

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

February 23, 1999

PRESENT: Apodaca, Asher, Bettencourt, Borba, Brockman, Broin, Campbell, Cruz, Erickson, Farrar, Gackowski, AbuKhalil, Hilpert, Hor, Jaasma, Klein, Katsma, Li, Littlewood, Luo, Nelson, O'Brien, Pallotta, Peterson, Phillips, Russ, Sundar, Thomas, Thompson, Tynan, VanderMolen, Weikart, Wolf, Zarling

PROXIES: Demetrulias (Curry),

GUESTS: Blankinship, D. Bowers, Renner

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

12/AS/98/GC-UEPC—Research Policy Committee, APPROVED
15/AS/98/FAC—Amendment to Article II. of the RPT Procedures, TABLED
1/AS/99/FAC—Amendment to Article III. of the RPT Procedures. FIRST READING
MAP REPORT, CONTINUED

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, March 9, 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 2:34 p.m. It was MSP Farrar/Klein to approve the agenda as submitted. Hilpert noted a correction to the January 26, 1999 minutes. Page 1, Speaker/Senate Executive Committee, 3) .."Search Committee for the Assistant Vice President of ...". Senator Borba asked that the following language be incorporated into page 4, paragraph 4, last line to read "This would possibly effect non-tenured faculty employed prior to the 1999/2000 academic year. It was then MSP O'Brien/Nelson to approve the minutes of January 26, 1999 as amended.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**Speaker/Senate Executive Committee (Hilpert)**

1. Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli and Trustee Goldwhite have tentatively scheduled a visit to our campus on March 9. As soon as this is confirmed, a schedule will be sent to you. One topic to possibly be discussed with them is Cornerstones.
2. On February 8, 1999, Provost Curry sent to the faculty a revised policy on Facilities and Administrative Cost Recovery. This was developed by the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee, faculty and administration.
3. Attached to the agenda is a copy of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee for Assessing Administrative Review and Hiring Practices. This report has also been sent to the Provost and President.

4. Attached to the agenda is a copy of the Policy on Receiving Gifts from Foreign Special Interests.
5. Criteria and Standards for Merit Increases will be discussed under Statewide Academic Senate.

University Educational Policies Committee (Asher)

1. The UEPC will meet on Thursdays, from 1-3 p.m. during Spring Semester.
2. The UEPC approved the program revision for the BA and BS in Mathematics and the Mathematics Subject Matter Preparation Program, effective Fall 1999.
3. The UEPC reviewed the Student Professional Ethics Statement and made recommendations.
4. The UEPC consulted with Associate V.P. Demetrulias regarding the CODEC Delivery of BA in Communication Disorders by CSU Fresno. Although library resources was a concern, the UEPC supports this program, and recommends that adequate library support be taken into consideration should this program be offered at CSUS. UEPC also voiced concern about service area distinctions and will continue this discussion.
5. The UEPC reviewed recommendations from each of the UEPC subcommittees and sent a response to each chair.
6. The UEPC reviewed the SNAPS questions and made recommendations.
7. The UEPC, along with the Globalization Task Force and the Graduate Council, met with Dr. Cortez. He was helpful in considering ways to implement the Globalization policy.
8. The UEPC will start reviewing the MAP Report and discussing issues concerning the Ad Hoc Assessment Task Force.

Thompson inquired as to the definition for this campus on globalization. Asher replied that a lot of discussion has been going on regarding this. There are system definitions. Thompson asked what happens when this issue leaves UEPC, and Asher replied the Task Force's recommendations will go to the UEPC and then will come to the Academic Senate and on to the Chancellor's Office.

Faculty Affairs Committee (VanderMolen) No report

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Erickson)

- a. A concern came to FBAC from Professor Dunbar regarding the distribution of excess funds. Of these, 72% came to Academic Affairs, and the remainder was split between University Advancement and Student Affairs.
- b. In the process of setting the budget for next year. The goal is to maintain the 72% and look at any other resources coming from other areas.
- c. Received a report from the Provost and the decision was that the campus should start out with a clean slate this next year. Klein added that the 1997-98 year had been cleaned up and they are now starting the

1998-99 year with a clean slate.

Graduate Council (Pallotta)

- a. A new Social Work course was approved.
- b. Guidelines for thesis and projects were updated.
- c. Discussed the social work proposal to allow full-time lecturers to serve on MA thesis committees. That discussion is on-going.
- d. \$22,000 is available next year for graduate fellowships.
- e. Will continue to discuss MAP Report and SNAPS questions.

Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson)

Russ explained the Statewide Academic Senate resolution on Criteria and Standards for Faculty Merit Increases. She explained that the major discussion was paragraph two in the resolution that "Teaching is at the center of any system of merit increases." A faculty merit and salary step activity sheet is being developed. This sheet is due April 1st this year and hereafter on Mar. 1st. The problem is that the contract has not been ratified and the form is not ready for distribution. So, we really don't know what to expect. Questions and comments included the following:

- 1) In the past, when a person had not received a PSSI, he/she could use 3 years of activities in the determination. It seems like this is a year-to-year determination. Associate VP Bowers commented that the current language indicates that it is since the last review prior to 6/30/98. Campus policy may limit that, but the language says from the last review to 6/30/98.
- 2) 31.XX, describes 2 review periods. Is it to our benefit to do both? Russ explained that the first review period was from the last review to 6/30/98, and the second review period was from July 1/98 to Dec. 31/98. She encouraged faculty to apply for the SSI and both Faculty Merit Increases. Assoc. VP Bowers will notify everyone who qualifies for the SSI.
- 3) Is the faculty merit and salary step activity sheet required? Assoc. VP Bowers said that the language was unclear. He suggests that if faculty do not want to be considered for the Faculty Merit Increase that they submit the activity sheet and indicate that they don't want to be considered for the Faculty Merit Increase.
- 4) 31.48 If "the employee has performed in a satisfactory manner..." the employee shall receive a service salary increase; How are part-timers affected? Assoc. VP Bowers said that they are eligible when they have accumulated 24 units without a one year break in service. A Sabbatical is not a break in service, and Bowers didn't believe it would have a negative effect regarding WTUs.

Thompson advised that the SWAS is not endorsing the Tentative Agreement or Merit Pay. But the Tentative Agreement said that we would have systemwide criteria and standards, and SWAS wanted language that gives faculty input into standards and has local Senates set standards. If we are going to have the contract and Merit Pay, then we want faculty to have more control and make the Merit Pay money available to more faculty.

VanderMolen stated that it seems the Faculty Affairs Committee will have to come up with a plan for this if

approved.

VanderMolen mentioned a possible issue with Librarians, Counselors and Coaches. With the new language, would they be a separate unit or included with a School or College? Who would chair these groups? These questions still need to be answered. Asher noted joint appointment could possibly require two different reviews.

Concern was voiced regarding the short timeline. If the application and activity sheet is due April 1, will departments have to have their committee in place by then? Bowers replied he would hope so.

Hilpert reminded Senators that the resolution is meant to keep faculty governance alert and that they have the major responsibility to establish the criteria and standards. This is a jump-start document contingent upon approval by the faculty. We have a short window because the contract has to be approved before everything can be done such as the activity sheet.

VanderMolen inquired as to the status of the SWAS resolution before us and Thompson replied that the leader of the bargaining team and the CFA President was at the SWAS meeting when the resolution was discussed and approved. It was agreed that the information from the resolution would be incorporated into the contract language.

Bettencourt asked if page 1, paragraph 3 dealing with work assignments affects counselors, and Russ replied yes.

VanderMolen asked that any suggestions be sent to him.

Associated Students (Alvarez/Starkey) no report

Provost/VPAA (Associate V.P. Demetrulias)

Tomorrow, President Hughes, Provost Curry and Associate V.P. Demetrulias will meet in San Francisco with the WASC Commission. The Commission will ask them questions regarding our self study. Within two weeks, a response from the Commission will be sent to the campus advising of the nature of our accreditation or anything that we might need to address. This information will be circulated to faculty. Thompson asked how this information will be circulated, and Demetrulias replied that the President will summarize the information, but the full text will be available for anyone to review.

ACTION ITEMS

a. 12/AS/98/GC/UEPC—Research Policy Committee

It was MS VanderMolen/Thompson to amend 7.1 by reducing number of voting members to seven and deleting "there shall be one representative each from and appointed by the UEPC and the GC."

VanderMolen explained that seven members is more workable and since the Senate decided this be a separate standing committee, there is no need for an appointed UEPC and GC member on this committee. The Committee should not answer to those committees. Plus, there is no special expertise these two members bring.

Pallotta strongly opposed this amendment. Members from UEPC and GC should be included because it is important to have representation from these policy-making bodies; there is no intention of influencing this committee.

Thompson agreed with VanderMolen that he sees no rationale for members from the UEPC and GC.

Asher opposed the amendment because she felt it important there be a strong connection with UEPC.

Sundar agreed with VanderMolen about the number of committee members, because it is easier to work with a smaller committee, but UEPC and GC are both involved with research and are both policy-making committees and therefore are the most involved with the new committee. She asked whether members would be on both UEPC or GC and RSCAPC. The answer was yes.

VanderMolen stated that there is no necessary connection between the RSCAPC and the UEPC. And, the GC is not necessarily made up of researchers. Pallotta disagreed stating all GC members are involved in research.

O'Brien stated the importance of both UEPC and GC having a representative on the committee. The committees should be apprised of what each other are doing.

Farrar questioned the number of meetings involved, and Pallotta replied a minimum of once a month. Farrar asked if she was opposed to non-voting membership, and Pallotta replied the two members should be voting.

Vote on the amendment failed with a vote of 8 yes and 21 no.

Return to the main motion.

It was MS Russ/Brockman to amend 7.2 (a) by adding "Academic Senate and" before "faculty" to read "research, scholarship, and creative activity policy development and recommendation to the Academic Senate and faculty." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Return to the main motion.

Thompson stated the duties under 7.2 are unclear and in the fourth Whereas clause the responsibilities of the different committees listed could conflict with the RSCAPC.

Pallotta stated there is no intent to take any duties away from any of the committees listed. There will be consultation with them. In terms of the duties, they are spelled out. Thompson commented that academic planning is not covered under the fourth Whereas clause.

O'Brien called the question. Vote to close debate passed with three opposed.

Vote on the resolution as amended passed with a vote of 30 yes, 0 no and 3 abstentions. This will now go to a General Faculty vote.

b. 15/AS/98/FAC--Amendment to Article II. of the RPT Procedures

VanderMolen reported that in the discussion at the last Senate meeting, a concern was voiced that faculty might be judged by standards different from the ones in place when they were hired. He suggested adding the following language under II. Review Criteria, last sentence to read "since faculty have the right to be evaluated according to the elaborations in which they were hired."

Borba questioned if this language would take care of the problem. Departments would have to establish elaborations now, and they might not have had them in the past. How would that affect faculty prior to these elaborations?

Hilpert explained this resolution would require departments to have elaborations, and those that didn't would have to develop them. Faculty within the department would be involved in developing or modifying existing elaborations.

VanderMolen stated that if this proposed amendment does not cover the concern, it would be covered by grievance.

Borba voiced concern that faculty could be held to higher standards than they were hired under.

Weikart stated that right now, if a department doesn't have elaborations, they can change it arbitrarily. How can this be worse? At least now you would know what is required. Borba replied that if it were optional to those faculty, it would not be a problem.

Zarling stated that if these new elaborations are not forthcoming, then faculty could be evaluated however the URPTC would interpret.

VanderMolen suggested adding language such as "that they subsequently agreed to."

Demetrulias asked for clarification of the existing RPT policy: departments that wish to use elaboration of the RPT criteria must bring forward elaborations to the URPTC for approval. Under the current system, all faculty are judged under criteria in effect now, not when hired. R. VanderMolen replied that this was correct.

VanderMolen stated that this amendment would try to help faculty so they are not treated unfairly by any decisions.

Farrar suggested commenting on first year faculty only.

Borba stated that no one should be held to elaborations that change each year. Zarling suggested that this new language protects not only new faculty, but faculty who have been here for a while.

Sundar suggested we think of why departments change elaborations. In her department, faculty vote on elaborations. Everyone should be subject to that year's elaborations because they are there for a reason.

Russ remarked that we have to be cognizant of untenured faculty. We need to protect them.

Thompson stated that we have to inform faculty when they get here of what is expected of them to get

tenure. Can elaborations change every year?

VanderMolen advised that it is FAC's intent to make sure there are elaborations in scholarship criteria and to try to help faculty in departments that don't act as they should by trying to get rid of faculty by changing elaborations.

Hilpert asked if URPTC can say we don't agree with what you are doing? VanderMolen replied yes, any amendment to elaborations have to be approved by the URPTC.

It was MSP Russ/Erickson to table until the next Academic Senate meeting.

Any suggestions should be sent to VanderMolen.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 1/AS/99/FACÛAmendment to Article III. of the RPT Procedures

It was MS VanderMolen/Thompson

Whereas: review of a faculty member two months after arrival lacks meaning; and

Whereas: new faculty members deserve to be evaluated by the end of their first year of teaching; therefore be it

Resolved: that the RPT Procedures be amended as follows:

III. ELIGIBILITY

These procedures shall apply to tenure track faculty appointed to the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, or equivalent Librarian or Counselor rank. The Chair of the University Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee will obtain from the Faculty Affairs Specialist a list of all faculty who require mandatory review according to the collective bargaining agreement currently in effect and according to these RPT procedures. A faculty member may apply for promotion or tenure at any time during his/her professional career by following the University's RPT procedures. By the same token, a faculty member may, through the departmental RPTC, waive consideration for promotion at any time before or during the RPT review process by written statement to the URPTC.

[1998 Collective bargaining agreement- see articles:

13.3: "The normal period of probation shall be a total of six (6) years of full-time probationary service and credited service, if any. The normal period of probation for Counselor Faculty Unit Employees hired prior to the effective date of this Agreement shall continue to be a total of four (4) years of full-time probationary service and credited service, if any. Any deviation from the normal six (6) year probationary period shall be the decision of the President following his/her consideration of recommendations from the department or equivalent unit and appropriate administrator(s)."

13.4: "The President, upon recommendation by the affected department or equivalent unit, may grant to a

faculty unit employee at the time of initial appointment to probationary status up to two (2) years service credit for probation based on previous service at a postsecondary education institution, previous full-time CSU employment, or comparable experience."

14.2: "A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation. However, a faculty unit employee in the rank of instructor or librarian equivalent may be considered for promotion after completing one (1) year of service in rank. Probationary faculty unit employees shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate. A probationary faculty unit employee shall normally be considered for promotion at the same time he/she is considered for tenure."and

14.3:"Promotion of a tenured faculty unit employee shall normally be considered after he/she has (a) been granted four (4) MSAs under the salary schedule in effect prior to the effective date of this Agreement, eight (8) Service Salary Step Increases under the revised salary schedule, or a combination of both which does not exceed the total of eight (8) Service Salary Step Increases on the revised salary schedule, (b) has served four (4) years in the same rank/classification, or (c) has reached the maximum salary for a given rank/classification, consistent with provision 14.10 of this Article. This provision shall not apply if the faculty unit employee requests in writing that he/she not be considered."]

A. REVIEW LEVELS AND TYPES OF REVIEW

1. Levels of Review: Department (RPT Committee and Chair), School or College Dean (or equivalent), University RPT Committee, Vice President for Academic Affairs (or equivalent), President

2. Types of Review

- a. Partial Review: does not include URPTC.
- b. Full Review: includes URPTC.

B. PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

- a. Initial appointment may be made at any rank depending upon experience, qualifications, and departmental recommendation.
- b. The normal probationary period is 6 years of credited full-time higher education experience.
- c. A probationary faculty member normally shall be considered for both tenure and promotion at the end of the probationary period.
- d. A probationary faculty member shall not be promoted beyond the rank of Associate Professor without having been granted tenure.
- e. An Assistant Professor will not be promoted to the rank of Full Professor without having first served as Associate Professor.

2. REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

- a. Partial Review will be conducted in the fall semester of the second year after employment begins and during the spring semesters of the fourth and fifth years. The departmental RPT Committee and the Department Chair will provide information to candidates on their strengths and weaknesses with regard to the four criteria, in preparation for the full, more formal reviews described below. Recommendations to

retain will be submitted to the Dean (or equivalent) and forwarded to the VPAA (or equivalent) and the President. Recommendations to terminate will result in a full review by all levels.

b. Full Review will be conducted in the following instances:

- 1) when there is a negative review for retention at any level;
- 2) in the third and the sixth years after teaching begins;
- 3) ordinarily for promotion and tenure during the sixth year;
- 4) upon application for promotion or tenure

C. REVIEW OF ELIGIBLE TENURED FACULTY

Promotion of a tenured faculty member normally will be considered when the faculty member has reached the status recognized for promotion in the collective bargaining agreement currently in force. This will be a full review.

VanderMolen explained that a couple of years ago, the URPTC recommended new faculty not be reviewed during their first year, but rather during their second year. This resolution is a result of that request. Also, the Eligibility section has also been rearranged to clarify. Levels of review are defined, types of review are explained, how probationary faculty are eligible for reappointment and promotion, review of probationary faculty partial and full review, and review of tenured faculty.

Russ noted that some of this language could be changed if the contract is approved. VanderMolen stated that if this amendment needs to be changed because of the contract, it will be. But, the only change in this document is the review during the second year rather than the first year.

This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEM

a. MAP Report

Hilpert explained that SEC felt the Academic Senate should decide whether to 1) accept the report, 2) respond to the report, 3) bring concerns forward, 4) draft a resolution in support or not support, 5) appoint a task force to review/respond to the report, or 6) just drop it and no further discussion.

Asher stated her opinion that the Senate should discuss the report.

Due to the time, it was MSP Russ/Borba to table to the next Academic Senate meeting at a time certain to be established.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.