

<p>Academic Senate May 10, 2011</p> <p>Present: Akwabi-Ameyaw, Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Broadwater, Burroughs, Contreras, Cotten, Davis, De Cocker, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, Marshall, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Rogers, Sarraille, Seong Soo Oh, Silverman, Stessman, Stone, Strahm, Strong, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: Kurt Baker for Stephen Black, Chad Stessman for Michael Drake, Elaine Peterson for Mark Bender</p> <p>Guests: Dennis Shimek, Halyna Kornuta, Daryl Moore, Brian Duggan, Gina Leguria, Lauren Byerly, Elizabeth Breshears, Jim Tuedio, Linda Nowak, Robert Marino, and Barbara Olave.</p> <p>Isabel Silveira Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>INFORMATION ITEM: Draft Plan to Study Affordability of Clickers for Students</p> <p>INFORMATION ITEM: UBAC Recommendations</p> <p>INFORMATION ITEM: FDC Use Policy</p> <p>3/AS/11/SEC-UEPC—Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY</p> <p>6/AS/11/CIS/SEC--Recommendation for suspension of the CIS Program, FAILED</p> <p>9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl/K. Stone/D. Shimek--Recommendation of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee, APPROVED (Sense of Senate)</p> <p>11/AS/11/SEC—Reaffirmation of RPT Policies & Procedures, APPROVED (Sense of Senate)</p> <p>12/AS/11/History/Political Science/SEC—Resolution to Urge the Board of Trustees to Delay Consideration of Waivers to the Existing Title 5 'American Institutions' Requirement, FIRST & SECOND READING. APPROVED (Sense of Senate)</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>August 30, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order
2:05pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Added two information items, summer school margin analysis and FDC.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 26, 2011
Approved with slight modification to attendance.

4. Announcements

Eudey reminded all that information has been shared via Postmaster regarding the services for Armin Schulz, which includes a viewing on Friday afternoon, funeral and memorial on Saturday, with the memorial ceremony from noon-3 in FDC 118. A commendation in memoriam resolution will be brought to the General Faculty meeting on Thursday, May 12th as a consent item.

Eudey reminded everyone that the First Annual Assessment Spotlight will be held on **Friday, May 13, 8:30am-Noon in MSR 130**. Members from across the CSU Stanislaus community will share their assessment and continuous improvement stories. If you want to come to the post spotlight lunch to discuss what has been learned, please RSVP to Ximena Garcia today.

Eudey noted that there are still 2-3 slots available for the Affordable Learning Solutions Faculty Learning Community co-sponsored by the Library and FCETL. The intention is to create anthologies to replace higher cost texts.

Strahm noted that tonight is the Penumbra reading from 6-9pm in the Carol Burke Lounge.

Byerly announced that on Friday and Saturday, May 19 and 20th, the Modesto Symphony Orchestra, and the choir singers will be performing Mendelsohn's Elijah. This will be amazing. Tickets are cheap this year, so everyone should come.

Marcell noted that last Saturday 20 students went to the East La Loma Park in Modesto, where they provided senior fitness testing to 40 older adults. They will be doing a similar thing in Turlock at the Turlock Covenant Church for the entire community.

Nagel noted that on May 18th there will be a Press Conference at Cal Poly Pomona to publicly release a white paper on the future of the CSU which was put together by CSU system faculty. This is an alternative to the Chancellor's vision on how to restructure the CSU and the dangers of what the Chancellor's office proposes for our campuses.

Kornuta thanked the faculty, chairs and staff for reviewing the material for the catalog. They're ahead of schedule from last year, and she thanks everyone for that.

Jasek-Rysdahl announced that the Spring General Faculty meeting is this Thursday, May 12, from 2-4pm in this room FDC118. It is a chance to recognize those who have been doing a lot of work in faculty governance. It's also a time for the President and the Provost to make remarks. There will be time to ask questions and make comments. He encouraged everyone to show up. The President is providing the refreshments.

Filling announced that the Annual Beer B-Que is on Saturday, May 21st. Tickets are \$10 and you can get them from Stone, Filling, Erickson, and others. A reminder will be sent out soon. He encouraged all to come out to gently blow off the stress from the semester.

Filling noted that Paul O'Brien was elected to the Executive Committee for SWAS system. Ovation.

Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed the guests as Dennis Shimek, Halyna Kornuta, Daryl Moore, Brian Duggan, Gina Leguria, Lauren Byerly, Elizabeth Breshears, Jim Tuedio, Linda Nowak, Robert Marino, and student Barbara Olave.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

No questions.

6. Information Items

a. Draft Plan to Study Affordability of Clickers for Students

Jasek-Rysdahl noted this is a plan to study the affordability of clickers. This is something that originated with the Statewide Student Association that said that clicker costs are getting exuberant as students are carrying multiple clickers. They wanted the CSU to look into this. The Technology & Learning Subcommittee is working with OIT to create a plan which is included in your packets today. This will come back to the Senate next year. Those of you who use the clickers should pay attention to announcement, as the cost can be significant to students.

Regalado asked what a clicker is.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted it's like a remote control. A number of people use them in class to pose multiple choice questions in classes. Students respond, and the stats show up on a screen so faculty can use that information in the classroom.

O'Brien said the statewide group of students passed a resolution and SWAS supported it. When students buy an introductory textbook it may cost \$80 but it can be as much as \$120 because a clicker is packaged with it. Students have several clickers and they're looking at a way to save money.

Eudey noted that there was a workshop yesterday by OIT and FCETL. The use of student response systems, otherwise known as "clickers," offers the potential for engaging students in lecture courses in new ways. OIT and FCETL is willing to help with more information.

Silverman noted "all everywhere" software that allows cell phones to be used as clickers.

b. UBAC Recommendations

Jasek-Rysdahl noted the following recommendations are included in the packet. We can discuss these during the open forum to share information with UBAC members. Jasek-Rysdahl has asked the President to share information on the budget process with his remarks at the General Faculty meeting on Thursday.

UBAC Recommendations as of May 4, 2011

Recommendation 1:

The committee urges the President to look at growth trends through demand of student enrollment to examine academic programs and scheduling. Reduce staff, faculty, and administration workload by reevaluating the scheduling process while using student demand to increase efficiency.

Recommendation 2:

UBAC urges the President to increase the administrative span of control, to increase efficiency, which would result in reengineering processes. This may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- reducing administrative costs and redundancy
- provide access to resources to those serving students
- decreasing the number of approval levels

Recommendation 3:

UBAC recommends that the campus consider recombination of colleges.

Recommendation 4:

UBAC recommends that the President consider variable cuts across divisions. The University should determine the levels based on the strategic plan and mission of the University, protecting excellence, and meeting the urgent needs of units already stretched to their limits.

Recommendation 5:

UBAC recommends that the campus review all scheduling of facilities to realize their maximum efficient use on campus without disruption of course pedagogy, with focus on student needs, and in order to improve campus sustainability practices with regard to energy. The committee also recommends not heating the swimming pool.

Recommendation 6:

UBAC recommends that the institution's leadership assure no one is assigned excessive workload. This should include the examination of methods and delivery of services to eliminate low priority duties and inefficient tasks.

c. Summer School Contribution Margin analysis

McGhee distributed a handout that he created. This is an analysis done so we know how much each class contributes toward the University's needs for the next year. This is based on \$295 per unit for undergrads, based on 3 and 4 unit courses. It is broken down by base salaries. We can get an idea of the costs based on number of students per class. The variable costs at the 4% are the truest, and others have additional costs but

are not truly variable because they will still be there regardless of class size. Based on what is being taught, up to 25 enrollments is how much of a contribution margin we have. For most of us, it's a fairly significant contribution margin down to 10 students in a class. It's good for us to know what is going on and what we can do to help the University generate funds, so that we don't leave money on the table by canceling classes that could help us. We know that the budget situation is bad, so any dollars we can squeeze out can help the University.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that questions can be address during the open forum section of this meeting.

d. FDC Use Policy

Eudey announced that the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) and SEC have been responsible for approving any changes to the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center (JSRFDC) facility use policy. Eudey will share a revised policy with SEC that would allow appropriate offices in Advancement to rent the JSRFDC during specific periods when faculty use is limited (summer, winter intersession, Sundays, one Saturday and one Friday evening per month during the academic year). We do not yet have the information on rental fees and revenues, and these will be shared before SEC is asked to vote on this. The FDC is expected to receive 50% of the profits for use for programmatic purposes.

7. Action Items

a. 3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC- Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs (revised version)

Jasek-Rysdahl reminded all to speak for or against an item. If amending it's only on the resolution and not the policy. This item has been tabled a couple of times to get it to committee to make changes. We're putting a timer on because there are a number of items to address. You may speak at most twice to a motion and you need to speak for or against this resolution.

3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves a Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs; and be it further

Resolved: That the policy 3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC take effect upon approval by the President, and that this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook upon approval.

Rationale: As CSU Stanislaus moves towards more online course and program offerings, a policy regarding such offerings is needed which ensures and protects college and department autonomy in developing and teaching online courses. The current UEPC guidelines on online courses and programs are not adequate to meet University needs. Technology is changing and evolving rapidly with respect to course delivery methods. Online courses in the last three years have shown substantial growth.

The existing UEPC guidelines (approved December 8, 2005

<http://www.csustan.edu/oit/LearningServices/FormsPublications/OnlineCourseGuidelines.pdf> do not adequately address university values, principles, and concepts.

As our growth in OTM courses and programs increases, WASC will require a university policy to be in place that addresses faculty and student support, security, assessment, etc., with respect to said courses and programs.

Stessman noted that this is another revised version with modified language for clarity and to address concerns. The major new thing since the last time is that they addressed the question raised in 3.7 about issues of workload to be consistent with the CSU/CFA workload contract. They removed mention of workload out of 3.7 and put in a new 3.9 that says it must be consistent with the current bargaining contract. He hopes that maintains what people wanted in this previously.

By voice vote, unanimous. Ovation. Jasek-Rysdahl offered congratulations to technology subcommittee, UEPC and Brian Duggan for working so hard on this. Eudey is so glad that we passed this resolution, and she appreciates all the work UEPC and others put into making this happen.

b. 6/AS/11/CIS/SEC Recommendation for suspension of the CIS Program

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that this will be voted on by a secret ballot. There are no changes from the last discussion.

Eudey said that given that nothing has changed she will be voting against this resolution, as she believes that there are other activities that can be engaged to support the major itself.

Sarraille noted that much has been said about the CIS resolution, but he would like to bring up the fact that CBA recently added on an endowed professor who will be paid \$140K and will be teaching half time. This illustrates that there was money that could be used to hire and pay the additional faculty necessary to have in the college to make it possible to support the CIS program better. It's even more abundantly clear that there have been machinations in that college that have moved things along in a way that have narrowed down the resources for CIS. He can't vote in favor of this resolution, because it's basically an anti-public-education situation that it's trying to bolster.

Voted by secret paper ballot. 13 yes, 29 no, 1 abstention. Resolution fails.

c. 9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl/K. Stone/D. Shimek Recommendation of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee (Revised version)

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that he made a minor change to recommendation one, added "at minimum every other week" to ensure meeting on a regular basis. This year we met every week. This is the only change since this resolution was sent out as follows:

9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl, K. Stone, J. Strong, D. Shimek Recommendations of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate supports the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee, and, be it further

Resolved: that the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee present these recommendations to the President's Senior Staff for approval, and, be it further

Resolved: that upon the approval by both faculty leadership and administration, they will collaborate in order to implement the recommendations.

Resolved: that the Senate Executive Committee will update the Academic Senate at least once a semester regarding progress made in implementing these recommendations, and, be it further

Rationale:

The members of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee are Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker, Koni Stone, Speaker-elect, James Strong, Provost/VP of Academic Affairs, and Dennis Shimek, Interim VP of Human Resources and Faculty Affairs. The members of this ad hoc committee met on a regular basis since November of 2010.

The group was charged to develop a plan of specific actions to address campus morale, improve communication between faculty and upper administration, and rebuild a productive working environment. The Ad Hoc TRPC will present draft proposals to various campus groups for input and eventual approval.

The charge also indicated that the ad hoc committee will also present draft proposals and seek eventual approvals of the recommendations from the Academic Senate and the President's Senior Staff.

The members of the ad hoc committee regularly referred to a survey of faculty conducted in September of 2010. Respondents to the survey indicated that respect for shared governance which included following existing policies and procedures was critical to rebuilding trust. When there are disagreements between faculty and administration, the structures of shared governance that are in place need to be used to resolve issues.

Improving communication and the quality of the dialogue between faculty and administration was another theme of the responses to the survey. The university's statement on shared governance states clearly that there should be "Early inclusion of faculty in identifying issues and in agenda setting, ongoing consultation, much of it face-to-face, as an iterative process between faculty and administration to reach understanding, and substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreement cannot be reached."

The following recommendations are meant to address these issues through actions that respect shared governance and productive communication between faculty and administration. It also includes a general outline regarding implementation of each recommendation. While it is hoped that implementing these recommendations will have positive impact on trust, it will be up to others (WASC Research Team for example) to document changes in trust.

Recommendation 1

The TRPC should continue to meet to address issues of trust, leadership and governance. The continuation and membership of this committee will be evaluated at least once a year.

The TRPC should continue to meet with a slightly different charge. Specifically, TRPC will be charged to:

- Have regular, ongoing, face-to-face interaction at minimum, every other week.
- Identify areas of conflict
- Discuss concerns regarding university issues
- Continue to develop ways to address issues of trust, leadership, and governance

Rationale:

The committee has worked hard to increase communication between faculty governance and upper administration. One benefit of this is that faculty and administrators have been able to address issues directly as issues have come up. While there has been more communication and the group has been able to address some issues, much more work needs to be completed.

Process indicators:

The committee will continue to discuss issues as they come up.

Recommendation 2

SEC and COC will be responsible for recruiting faculty for all faculty appointments to university committees.

SEC and COC will work with the administration to recruit and appoint faculty members to university related boards.

SEC will work with these faculty members to develop more consistent communication regarding the activities of the committees and boards.

Rationale:

There have been faculty appointments to some university related committees and boards without consultation with appropriate governance committees. This has resulted in a lack of trust of the activities of those entities.

Faculty governance and the rest of the university community often hear about the activities of these boards or committees when they are published for the whole community. This also contributes to a lack of trust when community members contact people at the university and they know less about the action than the person who is contacting them.

Process indicators:

- COC and SEC will get requests to recruit faculty for university committees and boards.
- Request to COC will include: number of faculty representatives needed, criteria of representatives e.g. representative from each College, experience in certain area, tenured or tenure track, etc., when appointment(s) are needed, frequency of meetings, when they will meet, expected duration of the committee, who the committee reports to, charge of the committee, overall composition of the committee.
- COC will be responsible for tracking requests and notifying SEC regarding compliance.
- SEC will request that all faculty who are appointed to university committees periodically provide updates regarding the work of the committee.

Recommendation 3

Administration will work through the normal the Academic Senate committee structure to develop University Extended Education policies regarding special programs, summer session, and winter intersession.

Rationale:

University Extended Education is an area of great importance for all at the university. It is also an area where there are many concerns and issues.

We need better policies as more emphasis is being put on revenue generation in special sessions. Concerns have been raised regarding the distribution of revenues, costs of operation, student fees, and course selection. There are also questions regarding the approval processes for courses and programs that are offered through UEE.

Process indicators:

Administration will share current policy and practices regarding special programs, summer session and winter intersession with SEC along with a request to develop policy.

SEC will share information with appropriate committees for review.

Governance committees will begin work in Fall 2011 with a goal of going to the Academic Senate for review and approval in Spring 2012

Recommendation 4

The President will share his proposal for Endowed Professorships with faculty governance and will submit it for review and revision.

Until a policy is developed, the administration will consult with deans, academic departments, and academic program reviews when endowed professorship opportunities arise.

Searches to fill endowed professorships will not begin or continue until a policy has been approved by the Academic Senate.

Rationale:

There is a long and well established principle that faculty control the curriculum. Faculty appointments are a critical element of curriculum delivery and design. Colleges and departments must follow well established procedures when requesting new faculty lines. Currently, the practice for creating and filling endowed professorships is not aligned with these procedures.

The absence of policy regarding this leads to inconsistent processes that result in questions regarding the purpose of these positions.

Process indicators:

The administration will bring a proposed policy document to SEC.

SEC will ask relevant committees to study the proposal and suggests revisions.

SEC will work with administration to revise the proposal based on suggestions.

Document will be forwarded to the Senate in Fall of 2011.

The next search begins after the policy has been approved.

Recommendation 5

Committee on Committees will work with appropriate administrators and committees to examine the membership of some administration and faculty governance committees to increase communication between faculty and administration. Any recommendations will go through the regular governance processes for review.

Committees to examine first should be the Provost's Deans Council, President's Senior Staff, University Budget Advisory Committee, Enrollment Planning Committee, and Leaves and Awards.

Rationale:

Continue to expand the joint communication and consultation process on issues that are of joint interest to both the senate and the administration.

Process indicators:

This process will begin in Fall 2011 and will be ongoing.

Recommendation 6

The Speaker, URPTC, and FAC will work with administration to develop a process to gather information regarding RPT from the provost, deans, department RPT committees, department chairs, and candidates who are going through the review cycle or have just completed the review cycle.

The goal will be to gather information about the perceptions people have about the RPT policy and procedures. This information will be used to examine our policies and procedures to determine if any steps can be taken to reduce the conflict that is created every year on this campus. Any recommendations will go through the normal faculty governance evaluation process.

Rationale:

Faculty members perceive that administrators want to increase research expectations and that administrators are applying their own criteria and definitions for acceptable research when evaluating faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. There have been questions from deans and other administrators regarding elaborations and their role in reviewing the elaborations.

Process indicators:

This process will begin in Fall 2011 and will be ongoing.

This item is open for discussion.

Regalado says that the Dept. of History is concerned with wording at this point in large part because it could use more muscle to the resolution itself and it requires more time. One concern echoed is that the committee did good work; it was a good effort and time was taken. They recognize that, but the committee started its work late in the academic year. Even though we continued to get updates on various matters associated with the resolution we have not had sufficient time to look at it thoroughly. He considers tabling this until a meeting in September to give members of Senate and faculty time to review it thoroughly. It would be more effective if stronger language is used in the resolved. Considering the concerns that it will take more time than we've been given, Regalado moved to table this resolution.

C. Davis noted that we cannot table to a new academic year. Jasek-Rysdahl noted that tabling it makes it over this year and it will be up to next SEC to bring it up.

Sarraille thinks this is viewed by people on SEC as something important. These discussions and the TRPC are thought to be helping relations along with the upper administration. It will help if it continues through next year.

Filling thinks that included are recommendations that are pretty sensible and things that we think would be useful to have in place, especially items 2-4. Item 4 speaks to the endowed professorship, and it's best to have no more of those until we have these agreements.

Poole noted not this is not a policy document. It will evolve and provide a plan for next year. If we table or don't approve this we will have nothing, and that gets us back to where we were at the start of the year. She hopes this passes. There has been progress, and it's something to continue to work for.

O'Brien said we have taken baby steps. We don't see this as the cure-all, but something that moving forward is better than nothing. As Filling pointed out, we spent a lot of time working to move it forward.

Provost Strong supports the resolution and encourages all to consider it favorably.

Regalado is hearing that members are lukewarm about the recommendation. Some may feel that we got this far, and we better get something thru, as good this is as good as we can get it. There's not a lot of confidence that when WASC visits that it will be as strong as it can be. He withdraws the motion to table this, but would like to make a motion to at least address the end resolved with additional wording.

Regalado motioned to amend resolution #3 to read "Senate Executive Committee will update the Senate and WASC at least once a semester regarding the progress or lack thereof made in implementing these recommendations. Seconded by O'Brien.

O'Brien thinks it tightens it up a bit, and sees no harm in this revision.

Nagel asked if SEC can communicate directly with WASC. Stone also questions that, and wants to remain positive and not include lack thereof. Regalado noted that we have this process because things were not positive.

Kornuta noted there is a special visit research team that has been convened that includes faculty and administration and part of their charge is to look at how we communicate to WASC about our situation now and planning over the next few years when another report is due in 2015. That may be a vehicle through which that team can look at how information is relayed to WASC.

Sarraille once tried to contact WASC and was brushed off. He's not sure that SEC can communicate with WASC. WASC may write back and say SEC needs to go through some third party on campus.

Filling asked the ALO, what happens if the Senate or SEC wants to send a “negative “message to WASC, how will you pass that through?

Kornuta asked if Filling meant what will be submitted or forwarded to them.

Filling asked if she intends on editing things, or will she send it as it is given to her. The protocol is that messages are delivered to WASC from the Accreditation Liaison Officer, who is Kornuta.

Kornuta hasn't had an experience where she has edited communications to WASC. If messages need to be in the context of what we are doing with the study, and it has to go thru through the special visit team. Past record is that she does not edit communications to WASC.

Provost Strong is concerned about the part about communicating to WASC and how that would be operationally organized. We will have a WASC special visit in October, and the team will be visiting with SEC. At the end of the semester they will get a report back from WASC and they'll have instructions for us. At the end of the fall semester we would give another progress report based on these recommendations, and then at the end of spring we would provide another report. He would like to ask the ALO if that fits within the normal WASC protocol. He also has a question for this body if that's what they want to happen. Do we want to lock ourselves into that or do we have more flexibility? We're recommending this for next year, that the TRPC meet next year and be reevaluated. Next year may be the end of the committee, but it doesn't mean that we wouldn't monitor progress in some other fashion.

Kornuta noted that the timeline and actions and responsibilities are accurate.

Marcell said doesn't the default “*making the report about progress*” imply progress or lack thereof?

Regalado wanted to state it rather than imply it. We'll be advising WASC, and there is the possibility that the progress reports would be good. The only reason to report is not just the bad things. There could be good reports if all are toeing the line.

Voice vote on amendment. Failed by voice vote.

Regalado offered a motion to revise resolved #4 to read “collaborate indefinitely in order to implement.” The concern in part is that the committee may not exist a year from now, and he's concerned about the post-WASC period. What occurs afterward will be subject to changes beyond the recommendations, or if there would be retribution. Continued collaboration indefinitely creates a shield or watchdog impression that this collaboration will continue. The issues will continue well past the time of WASC.

Marcell suggests grammatically saying approval by both faculty leadership and administration, “*they collaborate indefinitely in order to implement the recommendations.*” Regalado supported the change.

Sarraille is concerned with the word “indefinitely,” which could allow for ending at any time, even immediately. “Perpetual” comes to mind, but he doesn't want to use the term in this context. Maybe we should simply say: “from now on.”

Provost Strong thinks the wording is fine and resists the temptation to wordsmith this on the floor of the Senate. He doesn't have substantive problems with the amendment but will vote against it.

Dean Moore said couldn't it just be an ongoing process?

Sarraille offered: "they collaborate from now on in order to implement the recommendations." Regalado supports this.

Baker doesn't think the wording adds anything.

Dean Moore said the process may not need to be ongoing. If things go well over time we would envision a moment in time on the horizon when things are good and we don't have issues with requesting trust. That's an optimistic way of looking at it.

Regalado thinks given the gravity of the problem that brings about the creation of this committee, if you think the problems will magically go away after the committee does its work, it is naïve. It's important to continue this mechanism for as long as needed. He thinks it's essential.

It was unclear by voice vote, so by hand vote 19 yes, 22 against, and 1 abstention. Amendment fails.

Discussion on original resolution continued. Filling apologizes if it seemed there was a lack of enthusiasm. This resolution provides some things we really need.

Eudey supports this resolution. If we don't pass it there could be some actions that may occur in regards to Endowed Professorships. She hopes that the current conversations will allow this to occur even without the resolution, but this gives it accountability. It's not necessary, but helpful to the conversations we will be having with WASC.

Baker said the skepticism is that this is the best we can do, but that doesn't mean that we think it's not good. He's concerned with how well we think it will work.

Poole said we can place the comma in the resolved where it will be more correct grammatically. Tuedio thinks that the fourth resolved is referring back to the second resolved, not the third.

Eudey moved to switch the third and fourth resolved, and change the third resolved to read "***upon the approval by both faculty leadership and administration, they will collaborate in order to implement the recommendations***" and be it further added to the end of the new third resolved. Seconded by Strahm.

By voice vote the amended resolution passed.

Regalado reiterated his lack of support for the resolution. He doesn't think it's as strong as it needs to be. With respect to the TRPC and incredible work done in a short time, it seems we're trying to rush something that may backfire if we pass it in this stage.

Tuedio encourages approval even if this has happened in a compressed period of time. Each recommendation identifies a specific concern raised repeatedly, and it came to a head in the past year. He thinks this resolution sufficiently galvanizes the opinions of most, and these are suggesting institutionalization of points of agreement to track and monitor for effectiveness. It's important to respect each of these six things that are important.

8. First Reading Items

a. **11/AS/11/SEC Reaffirmation of RPT Policies & Procedures**

Filling moved the resolution. Seconded by Sarraille. Filling noted that Sarraille made a statement at the last meeting about occurrences in RPT processes last year. Jasek-Rysdahl and Filling also made statements. This is to reaffirm the rules under which we live. Filling asked for a waiver of the first reading. Seconded by Eudey.

11/AS/11/SEC Reaffirmation of RPT Policies & Procedures

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms the CSU Stanislaus Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure Review which have been developed in a consultative process to reflect the mission and values of the University; and be it further

Resolved: That individuals and groups at all levels of review should abide by the Principles, Criteria and Procedures when reviewing individuals applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion; and be it further

Resolved: That all levels of review should pay special attention to the following statements from the document:

I. Principles. **Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal.** [emphasis added] The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based on the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exist for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. **The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.** (From AAUP Guidelines.) [emphasis added]

II. Review Criteria. The following four criteria apply to the faculty as a whole, and all criteria must be considered in the review process. Academic departments* must formulate written elaborations of the four criteria (A, B, C, D) listed below. **All elaborations and amendments to them must be approved by the URPTC prior to their first use in a review process. Once approved, departmental elaborations remain in effect for all subsequent reviews until amended or replaced by the Department.** [emphasis added] Any such changes must be approved by the URPTC. Each RPT file must contain copy of the current as well as any applicable prior elaborations. **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.** [emphasis added]

A. Teaching proficiency, including preparation, classroom presentation, student advising, and adherence to departmental guidelines and university wide academic standards. **Teaching proficiency is the primary qualification for retention, promotion, and tenure.** [emphasis added]

B. Scholarship or other equivalent creative activities.

C. Extent and appropriateness of professional preparation, normally including the doctorate or equivalent attainment (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 42711).

D. Participation in university affairs.

No criteria other than those in the section above may be used in retention, promotion, or tenure considerations. [emphasis added]

VI. Preview Principles and Procedures, I. RPT candidates' files shall be made available simultaneously to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the University RPT Committee. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University RPT Committee shall each conduct an independent review. For each candidate, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University RPT Committee shall provide written comments for each of the four criteria and summary recommendation.

The candidate for any review shall be informed of any tentative recommendation or minority report. Such a recommendation or report shall identify the criteria on which it is based and shall state the reasons for it. The candidate shall be given ten (10) calendar days to forward a written response supporting his/her case before the recommendation or minority report is forwarded to the next level. The candidate shall be informed of the review level's final decision. **Such a decision shall identify the criteria on which it is based and shall state the reasons for it.** [emphasis added]

E. Review Steps. All candidates for Retention, Promotion or Tenure shall be reviewed according to the following steps: Departmental Committee; College Dean (or equivalent), Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs AND University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee; **Conference Committee***; President.

J. The Conference Committee is formed when the URPTC and Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs tentative recommendations do not agree or if the President disagrees with the URPTC or Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs tentative recommendation. The Conference Committee shall consist of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the members of the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee. They shall seek to achieve consensus regarding their intended recommendations. [emphasis added] For each candidate, the URPTC and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs shall submit their final comments for each of the four criteria and their summary recommendations to the President on or before the date set forth in the RPT calendar. When the President's impending decision differs from the recommendation of the URPTC or the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President shall consult with the Conference Committee before the decision is final.

Rationale: In May 2009 the Academic Senate, General Faculty, and President all approved 8/AS/09/FACURPTC- Amended to Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review. In part, this revised document reaffirmed that CSU Stanislaus is primarily a teaching institution and identified teaching as the primary qualification for retention, promotion, and tenure even as professional preparation, scholarship or other equivalent creative activities, and participation in university affairs are criteria considered in the review process. There have been no revisions to this policy document since May 2009 so these principles, criteria, and procedures for review are still in effect and should be followed.

This resolution is necessary because there is compelling evidence that has been provided to faculty leadership, department chairs, and departmental colleagues that these principles have not been followed during the 2010/2011 review cycle. It is critical that the Academic Senate make it clear that it will not be silent when approved policies of the university are not followed. The Academic Senate needs to make this public statement to support colleagues who have been evaluated in a manner that is inconsistent with this document.

There is significant concern that, at least at the Provost level of review, these principles and procedures were not being given proper consideration. Specific concerns include:

1. Introduction of a ranking system that was never communicated to the faculty prior to the evaluation cycle. There is no explanation of how the rankings are applied. There is no apparent connection to the departmental elaborations. This ranking system was used by the Provost and one or two Deans.
2. The Provost implied that he used a "university standard" to develop his recommendations. Our university has no agreed upon standard other than those approved by faculty and accepted by candidates [i.e., departmental elaborations].
3. There is no evidence to suggest that teaching proficiency was the primary qualification in the Provost's review of candidates.
4. The Provost's review appeared to be biased toward a narrow band of research dissemination over all other areas of evaluation. Publication in high level refereed journals was highlighted as notable while other types of scholarship were ignored. This occurred whether the review is favorable or unfavorable.

5. The Provost's letters often contained language indicating an expectation that candidates provide evidence about the quality of journals, even when this is not an expectation contained in departmental elaborations.
6. The Provost missed the scheduled Conference Committee that is expected by policy. The purpose of the Conference Committee is to discuss areas of disagreement between the Provost and URTPC before tentative letters from either go out to candidates.
7. There were a number of cases where the Provost's recommendation contradicts the recommendations of all other levels of review. In these cases, there should be compelling reasons that clearly explain why every other level of review is wrong.

These actions hinder any ability to develop trust. Administration's statements regarding changing policy so that deans or the provost have signature authority over elaborations, further erodes trust. There is nothing that prevents the Provost or Deans from meeting with departments to discuss concerns they have regarding elaborations. At the moment, we have no evidence that any department has been approached by a dean or the Provost to have a discussion about elaborations.

When all these actions are taken together, many feel that the administration is trying to change the culture of the university so that publications are a primary emphasis of the university. Furthermore, the administration is trying to impose this culture through the RPT process.

We discussed the movement to a second reading. Filling thinks this is important as we're at the tail end of the RPT process, and this may help us as we try to salvage the process by being reminded of this policy.

Eudey affirmed that since this is not a new policy, it should go to a second reading.

Agreed to move to a second reading. There was a request for a secret ballot.

Nagel asked if this is a sense of the senate. Jasek-Rysdahl indicated yes.

Provost Strong supports the primacy of teaching, and following the policies that we have in place. He has received some memos from individuals which he is reviewing and he will respond. Some are from the RPT candidates, depts., and dept. RPT committees. He will respond to all explaining the positions and responding to their questions and requests. Regarding the meeting with URPTC, what happened was that he missed the meeting because he was finishing up on a last case, and he asked for a postponement. He's not sure if it was communicated. The meeting was not able to be moved to that afternoon, so they had it the following Tuesday. He noted the concerns of the URPTC and reviewed all the material they asked him to review and he made some changes. Next year he will be sure to meet before the letters go out, which was past practice but he was not aware of this at the time. When that happened he did apologize to the committee relative to missing the meeting. They did meet and had a productive meeting from his perspective.

Filling said there is no bit of our policy that speaks to "I'll respond to people's comments" outside of letters prepared in the evaluation. Replies do not go in RPT files where the original letters were put. The Conference Committee meeting is policy, not practice. It's part of the policy. It was not conveyed to the committee that it was a delay that caused the Provost to not attend. It was literally 7 people in a room waiting for someone who didn't show up. He appreciates the apologies and it's nice that it will go right next year, but we need to fix what was done wrong this year.

Garcia wants it to be noted in the discussions about concerns with the RPT, as it wasn't the absence of one meeting, but throughout the process there have been a number of things occurring that seem to call for a need for something like this resolution. We need to take action and remind administration that these are the RPT policies and procedures. He's heard about changes in RPT requirements, faculty getting new information

above and beyond what is written in the policies and procedures, and that elaborations are being ignored in the process. It's not one thing leading to a need for this resolution.

Provost Strong doesn't think the policy says the Conference Committee has to meet before the letters are sent out. That's what he's referring to.

Provost Strong wants to put on the record that he asked Shimek to speak to URPTC and tell them he couldn't come to meeting due to an unexpected delay. Maybe that message wasn't properly relayed. He wants this body to know he didn't just not show up.

Tuedio doesn't know how to clarify, but under J the conference committee is formed when URPTC and Provost tentative recommendations do not agree. List of things occurring under 6 on next page, purpose is to discuss areas of disagreement between Provost and URPTC before tentative letters go out. When was that put into the document? Is that part of the current statement? Jasek-Rysdahl noted that this is the statement cut and pasted from the policy. Tuedio notes that 6 indicates that there is an ambiguity in the policy that the CC is to meet after letters written, not necessarily requiring the meeting occur before letters sent.

By paper secret ballot, 41 yes, 1 no, no abstentions. The resolution is approved.

b. 12/AS/11/History/Political Science/SEC "Resolution to Urge the Board of Trustees to Delay Consideration of Waivers to the Existing Title 5 'American Institutions' Requirement"
Regalado introduced a resolution to delay consideration of waivers to Title 5 American Institutions requirement. Seconded by O'Brien.

**12/AS/11/History/Political Science/SEC "Resolution to Urge the Board of Trustees to
Delay Consideration of Waivers
To the Existing Title 5 'American Institutions' Requirement"**

- Resolved, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus urges the Board of Trustees to delay any consideration of Title 5 changes to the "American Institutions" requirement until the possibility of using the existing Comprehensive Exam option to bring the CSU into compliance with SB 1440 is fully explored with the help of the system's Political Science and History faculty; we acknowledge that there may need to be procedural and/or policy changes in the administration of these exams but believe that the option could be of great promise in complying with SB 1440 without the need for a Title 5 change; be it further
- Resolved, The Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms its commitment to the principle that all graduates of our institution should demonstrate an understanding of "American democracy and of the society in which they live" so that they may "contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens"; be it further
- Resolved, That the CSU should strongly consider the option of not recognizing transfer AA degrees that fail to allow the American Institutions requirement within the constraints of SB1440 degrees--as being too dissimilar to our own degrees; be it further
- Resolved, That the CSU should request that the Legislature amend "The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act" (SB 1440) to clarify that American Institutions requirements should be fully maintained during the implementation of the law; be it further
- Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed to the Chancellor, to the Board, to the ASCSU, to all

campus senates, and to the Chairs of all CSU History and Political Science Departments, the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, and the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges.

Rationale:

For decades the California State University has maintained a requirement (in Title 5 administrative law) for all CSU graduates to “acquire knowledge and skills that will help them to comprehend the workings of American democracy and of the society in which they live, to enable them to contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens” (Title 5 40404).

[continued]

An informed citizenry is necessary in American democracy, but mounting evidence shows that “most individual voters are abysmally ignorant of even very basic political information.”¹

The passing last Autumn of SB 1440—a measure designed to streamline transfers from the California Community Colleges to the CSU, has enabled the creation of “Transfer AA” degrees from the CCC system; the CCC system, however, refuses to include the Title 5 American Institutions requirements as a part of these newly created transfer degrees.

The CSU Board of Trustees is considering changes in the Title 5 “American Institutions” requirement that will enable (but not necessarily require) the Chancellor, Presidents and “appropriate campus authorities” to waive the American Institutions requirement for certain majors and groups (called “the proposal” in this document).

After a few weeks of informal conversations, the proposal was first publicly broached at an April 13 meeting with the CSU Presidents; this unfortunate time line has resulted in insufficient consultation to date with History and Political Science faculty and almost no time—in the last month of classes—for local Academic Senates and their curriculum committees to respond. Nor has the possibility of using the existing option of comprehensive exams in American Institutions to bring the CSU fully into compliance with SB1440 been fully explored.

Recently the CSU Presidents along with Chancellor have made a proposal to create waivers to a Californian Code of Regulations. This section requires campuses to require instruction in US History, CA History, and local government. This requires students to demonstrate competence by successful completion of courses or via comprehensive exam. The proposal is to grant waivers or exceptions to various programs, like professional degree programs or hardship cases to eliminate this requirement. This proposal is consistent with the resolution from other campuses to delay movement on these waivers to move into fall for further discussion on this important area. Most History depts. think that such waivers are a bad idea. This goes against our mission statement which asks us to be fully engaged responsible citizens. This is hard to do without history or government courses. It’s hard to be a responsible citizen without the base knowledge. The History Dept. and the Political Science Dept. would like approval of this resolution that is consistent with others across the state.

O’Brien speaks in support of this; it’s mostly what he did last week at SWAS. SWAS asked the board to delay this. 15 campuses have passed resolutions asking the board to delay. Email from chair of SWAS noting BOT is meeting this week. GET NOTES FROM PAUL. Will wait until July meeting. Hearing groundswell from campuses. See not only no harm, but good to ask for time to contemplate before making decisions.

¹ See, for example, Ilya Somin, “When Ignorance Isn’t Bliss: How Political Ignorance Threatens Democracy” (Policy Analysis No. 525, September 22, 2004.) “In this paper I review the overwhelming evidence that the American electorate fails to meet even minimal criteria for adequate voter knowledge” (p. 2.) See also Andrew Romano, “How Dumb Are We? Newsweek gave 1,000 Americans the U.S. Citizenship Test—38% failed. The country’s future is imperiled by our ignorance,” *Newsweek* March 28 and April 4, 2011. See also Sam Dillon, “Failing Grades on Civics

Exam Called a 'Crisis', *New York Times*, May 4, 2011

<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/05/education/05civics.html?scp=2&sq=crisis&st=nyt>.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted the handout is information from the chair of Political Science and the Dept. of History.

Marcell strongly supports the amendment. Breadth and depth are important in all areas as it offers support.

Nagel moved to waive the first reading and move to a second. Strahm seconded. Nagel said time is of the essence.

O'Brien noted that we're just asking them to delay this. Asking to delay is mild.

By hand vote moving to a second reading was approved.

Filling spoke for the resolution. He noted that the Board of Trustees thinks that some consultation can occur before July.

Marshall noted that people need this course.

Passed unanimously by voice vote.

9. Open Forum

Filling announced that at SWAS a resolution passed asking all campuses asking for a minimum grade of C for the golden 4 GE areas. His understanding of the minimum acceptable grade on our campus is a D, so it would require a change on our part.

Manrique said on behalf of ERFA, she thanks the Faculty Affairs Committee, the FAC Chair Kurt Baker, SEC and the Senate members who supported the resolution in favor of parking privileges for retirees.

Silverman is concerned about the fact that the faculty/staff swim period from 5PM to 7PM was closed. There are many reasons why faculty/staff should have access to the exercise facilities at work.

- (1) From point of view of the country, now that we have National Health Care System, the only way not to go broke, is to keep the people healthy.
- (2) From point of view of the University, if the faculty/staff are healthy, that would allow the university to negotiate better insurance rates with its insurance companies.
- (3) From point of view of students, a multi-year research indicates that if faculty grades student's exams after swimming laps, the students do better in their exams on average by 7.2 points.

In the interest of full disclosure, there are swimming periods from 6 to 8AM and 12 to 1PM. It is against his religion to be up at 6AM and noon is a good time for skin cancer.

Marcell said that the swimming pool on campus is not under the care of the Dept. of Kinesiology. They run the old weight training center which is available for faculty use for certain times. ASI has current control over the swimming pool utilization and is looking for cost savings. The SRC does not want to take ownership of that facility. These issues likely need to run through ASI. There is a lot of discussion within his dept. about this.

Eudey wasn't expecting this issue. She noted that a recent study out of Canada reported that Assistant Professors are significantly less likely to get exercise that is recommended by the government. This is primarily due to their workload that they are not taking care of their health.

O'Brien shared some budget issues from SWAS. It's interesting that Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer of the CSU gave a report which was all bad. We all know the numbers look bad, when the question raised is if a second \$500 million is cut from CSU. They said they're not planning on that, in that they think it would be so devastating to campuses that they would not come to campuses to resolve it. There would be tuition increases and course cuts.

Filling thanked Eudey for her ability to talk and type at the same time.

Marcell wanted to direct a question to McGhee about the 3 and 4 unit classes. Assuming that most people are paid under \$90K, any class with 10-11 students should make money for the university. Marcell noted that there was some hope to not have classes go forward without 15-20 students. McGhee noted that it's not the same for fall and spring.

McGhee said that someone who was teaching a 3- unit class with 20 students in it will generate money.

Marcell noted that a class with 11 students or more would make money. McGhee said it would generate costs for which overhead costs have already been utilized. What costs would be avoidable? Each of the two reflects scenarios the university uses to allocate costs and revenues to depts. That has costs involved. This is usually long term in nature and not short term, and it's based on UEE course costs.

Regalado congratulated the incoming Speaker Koni Stone, and hopes she will maintain her positive demeanor. He looks forward to working with her. He also congratulated Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl for his hard work and devotion to shared governance. He's had the privilege to visit his office a few times. Things started out looking chaotic, and we should thank Jasek-Rysdahl for working hard to make this a great place to be. Thanks for all your hard work and service to this University. Ovation.

Provost Strong wanted to thank Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Koni Stone, and Dennis Shimek for their good work on the ad hoc TRPC. Thank you. Ovation.

Stone said another RPT forum Thursday May 19 9-11am. Thursday at 2pm is General Faculty meeting.

Filling responded to Marcell about the summer school analysis. If you're sitting at 6am on June 6 deciding whether or not to run a class, this is the cost/revenue decisions to make if cutting on June 6 rather than 3 months earlier. Much of expense is already into it by the time the first day of class arrives. The 4% is the portion given to the Chancellor, and then money to faculty member. Marcell thought this might impact the academic year.

Eudey reminded everyone about the College Reorganization meetings being scheduled on May 19th, from 11-1pm, in the Carol Burke Lounge. It's time to share ideas that have money saving opportunities.

Regalado recognized Isabel Pierce for her work on the Senate. Ovation.

Provost Strong is aware of the contribution margin approach to decision making that McGhee found. He will take the information provided into consideration as they make decisions for the summer.

10. Adjournment
3:45pm.