnic stated part of the fear may be how the information is used when out there. Is it used to showcase or get uniformity among departments systemwide. Tuedio stated we have lots of information online already, so he stated he doesn’t share that concern. What we are dealing with here is how we present ourself in regard to our research and teaching. We should have the confidence to put our face out there and stand behind it.

Thompson suggested it is not necessarily all grounded in fear. We can understand the desire to allow departments to control the text, so do we really have a desire to post these? He added we don’t need total disclosure so let departments decide. Petratos stated if we make a choice not to share publicly, it is not necessarily about wanting to hide something. Further, he stated he didn’t think other universities have them posted online. Dempsey asked what the goal was. Is it to define what-our goals are for RPT or get them out there for incoming faculty? What is expected? Petratos replied that every faculty member in his department has a copy of their elaborations in their RPT file and they are also available upon request.

Thomas voiced concern that in the College of Arts, they can’t get help updating their web pages. They are trying to get support for improving them, but so far have received no help. The way we present our face has improved in the large picture but go down to department level and it’s terrible. Covino replied they have hired a web designer to help departments.

S. Davis agreed there are other ways that the information can be shared. Posting on the web is an easy way to make information available to the WASC people. But the question is grounded whether these documents are or should be available outside of the department and that is the larger question.

Johnson acknowledged that faculty do not fully support posting online so maybe FAC should consider whether it makes sense they should be available for internal use or shared on a voluntary basis. Right now for WASC purposes, it makes sense to have them available in a way they are protected and not available to everyone.

Peterson voiced concern if we do that, new faculty would not have them available. She suggested when they are hired, a copy should be given to them. C. Davis replied the cover letter for RPT tells faculty that they should have received elaborations by now. Morgan Foster stated we have to demonstrate a ‘culture of evidence’ that shows how we share information. We are obligated to respond to the issues raised in the last WASC report. There is latitude in the manner in which the demonstration is done. Filling stated we have to be careful that we aren’t driven to create aspects of the culture in response to WASC. Thompson asked if Demetrulias said there was a lack of clarity in the RPT process and Demetrulias replied there was a lack of clarity of the definition of RSCA used in RPT. Thompson added it may not be related to elaborations. Demetrulias explained that is how we define research. Peterson added that the Faculty Development Committee helps new faculty, so they could check to see if all new faculty have their department elaborations. C. Davis replied they already do that.

Peterson suggested Senators go back to their departments and ask them. It could potentially be useful in recruiting. Petratos suggested just put a copy of the elaborations in the new faculty packets.

C. Brown pointed out that when the College of Education has to go through accreditation, it is not uncommon for them to present vita information to officials. He stated he agrees with Tuedio that we are who we are and should be proud of that. Further, there is nothing wrong with presenting information on how we make our decisions. It is
helpful with the process to provide those who are arranging for the WASC visit to work and provide information for a successful visit. Thompson stated in his own department, they have posted their strategic plan and bylaws. He can’t think of taking that down and putting up elaborations to represent who they are.

Johnson stated she appreciates all the comments but senators need to go back and talk with their departments and get their opinions. Also, FAC should discuss because this relates to its charge.

Adjourned at 4:30 pm.