

<p><b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</b></p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES</p> <p>March 11, 1997</p> <p><b>Present:</b> Abukhalil, Almy, Apodaca, Cortez, Curry, Danziger, Dunbar, Fanning, Farrar, Finley, Gackowski, Goedecke, Hilpert, Jacob, Jasek-Rysdahl, Kane, Keymer, Klein, Levering, Li, Lindsay, O'Brien, Sanchez, Savini, Schmandt, Schmidt, Souza, Sumser, Sundar, Thompson, Tordoff, Towell, Tuedio, Watson, A.Young, Zarling, Zhang</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Bross, O'Donnell, Sedova</p> <p><b>PROXIES:</b> Luo (Bowen)</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Banks, Dias (Signal), Donahue, M.Hughes, Pierce, Renner</p> <p><b>RECORDING SECRETARY:</b> Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>1/AS/97/SAAC-Proposed Policy on Amplified Sound on the Quad, TABLED</p> <p>Athletic Grants-in-Aid, DISCUSSED</p> <p>Service Learning, DISCUSSED</p> <p>Teaching Evaluation Task Force update, DISCUSSED</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, MARCH 25, 1997 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Mark Thompson, Clerk</p>
--	--

The meeting was called to order by Speaker Tuedio at 2:33PM . It was MSP Sundar/Goedecke to approve the agenda and MSP Farrar/Sumser to approve the minutes of 25 February 1997.

**REPORTS:**

**Speaker/SEC (Tuedio)**

a. Eighteen faculty attended the Monterey meeting on the baccalaureate and the Cornerstones project. The state-level work groups are assimilating the input from approximately 650 faculty and administrators. The campus will have a chance to respond to the revised document by the beginning of summer, and the work groups should return further revisions by the fall term for negotiation. The current documents could cause major changes in the "way we do business."

**University Educational Policies Committee (Hilpert)**

a. New items of business include: new degree program, 5-day exam, mathematics and English assessment, criteria and protocol for waitlisted students, retention of undergraduate and graduate students, program revision: preliminary level I credential, and the GE requirements for upper division transfer students.

b. Still investigating proposed University Hour and class hours.

**Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Goedecke)**

a. Sent a letter to the administration regarding support of the library.

b. Met with VPAA Curry to discuss next year's budgeting process and will continue to discuss with him at the next meeting. Specific issues discussed were funding for institutional technology (including equipment) and professional development.

**Faculty Affairs Committee (Tordoff)**

a. Will meet with chairs of UEPC and Graduate Council to discuss constitutional amendments.

b. Currently inviting input on PSI. Open forums will be held on March 20 and 24. Tuedio noted that the Chancellor is open to faculty-driven changes in the process.

**Associated Students (Jacob)**

- a. Still have several openings
- b. Working on Senior class gift donations.
- c. Fee committee met to consider proposals from the University Union and from athletics,
- d. Working on Warrior Day, Campus Pride Day, and Good Neighbor Day.

**Statewide Academic Senate (Levering/Wade)**

- a. Continuing to discuss the baccalaureate.

**Other:**

- a. O'brien announced that the next foundation meeting will be on April 18.
- b. Curry announced that a meeting with K-12 leadership is scheduled for 11 March to discuss pre-collegiate academic development.
- c. Schmidt announced an interdisciplinary student conference at Stanislaus this fall on "Constructions of the Human"; those interested should contact him.
- d. Apodaca announced that Ethnic Studies is celebrating its 25th anniversary and invited all to a meeting on April 25.
- e. Hughes announced that commencement will begin at 7:30 a.m., May 31 with guest speaker U.S. Secretary of Education Riley.

**SECOND READING/ACTION ITEM:**

**a. 1/AS/97/SAAC--Proposed policy on Amplified Sound on the Quad**

Discussion: Keymer noted that he had attempted to address concerns raised at the previous meeting. There is now a division in the policy between "Student Programming Board Events" and "Free Speech Events." He has also clarified where learning activities take place and where speakers should be aimed. Abukhalil questioned the formation of such a policy based on anecdotal evidence, labeling idea of monitoring noise levels "Orwellian." O'brien noted that we should wait till students have reviewed and evaluated the document. Sumser questioned when something becomes a "free speech event." Schmandt supported the policy; he has seen, in his own and in his colleagues classes, the disruption caused by noise.

It was MSP Goedecke/Jacob to table the motion until review by ASI is complete.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

a. (Donahue)(Handout distributed)--Athletic Grants-in-Aid. Tuedio stated that after the SEC meeting of last week when this item was placed as a First Reading Item, he took this issue to BPAC. At their urging, Tuedio noted that UBPAAC desired that VP Strong research the financial support opportunities in the community for athletic grants-in-aid. The item was switched from a First Reading Item to a Discussion item. Donahue distributed additional information supporting athletic scholarships and delineating grants provided on other campuses in the CCAA. Donahue expanded on the whereas clauses in the proposed resolution.

Thompson queried whether athletic grants will be one of several talent grants we ask for if a student fee increase is proposed. Donahue explained that President Hughes supports talent scholarships including many different talents, that IRA money and general fund money cannot be used for athletic scholarships, and that fundraising would be the main source of scholarship money.

Tuedio suggested putting a rider on academic standing and Donahue agreed as long as this was applied to all talent scholarships. Abukhalil asked who would raise funds. Donahue stated that the SWAA, organized through VP Strong's Office, currently raises funds for athletics and will continue to do so. Also, if there were an additional student fee for talent, students should have free access to athletic events. Donahue further explained that we would probably only give scholarships for tuition, fees and books.

Talent scholarships are a financial as well as a student access issue. Tuedio suggested Senators digest this information and send their input to Donahue.

b. (Renner)(Handout distributed)--Service Learning. Renner began with the question of whether we should incorporate service learning into our curriculum. Hilpert questioned how the term "service learning" differed from internships, cooperative education and project classes. He also questioned the usefulness of service learning for returning students. Sumser asked about the distribution of money and about whether the service learning would be required. Renner noted that faculty would not be required to incorporate service learning into their courses and that service learning combines academic work and community service. Funds would be needed for an office and a half-time faculty administrator to coordinate the matching and placement of students in service learning situations. Hilpert noted that a previous Internship Council had lost funding and faculty connection upon being centralized. Several Senators questioned the need to have a separate entity to create or facilitate or, perhaps, evaluate courses.

c. Teaching Evaluation Task Force Update. Tuedio reviewed the 5 Goals for Evaluation formed by the Task Force and invited feedback during the next two weeks. The overarching rationale is to facilitate better teaching. The "Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness" was formed by the Task Force after reviewing instruments from several other campuses.

Discussion: Sundar questioned how the statistical analysis might be conducted and if the intent is to compare faculty. Abukhalil questioned whether the committee considered publishing the results to students, why anyone besides students should evaluate teaching, and whether goal #1 applies to all faculty. Keymer suggested that students control the dissemination of evaluation data. Apodaca noted some questions might be biased against an instructor and that multiple assessment methods are important. Tordoff noted that the faculty evaluations are confidential information. Jacob reported that the students are developing their own instrument.

Finley questioned whether the form was summative in its evaluative role. Tuedio responded that the task force will recommend against a summative analysis since the student response to each question needs to be considered on its own merit. He also noted that the final two questions (#s 13 and 14) could be taken to provide a pseudo-summative assessment of student satisfaction. Klein reinforced the notion that the proposed instrument is intended solely as a measure of student satisfaction, not as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Tuedio asked that Senators query their departments about the proposed form and that they send feedback to Diana Saugstad by March 20.

It was MSP Sundar/Sanchez for adjournment at 4:33 p.m.