

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 7, 1998

Present: Abukhalil, Apodaca, Borba, Brockman, Bross, Campbell, Doraz, Fanning, Farrar, Finley, Fletcher, Hejka-Ekins, Jacob, Keymer, Klein, Leonard, Levering, Lindsay, Lindsley, Nemzer, Olivant, Pandell, Perpich, Russ, Schmandt, Schmidt, Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Watson, Weikart, Zarling, Zhang

Proxies: Fletcher (Luo), Demetrulias (Curry), Katsma (Souza),

Absent: Alvarez, Dinse, Gackowski, Li, O'Brien, Peterson, Sanchez

Guests: Crawford, Hughes, VanderMolen

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

4/AS/98/FAC--Resolution to Create Two Standing Committees of the Senate on Faculty Development, TABLED

5/AS/98/FAC--Resolution on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, FIRST READING

6/AS/98/Ad Hoc--Draft Intellectual Property Rights Policy, FIRST READING

WASC Standards, DISCUSSED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, April 28, 1998
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. It was MSP Lindsay/Russ to approve the agenda as submitted and MSP Farrar/Finley to approve the minutes of March 24, 1998 as distributed.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**Speaker/SEC (Klein)**

- a. Forming a committee for Assessing Administrative Review and Hiring Practices to be chaired by John Barnett. If you are interested in serving on this committee, please contact Diana Saugstad.
- b. SEC has asked FAC to begin a discussion of post-tenure review.
- c. MAP is reviewing the class time modules resolution.
- d. A call has gone out for items to be included in the Time Capsule, including a statement of current concerns. If you have concerns you would like included in the Capsule, please send them to Diana Saugstad.
- e. The GE Task Force will have a forum on Thursday April 9 in South Dining from 2-4.
- f. Nina Ribak-Rosenthal, Professor of Education, died this weekend. The Senate observed a moment of silence.

University Educational Policies Committee (Doraz)

- a. Still dealing with retention, assessment, and program review.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Fletcher)

- a. Will begin discussion on post-tenure review.
- b. Noted that FAC is not in favor of tabling the second-reading item, 4/AS/98/FAC and the committee would like the resolution voted

up or down.

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Lindsay)

a. Met with Andy Young to discuss the budget implications of the proposed Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (FCTL). After considerable discussion, the committee felt the proposal worthwhile, but had concerns about the funding. If the funding comes from a Title 3 grant or from fundraising, the committee supported the proposal. But if the funds must come from Academic Affairs, the proposal should be tabled until prioritizing of all projects are completed.

Graduate Council (Hejka-Ekins)

a. Will discuss questions about the proposal returned by MAP.

Statewide Academic Senate (Levering/Russ)

a. No report.

Associated Students (Jacob/Alvarez)

a. Election for faculty governance and the mascot is April 7-8.

b. Planning for Warrior Day, May 8.

c. New date for Campus Pride Day, April 24.

MAP (Tuedio)

a. (Handout distributed.) Discussed the ALS proposal, especially Liberal Studies and Honors.

Other

a. Hughes noted that we received two administrative briefs. One highlights the Honors 2000 Program and the other highlights campus issues.

b. The Staff awards ceremony has been delayed till 3:30.

ACTION ITEM:

a. 4/AS/98/FAC--Fletcher noted that the impetus for creating a committee came from the RSCA Task Force. The constitution indicates clearly that FDC is responsible for RSCA. FAC believes that it would be best to split the duties between two committees one dealing with teaching and one with research and have all members elected. She understands the point of opposition from FDC is that the addition of duties to include research policy would be burdensome. Fletcher noted that at the last SEC meeting, A.Young, chair of FDC requested this item be tabled. This is the second time we have been asked to continue or table. FAC wants this issue voted up or down. Hejka-Ekins questioned what sorts of input FDC had into the process. VanderMolen, member of the FAC, added that FAC had first recommended a subcommittee of the FDC, but was told the FDC did not want this. So, after input from the Academic Senate, URPTC, GC and FDC, FAC changed it to the present resolution. Demetrulias noted that FDC had concerns about the teacher/scholar model and dealing with research policy. Tuedio added that the present resolution does not consider the proposed Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. Klein added that the FDC proposal had come to the last SEC meeting but had been sent back to that committee for further revision. Fletcher asked that Senators refer to 5.2 of the Constitution which clearly states that research, scholarship and creative activity is part of FDC's duties. Further, Fletcher added that we are designing committees without having definitions of research and scholarship in place per the RSCA Task Force Report. Further, that if research policy is the issue, this should be a subcommittee of UEPC. Weikart added that the resolution would provide proper attention for research and scholarship, part of FDC's role which the committee has not fulfilled. Tuedio stated that, if we are going to favor FDC, we should make clear the importance we place on research; in the past we have focused on teaching issues. Keymer urged not separating the teacher/scholar from other scholars. It was MSP Zarling/Hejka-Ekins to table the motion.

FIRST READING ITEMS:

a. 5/AS/98/FAC--Resolution on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. It was MS Fletcher/Thompson

WHEREAS: Article 15 of the MOU requires in Section 15.14, "Written student questionnaire evaluations...for all faculty unit employees who teach" and in Section 15.16 (a), "...the format of student evaluations shall be quantitative or a combination of quantitative and qualitative"; and

WHEREAS: Much of IDEA, the instrument currently used at California State University (CSUS), is deemed less than satisfactory as a student evaluation instrument for assessing teaching effectiveness for the purposes of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) review of the faculty; and

WHEREAS: The IDEA evaluation form will have new items beginning Fall 1998; and

WHEREAS: The Teaching Evaluation Task Force has developed and piloted an alternative evaluation instrument; and

WHEREAS: Acceptance of the proposed evaluation package by the faculty at this institution, whose primary mission is teaching, requires evidence of its validity and reliability as a means of eliciting meaningful student responses; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate (AS) of CSUS adopt the Student Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (SATE) as one tool for the purpose of RPT review; (This Resolved may be amended pending contract issues clarification.) and

RESOLVED: The SATE be one part of a multifaceted approach elaborated by the department; this should include, but is not limited to, portfolios, interviews with previous students, peer review, and student outcomes; and

RESOLVED: That during the 1998-99 academic year an ad hoc committee of the AS of CSUS will coordinate with the Office of Institutional Research to complete a reliability and validity study for the SATE instrument; and

RESOLVED: The IDEA instrument be retained for the 1998-99 academic year; and

RESOLVED: At the end of the 1998/99 academic year, the faculty will decide which instrument(s) to retain.

Fletcher noted that there had been broad consultation on the issue including departments, two open forums, and consultation with the URPTC. There was a general mood to move away from IDEA, but, subsequently, we found that IDEA is designing a new form. It is clear that SATE or IDEA will be only one part of evaluation of teaching effectiveness. FAC also created a companion document, a set of draft guidelines for developing and evaluating teaching effectiveness. Abukhalil noted that he prefers IDEA because the SATE requires too much information from students. He also worried that the guidelines will corrupt the process and wondered when evaluations will be made open to students. Further, he noted that peer review would mean different things to untenured and tenured faculty. Fletcher noted that the guidelines are not what would be approved by passage of the resolution. Contract issues related to the validity and reliability of the instruments would also need to be resolved. Fletcher clarified that the second resolved commits departments to provide additional evaluation procedures and that, for the 1998/99 academic year, both SATE and IDEA would be used. Klein clarified that the IDEA people have said that IDEA should be used for professional development and that the SATE was used last spring as a trial. It was suggested that the last Resolved should be changed since spring evaluation results would not be available until summer. A deadline of September or October 1999 would be more realistic. Also, the second Resolved should be reworded to clarify if the multifaceted approach would be required of departments.

b. 6/AS/98/Ad hoc--Draft Intellectual Property Rights Policy. It was MS Lindsay/Zarling

WHEREAS: We recognize that intellectual property created by faculty, staff, and students has value, and that rights to that value deserves protection; and

WHEREAS: The Chancellor's Office has directed all campuses with the CSU to develop individual policies regarding intellectual property rights; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached Policy on Intellectual Property Rights be approved by the Academic Senate.

Myers reviewed the critical portions of the resolution. She noted that policy is for the protection of those who create intellectual property on campus. She encouraged the Senate to read the booklet from CETUS on intellectual property rights distributed on campus earlier this semester. Abukhalil asked about the Disclosure section and wondered about the relation of the document and CETI. Myers clarified that the section is similar to policies throughout the system and that in cases where the faculty does not know, they would, of course, not be able to disclose. There was concern that, even without extraordinary support, the University may lay claim to patentable work. Keymer noted that all references to work should be linked to extraordinary support and questioned whether the word "works must" is appropriate wording in section VII. Pandell queried whether it was a legal issue and, if so, whether the faculty should claim all rights in the policy for our campus. Farrar questioned whether a standard systemwide policy might be available. Myers replied that no systemwide policy is in effect at this time.

DISCUSSION ITEM:

a. WASC Report Standards (Stryker): The section on page 3 under Governance and Administration has been expanded after consultation with ASI. Discussion focused on bullet 4; it was noted that the participation is already allowable under current RPT procedures. Farrar suggested the word "routinely" be added to bullet 6. Also, bullet 5 was questioned regarding student participation on all committees charged with policy making that affect ASI. Who determines if the ASI is affected? Tuedio noted that bullet 2 under Governance and Administration reflects a concern with faculty not receiving timely information on projects of the University, adding that the second part of the sentence, related to the academic priorities, is crucial. Too many decisions are being made without faculty being involved. Tuedio noted that all faculty on committees will be getting a survey at the end of the academic year regarding the effectiveness of faculty governance. Thompson requested that "well defined reporting procedures" be added to bullet 1 under Governance and Administration.

For standard 4, Keymer noted that some bullets need to be more focused and action oriented. Thompson questioned bullet 4 under Reorganization and Redesign of Breadth Requirements: at what level is the breadth program? Klein responded that further definition is needed. Campbell questioned bullet 3 under Teaching and Learning Effectiveness and proposed a change to read "find and test...".

Klein suggested that the assessment discussion continue at the next Senate meeting.

It was MSP Russ/Thompson for adjournment at 4:30 p.m.