

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

Tuesday 24 March 1998

Present: Abukhalil, Bross, Farrar, Finley, Fletcher, Hejka-Ekins, Jacob, Klein, Levering, Lindsay, Luo, Nemzer, O'Brien, Olivant, Perpich, Russ, Sanchez, Schmidt, Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Watson, Weikart, Zarling, Zhang

Proxies: Russ (Brockman), Demetrulias (Curry), Renner (Keymer), Clark (Souza)

Absent: Alvarez, Apodaca, Borba, Campbell, Dinse, Doraz, Gackowski, Leonard, Li, Lindsley, Pandell, Peterson, Schmandt

Guests: Hernandez, Hughes, Manoharan, Morgan, Stryker, Weary (Fujitsu)

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

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

WASC Standards 1-3, DISCUSSED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, APRIL 7, 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 Farrar/Thompson to approve the agenda as submitted and MSP Farrar/Russ to approve the minutes of 10 March 1998 as distributed.

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

- a. GE Task Force forum April 9, 2-4.

University Educational Policies Committee (Doraz)

- a. No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee (Fletcher)

- a. Held two forums on student evaluation of teaching effectiveness and will bring a resolution to SEC next week; will also try to provide draft guidelines.
- b. Met with FBAC to discuss budget implications for implementation of suggestions from the Task Force on RS&CA.

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Lindsay)

- a. Met with FAC and discussed budget implications for implementation of suggestions from the Task Force on RS&CA. Discussed asking for a proposal from MAP or sending a letter to the Budget Redesign group. Decided not to take action yet. Also, discussed whether FDC and LAC had been allowed appropriate consultation.

Graduate Council (Hejka-Ekins)

- a. Discussing a proposal to MAP concerning the future of graduate studies.

Statewide Academic Senate (Levering/Russ)

- a. No report.

Associated Students (Jacob/Alvarez)

- a. Discussed CETI and the one-third fee requirement at CSSA.

MAP (Tuedio)

- a. Looked at academic plan proposed by the School of Education and have discussed clarifications to request.
- b. Discussed international studies and distance learning and decided that we need to better understand our academic identity before evaluating such programs.

Other

- a. Hughes, Manoharan, and Weary (from Fujitsu) reported on the phone upgrade. Manoharan thanked the faculty for their patience. About 85% of phones are functioning properly. Part of the problem with the change has to do with retention of numbers allocated by PacBell. Another problem is with the antiquated cable wiring systems on parts of campus. Service should be near complete within a day and should be complete by the end of the week. Weary reported that 85% success over a weekend indicates excellent performance according to industry standards. Part of the completion of the process will be a fully documented cable infrastructure. The help desk is in full operation and will be available until all problems are taken care of. Hughes added that a notice will appear in local papers.
- b. Schmidt announced the interdisciplinary graduate student conference and requested that faculty encourage students to contact him if they wish to participate.

FIRST READING ITEM (continued)

- a. 4/AS/98/FAC--Resolution to Create Two Standing Committees of the Senate on Faculty Development: Klein explained that the first reading was continued because we did not have a quorum at the previous meeting. It was MS Fletcher/Hejka-Ekins:

WHEREAS: The Task Force on Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities identified research as being of central importance in keeping faculty members current in their fields and enhancing their passion for learning, and

WHEREAS: The Task Force has given general characterizations of the key terms research, scholarship and creative activity as a guide for policy development, and

WHEREAS: The Office of Research and Grants requires an elected faculty body to develop and recommend research policy, and

WHEREAS: The Academic Vice President requires a faculty advisory group on research, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That there shall be two standing Academic Senate committees on faculty development: The Faculty Teaching Committee and the Faculty Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Committee.

Fletcher explained that FAC had consulted with the bodies recommended by the Senate, and it is the opinion of FAC that the current Constitution places responsibilities for supporting research, scholarship, and creative activity on FDC. This is balanced against a concern with creating too large a committee structure because of the difficulty in getting people to serve. Also, the Graduate Council wants a voting member on the proposed FRSCAC; the Speaker indicated that his position could be non-voting. The intent is to support the desired role of teacher/scholar on the Stanislaus campus. She noted that FDC has problems with the proposal and is crafting a substitute resolution. Tuedio added that FDC feels we need to distinguish between support and compliance areas of RS&CA, separating professional development and scholarship training from issues related to policy for compliance with off-campus agencies (or any kind of policies related to research). FDC will recommend a special research policy committee; Tuedio acknowledged that scholarship and research have not been the focus of FDC lately. Thompson queried if there was a conflict if both sets of duties are housed in one committee; Tuedio replied, no.

This will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEM

a. WASC Report/Standards 1-3: Under Standard 1, Zarling recommended a stronger statement on the value of academic freedom. Klein and Zarling noted that academic freedom could be productively linked to the definition of a learning-centered University. Thompson added that item 1 under Dissemination of Information which calls for a "policy and procedure regarding the release of official verbal communications and centraliz[ization of] that responsibility in an appropriate administrative area" highlights how important the definition of academic freedom is. Russ noted that the SWAS has specific language on academic freedom. Perpich wondered about the definition of "learning-centered university." Klein clarified that "learning-centered university" means to look closely at the needs of students and at learning outcomes. Stryker clarified that "learning centered" does not equate with "student-centered" and requires raising standards of student performance. Demetrulias noted that the WASC steering committee came up with 13 elements to consider in defining "learning centered." Stryker reported five questions that will be addressed in a separate chapter: 1) What is the definition of a learning-centered university given our university mission? 2) What are the values implicit in a commitment to a learning-centered university? 3) In what ways is our campus currently learning-centered? 4) What steps would need to be taken for our campus to become learning-centered in a comprehensive way? 5) How might assessment measures demonstrate institutional effectiveness within the framework of a focus on learning? Stryker noted that these five questions should have also been addressed in each Standard. Tuedio suggested looking at this like agenda setting. Stryker suggested qualifying each verb "provide, encourage, create, etc." Should have at least one concrete recommendation, or specific strategies. Thompson queried how we can talk about training and workshops without working definitions of terms such as "multicultural.". It was suggested Senators might meet with the workgroups for the purpose of input or send comments to the chairs of the workgroups. Under Institutional Management, it was noted that there is no learning-centered focus. Russ responded to bullet 3 "provide administrative coordinators, directors, managers, deans and others with training on the scope of CSU policies and procedures and the relationship between CSU and campus policies," asking should they not know this? Others responded that policy sometimes changes quickly and dramatically.

O'Brien suggested a workday after the end of the semester to break into work groups; Klein responded that the task now is to return feedback to the already-standing work groups. Some recommended an ad hoc committee of Senators be formed to read the entire document, but others felt it was the duty of the entire Senate to deal with the report.

Standard 2, Stryker reported that the plan is to identify 12-15 most appropriate learning-centered aspects of the strategic agenda and highlight how they will be dealt with in the document. Under Standard 2, theme 1, item 1, Tuedio noted that the item calls for a campus-wide discussion of what we wish to protect. Zarling felt the item implies that program quality will be assessed via enrollment. O'Brien queried whether this would lead to offering only classes that students want rather than courses that a university should offer. Tuedio responded that the item links to item 9, but the Strategic Planning Commission could not come to consensus. Stryker noted that the 57 items in the Standard do not necessarily reflect the content of the report overall. Klein noted that the material in Standard 2 is not current and needs to be updated. Fletcher noted that the 5 planning themes might allow us to select within each theme things we wish to accomplish; Tuedio added that we might prioritize within the themes. Demetrulias suggested that the item rise to the level of "value" in the final chapter.

Under Standard 3, Thompson questioned whether Quality of Academic Programs, bullet 5, "provide sufficient resources to facilitate development of effective outcome assessment practices, and incorporate these practices into our five-year program review and teaching evaluation practices." implies that assessment will be defined at the department level. Demetrulias replied that the intent is to implement assessment at the department level. Olivant asked whether bullet 1 under Role of Faculty "clarify faculty workload issues: establish appropriate criteria for determining faculty productivity as a realistic reflection of differing forms of faculty workload; establish realistic distinctions between kinds of courses, factoring in the differing demands of instruction" implies that RS&CA are not part of faculty workload. Tuedio replied that that is not implied. Olivant suggested that it be clarified that research and scholarship are part of workload.

It was MSP O'Brien/Tuedio for adjournment at 4:30 p.m.