

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DECEMBER 8, 1998

PRESENT: Asher, Borba, Brockman, Broin, Erickson, Farrar, Gackowski, Hejka-Ekins, Hilpert, Hor, Jaasma, Keymer, Klein, LeVeck, Lindsley, Littlewood, Miller-Antonio, Moren, Nelson, O'Donnell, Pallotta, Peterson, Russ, Thomas, Thompson, Tynan, VanderMolen, Weikart, Wolf

PROXIES: Demetrulias (Curry), Lindsay (Campbell), Riedmann (O'Brien), Savini (Olivant), Stone (Phillips)

GUESTS: Banks, Barrera (Signal) Blankinship, Harris

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

14/AS/98/UEPC–BACHELOR OF MUSIC, APPROVED
12/AS/98/FAC–RSCAP SUBCOMMITTEE OF UEPC, AMENDED BY SUBSTITUTION, (12/AS/98/GC/UEPC-RPC) AND TABLED
16/AS/98/SEC-CORNERSTONES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, APPROVED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, JANUARY 26, 1999
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

Minutes submitted by:

Marjorie Jaasma, Clerk

The meeting was called to order by Speaker Hilpert at 2:35 p.m. The agenda was rearranged changing 4) to 6), 5 b) to 4 a), 5 a) to 4 b), 6 b) to 5 a) and 6 a) to 5 b). The new 4 a) has a time certain of 3:00 pm and the new 5 a) has a time certain of 3:45 p.m. It was then MSP Klein/Farrar to approve the agenda as amended. Farrar requested a change in wording under a) Cornerstones Implementation Plan, paragraph five, delete "access" and add "assess." Asher requested a change under a) Response to CSU Task Force Report on Globalization, paragraph four, line one, amend by deleting "should indicate the" adding "indicated that." It was then MSP Russ/Wolf to approve the minutes of November 24, 1998 as amended.

ACTION ITEMS**a. 12/AS/98FAC--RSCAP Subcommittee of UEPC (revised)**

Speaker Hilpert pointed out that the FAC has attached a revised 12/AS/98/FAC to the agenda which will be on the table as an action item. The GC and UEPC have also attached a proposal to the agenda. We will recognize this as an amendment by substitution when the maker and seconder is recognized by the Chair to make a motion to amend by substitution to the main motion. We then return to the main motion (the FAC resolution revised), Amendments to the main motion can be made by the body, then we will move to the substitution (GC/UEPC proposal). The body then can amend this document. When both documents are amended (if necessary), we will vote on the substitute. If it prevails, it becomes the main motion and we can then make further amendments and vote. If it does not prevail, we will return to the original motion and further amendments can then be made and voted on.

It was MS Pallotta/Asher to amend by substitution as follows:

RESOLVED: That the General Faculty Constitution be amended as follows:

Article V. THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section 7.0 There shall be a standing committee of the Academic Senate on research matters, hereinafter referred to as the Research Policy Committee (RPC).

a. The RPC shall be comprised of 10 voting members including; a chair and chair-elect who are both tenured. There shall be one faculty representative from and elected by each school and college; there shall be one undergraduate and one graduate student representative appointed by the Board of Directors of the Associated Students; there shall be one representative from and appointed by both the UEPC and the GC; there shall be one representative from and appointed by the library; and there shall be an ex-officio member from Grants and Sponsored Programs.

The elections for chair and chair-elect shall be conducted by the Committee on Committees, according to the procedures in Article VI., Section 3.2

The Chair shall be elected from the faculty at large. The term of office of the chair shall be one year.

The Chair-elect shall be elected from the faculty at large. The Chair-elect shall serve one year as a member of the committee and the following year as the Chair. The Chair-elect will serve as chair in the absence of the chair.

The faculty committee members shall serve a two year term, staggered at the onset by lot.

The appointed committee members shall serve a one-year term.

a. The duties of the RPC shall consist of:

b. research policy development and recommendation to the faculty;

c. coordinating the promotion and support of research for undergraduate and graduate students;

d. Proposing funding recommendations for faculty research fellowships, publications, Journal of Research, faculty symposia, and travel;

e. providing support for WASC re-accreditation in areas relevant to research interests, performance, and policy;

f. providing advice to administration on issues related to system initiatives on research, including academic planning related to research; and

g. consulting, as appropriate, with UEPC, GC and URPT before proposing research policy to the Academic

Senate.

Speaker Hilpert advised that we will now discuss the original motion from FAC as follows:

WHEREAS: The mission statement and strategic plan of the University provide the context for a learning centered environment that fosters the scholarly and creative activity of its faculty and students, including the expansion of support for student and faculty research; and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus has, since 1990 been required by the Commission of the Western association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to clarify the role, definition, expectations, and appropriate degree of support for research consistent with our university's mission; and

WHEREAS: Therefore, a faculty body (Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Policy Committee) is needed to create and amend University research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA) policies; consequently, be it

RESOLVED: That the committee's duties shall consist of:

- a. developing research policy and recommending RSCA policies to the faculty;
- b. promoting and supporting RSCA by undergraduate and graduate students;
- c. proposing funding and resource recommendations to enhance faculty RSCA;
- d. working with the Administration on RSCA issues related to system initiatives on research, support for research, accreditation, and academic planning; and be it further

RESOLVED: That ex-officio members of the committee be the following: a librarian; a graduate student; and a person from Grants and Sponsored Programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the General Faculty Constitution be amended as follows

Amendment to Article VI. General Faculty Constitution

2.3 UEPC shall, in consultation with the Committee on Committees, establish and terminate working subcommittees it deems appropriate and necessary. There are four five standing subcommittees of UEPC: General Education; Off Campus/Distance Learning; University Writing; and Academic Program Review and Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Policy. The name, function, and membership of all subcommittees shall be published to the faculty. The Committee on Committees shall appoint subcommittee members in consultation with the chair of UEPC. The standing subcommittees shall be made up of five members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at-large. Terms of the subcommittee members shall be two years, terms to be staggered at the onset by lot. Subcommittee members may include non-members as well as members of UEPC. Each subcommittee elects its own chair each year. Unless otherwise specified (the RSCAP chair and chair-elect will be elected from the General Faculty). The charge of a subcommittee shall be to formulate, review, and recommend to UEPC any policy issue within its purview. Subcommittees under whose purview is the approval of courses for general education or writing proficiency credit have the authority to approve or disapprove those courses. Ad hoc subcommittees may be composed of more or less than five members and the length of service may vary as needed.

VanderMolen stated that the above resolution is the result of extensive revisions based on the discussions

from Senators over the last couple of meetings. Duties have been clearly stated, and it encompasses RSCA in conforming to what the Academic Senate instructed FAC last year and in what the Senate adopted last year regarding RSCA definitions. The constitutional amendment we will propose to faculty also calls for a chair and chair-elect. The intent is to have a committee as part of the policy-making body of UEPC. This is a compromise position that might pass by 2/3 vote of the General Faculty.

Thompson questioned the second Resolved regarding ex-officio members. In the past, ex-officio members are considered voting. Is this the case? It should be stated in the Resolved clause if it is not. VanderMolen replied that ex-officio members should be non-voting. It was then MSP to amend by adding "non-voting" before ex-officio members in the Second Resolved clause

Peterson inquired as to the effect on RPT review. VanderMolen replied that this will not interfere with RPT on any level.

Savini asked what the standing of this committee would be and VanderMolen replied that it would be a very honorable subcommittee like the GE Subcommittee, University Writing Subcommittee, etc. It is placed there at the suggestion of the Academic Senate.

Asher stated that this year's UEPC does not think it should be a subcommittee of UEPC. Her concern was that if the committee is appointed, it would be made up of junior faculty early in their service.

Thompson reminded the body that 7/AS/98/FAC approved last semester states that "each department has the prime responsibility for elaborating, interpreting, and reinforcing requirements for research, scholarship, and creative activities." He suggested taking the items 1, 2 and 5 in the third Whereas clause of the substitute resolution and moving it to the original resolution under the first Resolved clause and deleting a-d. Speaker Hilpert ruled this out of order. Thompson withdrew the suggestion.

There being no further discussion on the original motion, the body moved to the amendment by substitution.

Pallotta stated that UEPC and GC formed this substitute resolution after consultation with other bodies. Both UEPC and GC are policy-making bodies and believe this committee is better served as a free standing committee. Representation is from many different bodies. The duties are similar to the FAC resolution. The differences are in the composition and in the fact that it is not a subcommittee of UEPC.

Wolf questioned the third Whereas clause, second line 1) second line, "DNA Scientific Research." It should read "Recombinant DNA Research." This was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion as friendly.

Keymer stated that under 7.1, fourth line, the correct name is the "Student Senate" not "Board of Directors of the Associated Students." This was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion as friendly.

LeVeck asked for clarification on the composition of both committees. The substitute has five appointed and five elected for a total of ten members; the original motion has three appointed and two elected for a total of five members.

Nelson recommended the ex-officio member be stated as non-voting.

Jaasma questioned why ten members on this committee and Pallotta replied in order to have the representation needed, we need this amount. Two of those members are students.

Thompson questioned 7.2 f) consulting, as appropriate, with UEPC, GC, and URPT before proposing research policy to the Academic Senate. It does not seem they need to consult with UEPC and GC if representation is already on the committee. Further, why is a URPT representative not on the committee? Pallotta replied that this section could be amended to delete consulting with UEPC and GC.

Savini questioned the need for all voting members. Pallotta stated that in order to have voices heard, they should be voting.

Lindsay stated that the committee has an even number of voters (10). The chair could be non-voting unless a tie. Pallotta felt it important the chair have a vote and suggested the possibility one of the students not voting.

Hejka-Ekins advised that it is hard to get graduate students to serve on committees because of their commitments. It will be very hard to sustain two students on this committee.

Savini voiced his concern about voting balance. Asher explained that they had asked all Senate committees for feedback. They tried to be reflective of a variety of voices on campus. They added the library representative and a representative of the Office of Research and Grants because of their connection to research.

Keymer endorsed Hejka-Ekins' idea to have one student representative. It is very difficult to get students to serve on committees. There are so many committees requiring student representation and not enough interested students. We should give the Associated Students President the choice of appointing a graduate or undergraduate student. Keymer asked to amend 7.1 line 3 to read "there shall be one student representative appointed by the Student Senate." This was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion as friendly.

Nelson questioned why the URPT does not have a representative on the committee and Pallotta replied that consultation with them was sufficient. Also, Pallotta stated that the GC and UEPC wanted representation because they are policy-making bodies.

Savini replied that there is a GC and UEPC representative on the Academic Senate and would have a voice here. Pallotta stated that would not give them a strong enough voice during policy making.

Brockman questioned how the committee would balance not proposing policy that does not supersede RPT policy. Pallotta replied that this committee will not be involved in the RPT process. It will look at University-wide issues.

LeVeck questioned undergraduate students doing research. Maybe the student representative should be a graduate student. Pallotta stated her hope that the Student Senate would be sensitive to that.

Brockman inquired about 7.2 c) proposing funding recommendations for faculty research, fellowships, publications, Journal of Research, faculty symposia, and travel. The committee might support a different focus from our deliberations in departments. Pallotta replied that the committee would not supersede the RPT process or department elaborations. It would provide a stronger voice in advocating money for

fellowships.

Keymer suggested adding (graduate student preferred) to 7.1, third line, after "student representative." This was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion.

VanderMolen expressed that the issue of RPT involvement on this committee has been on the minds of some. Until a week ago, this proposal included this committee having a voice on RPT. Pallotta stated that the previous draft did have an item relating to RPT, but it was taken out because there is no intention to supersede the role of RPT.

Thompson questioned what 7.2 c) means and Pallotta replied it is an opportunity for monies to come to the University for faculty research fellowships that we have never had before. The committee would have a role in advocating these and in policy-making. Thompson noted that if there are proposals for funding, it could effect the brand of research that is done.

Hejka-Ekins questioned 7.2 f) and Pallotta replied that GC and UEPC was deleted per friendly amendment.

Savini questioned if the committee only proposed recommendations for funding, not make awards, and Pallotta replied that LAC awards RSCA and Affirmative Action Grants. This committee is strictly an advocacy and policy-making committee.

Thompson asked if new money comes in, does this committee participate in the funding decisions more than LAC? Pallotta replied that under 7.2 f) they would consult with all appropriate committees.

Nelson suggested deleting "proposing" and adding "advocating" under 7.2 c). This was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion as friendly.

Pallotta also accepted deleting "UEPC, GC, and URPT" and adding "other university committees" under 7.2 f).

The question was called by Hejka-Ekins. Vote to close debate passed by hand-count.

Thompson asked for a point of order because he felt there was some doubt that Senators realized what they were voting on. He moved to rescind the vote.

VanderMolen replied that he thought the body was voting to close debate on the amendments, not the motion itself. Further, the resolution as amended has not been debated.

The Speaker stated that the vote stands and debate has been closed. Vote on replacing the original motion with the substitute will be taken. But, anyone can challenge the Speaker. Thompson replied that he was uncertain what to challenge, but only wanted to be assured that Senators knew what they were voting on. There seems to be some confusion.

Vote on replacing the original motion with the substitute passed with a hand count of 19 yes, 13 no. The substitute motion is now the main motion before the body.

VanderMolen urged Senators to vote against this resolution because it is not comprehensive enough. It does

not include scholarship and creative activities. This resolution requires a very large cadre for nomination for office. The FAC's resolution had been a result of compromise with various committees and FAC feels it could have gotten a 2/3 vote of the General Faculty. There is some doubt this resolution would pass with a 2/3 vote. The proper role of a policy-making committee should be as part of UEPC—it does not need to consult with other committees.

Thompson asked for clarification of the process. What happens if this is approved as the main motion. No one should call the question just to be expedient.

VanderMolen reminded Senators that the President, Academic Senate and Faculty Affairs Committee can propose constitutional amendments. This can go forward to a General Faculty vote if approved by the Senate, and the FAC resolution can also go forth.

Hilpert agreed and further clarified that the Senate could also vote the present motion down and it could still go forth through FAC.

It was MS Nelson/Tynan to table until the first meeting in January 1999.

Savini urged Senators to come to some kind of understanding before the next meeting. There must be some way to come to terms.

Pallotta explained that there are fundamental differences of opinion.

Question was called and vote to table passed by voice vote.

a. 14/AS/98/UEPC--Bachelors of Music

Asher explained that at the last Senate meeting, we introduced the Bachelor of Music as a new degree program. We didn't talk about the revision to the Bachelor of Arts in Music. That is still being discussed at UEPC. What is before the body is a new degree program.

Harris, Department Chair in Music, clarified that the Bachelor of Music is a professional degree. The Bachelor of Arts in Music is not. The Bachelor of Music is appropriate for entering a graduate program. It will also serve students seeking teaching credentials since the CTC accrediting agency requires the number of units consistent with the Bachelor of Music degree. We currently are using the Bachelor of Arts in Music for this purpose and have been encouraged to change it. In order to move to a Bachelor of Music, we need to have enough students to sustain the program, and we currently do.

Klein advised that this gives the Bachelor of Arts in Music degree an opportunity to develop other things. Students can have a second major or minor.

Harris stated that we have lost students because some students aren't performers. This will open the door for those students who are interested, but do not have the skill level expected of performers.

Farrar questioned the foreign language requirement. Is there a place to have a second language? Klein replied that students take two semesters of Lyric Diction and can take a second language as part of their GE. However, the language of choice (Italian) is not part of our Modern Language Department.

Question was called (Farrar/Asher) and vote to close debate passed.

Vote to approve the Bachelor of Music passed by voice vote.

This resolution will be sent to the President for approval and then to the Chancellor's Office.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus approve the application for this new degree program, The Bachelor of Music; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this new degree program be implemented in 1999-2000.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 16/AS/98/SEC--Cornerstones Implementation Plan

It was MS Thompson/Russ

WHEREAS: the Executive Vice Chancellor has requested campus response to the draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan; and

WHEREAS: the Faculty and the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus have serious concerns regarding the draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan; and

WHEREAS: the implementation of the Cornerstones Report may affect the mission of the University and the role of the Faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that we take issue with the draft Implementation Plan for these reasons:

1. The draft Plan was developed and unveiled to campuses without significant faculty input.
2. Despite the lack of previous consultation with faculty, the faculty are expected to review and respond to the comprehensive document in a highly constrained time.
3. The draft Plan does not recognize campus autonomy as guaranteed in Principle 10 of the Cornerstones Report.
4. The draft Plan does not emphasize the right and responsibility of the Faculty to direct any implementation of the Cornerstones Report.
5. The draft Plan emphasizes learning outcomes assessment which may focus on easily measurable skills to judge competence and thereby diminish emphasis on "the development of advanced knowledge, skills, and understanding that are the mark of an educated person" and are "necessary for lifelong intellectual endeavor, for becoming productive members of society, and for participating in democratic institutions and civil society." [quoted from the ASCSU Baccalaureate Education in the California State University.]
6. The draft Plan does not recognize that many of the recommendations, such as those relating to quality and assessment, are already a part of the missions, strategic plans, and practices of the campuses; and, be it further,

RESOLVED: that we recognize the draft Plan for addressing the crucial issues of continuing access for students as well as adequate support for faculty in any implementation of the Cornerstones Report; and, be it

further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus forward this resolution to President Hughes, to the Chair of the CSU Statewide Academic Senate, and to Executive Vice Chancellor Spence.

It was then MSP Borba/Russ to waive the rules and go to a second reading.

It was MS Borba/Russ to amend the first Resolved adding 7) The draft plan recommends that graduate programs adopt the competitive practices of self-support units and programs. The recommendation to charge differential fees to graduate students and have graduate programs become self-supporting units could prevent a significant number of students from pursuing credentials and advanced degrees. The draft plan should ensure that CSU will provide financial support commensurate with the needs of graduate programs. The draft plan should adhere to CSU's responsibility and obligation to offer graduate as well as undergraduate students an affordable education. It is important to adopt only the competitive practices of self-support units that will enhance the academic quality and rigor of CSU programs and not for the sole purpose of economic expediency.

Borba explained that this reflects the issue of future CSU support for graduate programs and student affordability. This addresses the important points that should be part of the resolution.

Hejka-Ekins voiced her support and stated that we need to support quality without punishing students.

Thompson noted that the thrust of this resolution is general and this amendment seems too specific. If there is a way to get the idea across without being so specific, then it would be acceptable.

Brockman stated that the last two sentences of the amendment say it all. This would keep it broad. Borba and Russ accepted this as friendly.

The question was called by Farrar/Hejka-Ekins. Vote to close debate passed. Vote on the amendment passed by voice vote.

The body then returned to the main motion as amended.

Weikart suggested changing the word "recognized" to "commend" in the second Resolved cause. Thompson accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Moren suggested adding "adversely" in the third Whereas clause before "affect."

Weikart suggested that since the Cornerstones Report has already been approved, we should change the wording of the third Whereas clause to read "draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan may adversely affect" rather than "Cornerstones Report may affect." VanderMolen added that the word "will" should replace "may." Thompson noted that this is a different intent to how the Whereas clause was written.

Borba questioned if 5) addresses his concern of alternative to credit system only under extraordinary circumstances and Thompson replied no.

Savini supported Weikart's suggestion of changing the wording to the draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan.

Thompson stated that he accepts Weikart's suggestion, although it does change the intent of the Whereas clause.

Savini suggested under the second Whereas clause, second line, to strike out "concerns" and add "objections." Thompson accepted this as friendly.

Demetrulias reminded Senators that the campus will be submitting their response to specific elements, and many concerns voiced here will be reflected in that document.

VanderMolen advised that the Senate document will be sent separately. Hilpert agreed.

Thompson noted that because of the change in the third Whereas clause, the second Resolved clause should be changed to read "that we commend the draft Plan for addressing the crucial issues of adequate support for faculty in any implementation of the Cornerstones Report," deleting "continuing access for students as well as." This was accepted by the body.

The question was called by Farrar/Hejka-Ekins. Vote to close debate passed. Vote on the resolution as amended was approved by voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.