

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

January 26, 1999

PRESENT: Asher, Bettencourt, Borba, Brockman, Curry, Erickson, Farrar, Gackowski, Hilpert, Hor, Jaasma, Klein, Li, Littlewood, Miller-Antonio, Nelson, Peterson, Phillips, Sundar, VanderMolen, Weikart, Wolf

PROXIES: Lindsay (Campbell), Katsma (LeVeck), Luo (Moren), Nelson (Pallotta), Klein (Thomas)

GUESTS: Blankinship, Renner, Tuedio

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

12/AS/98/GC-UEPC-Research Policy Committee, TABLED
15/AS/98/FAC-Amendment to Article II. of the RPT Procedures, FIRST READING
Discussion of MAP Report

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, FEBRUARY 23, 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 2:38 p.m. Due to lack of a quorum, the agenda was accepted by the body, although no formal motion was made. An informal motion was made by Farrar/Klein to accept the minutes of December 8, 1998 as submitted. A quorum was noted at approximately 2:50 p.m.

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

1. The Strategic Planning Committee has been meeting. As plans are clarified, their intent is to share information with the Academic Senate.
2. Randy Brown and Deborah Kavasch are our faculty representatives on the University Lecture Series Committee. If you have recommendations, please submit them to them.
3. Provost/VPAA Curry has met with the SEC to start the process for formalization of a Search Committee for the Vice President of Institutional Research and Assessment. Position description is forthcoming.
4. There has been an error in the IDEA Report, specifically, the adjusted score. Saugstad is working with the Director of the IDEA Center to correct the problem quickly. The corrected Report should be sent to the campus shortly. She has received an offer by the Director to visit our campus in the Spring for the purpose of explaining the new IDEA short form and IDEA Report.

University Educational Policies Committee (Asher)

1. UEPC Spring meetings will be held on Thursday's from 1:00-3:00 p.m. in P 118.
2. Joint meeting between UEPC and GC with Carlos Cortez, well-known multi-cultural expert, will be held on Feb. 10.
3. A meeting has been scheduled with the Provost/VPAA to discuss the Academic Program Review

Committee structure.

4. UEPC met with Gary Novak to discuss Assessment. He asked UEPC to establish an ad hoc committee to act as an advisory committee to him as well as revise the draft assessment document. Committee charge is forthcoming.
5. UEPC met with VP Keymer to discuss the SNAPS Survey. An ad hoc committee was established by him to draft questions for the survey. Members of the committee are Novak, Stanislaw, and R. Floyd.
6. Globalization Task Force met several times. They have put out a survey to find out what resources exist in relationship to globalization. Faculty are reminded to respond.
7. UEPC attended the GE Workshop. We are in the process of responding to their competencies. We have asked the GE Subcommittee to also respond.
8. UEPC met with Connie Bratten to discuss two issues: the amount of time between final exams (request by S. Oppenheim to increase time) and number of Winter Term exam days. UEPC recommended that there be 45 minutes between final exams.
9. UEPC began review of Mathematics revisions.
10. UEPC reviewed the Policy on Receiving Foreign Gifts and made a recommendation to the Provost.
11. UEPC will review the MAP Report.
12. Student Professional Ethics Statement will be reviewed.

Asher thanked members of the UEPC for putting in the extra time this past couple of months.

Faculty Affairs Committee (VanderMolen)

VanderMolen reported that amendment to Article III. of the RPT Procedures is ready to be put on the next Senate agenda.

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Erickson)

Erickson reported that the administrative cost recovery program has been revised. The academic area is expected to receive \$100,000+ from this program.

Graduate Council (Pallotta) no report

Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson) no report

Associated Students (Alvarez/Starkey) no report

Provost/VPAA (Curry)

1. The President has supported a new program that changes the way we administer the facilities and administration costs of grants. This will return more money to faculty and departments. The new policy will be distributed to the campus.
2. Dr. Carlos Cortez, a scholar on Multi-Cultural Affairs, will be on campus February 9-10. Everyone is invited to an afternoon meeting with him on February 9. He will also speak at the Instructional Institute Day on February 10.
3. Finally, a regional educators' conference will be held the evening of February 9th. Faculty are encouraged to attend.

Other

1. American Association of Higher Education Conference was held on January 21-24. M. Jaasma and J. Klein attended. Klein reported that they are setting the agenda for higher education. Assessment was discussed as well as how to deal with it. The seminars were helpful to keep us aware of national trends in the governance structure. Jaasma reported attending interesting workshops on assessment and the scholarship of teaching.

ACTION ITEM

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

Speaker Hilpert advised that a request has been made by Gina Pallotta, Chair of Graduate Council, to not act on this resolution today. She is out of the country and will not return until right before Spring Semester begins, and she would like to be here for the discussion. Also, an amendment to the resolution was sent by R. Savini to be considered (distributed). It was MSP Erickson/Asher to table 12/AS/98/FAC until the first meeting in Spring, February 23rd.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 15/AS/98/FAC—Amendment to Article II. of the RPT Procedures

It was MS VanderMolen/Jaasma

WHEREAS: Senate resolution 7/AS/98/FAC states that "each department has the prime responsibility for elaborating, interpreting, and reinforcing requirements for research, scholarship, and creative activities"; and

WHEREAS: the same resolution requires each department "to formulate its elaborations in writing"; and

WHEREAS: such elaborations are necessary for RPT reviews; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the RPT document be revised as follows:

5. REVIEW CRITERIA

The following four criteria apply to the faculty as a whole, and all criteria must be considered in the review process. Academic departments* must formulate written elaborations of the 'Scholarship or other creative activities' criterion and may submit elaborations of the other three criteria. All elaborations and amendments to them must be approved by the URPTC prior to their first use. Once approved, departmental elaborations remain in effect for all subsequent reviews until amended or replaced by the Department. Any amendments must be approved by the URPTC. A copy of the current as well as any applicable prior elaborations is to be included in each RPT file."

Current document:

II. REVIEW CRITERIA

The following four criteria apply to the faculty as a whole, and all criteria must be considered in the review process. An academic department* may submit elaborations of these criteria, which are to be considered by succeeding levels of review. Such elaborations must be approved or disapproved by the URPTC prior to the initiation of the review process and approved elaborations must be included in the file of each candidate from that department. Approved elaborations shall remain in effect until amended or withdrawn by the Department or approval is withdrawn by the URPTC.

A. Teaching proficiency, including preparation, classroom presentation, student advising, and adherence to departmental guidelines and university wide academic standards.

B. Scholarship or other equivalent creative activities.

C. Extent and appropriateness of professional preparation, normally including the doctorate or equivalent attainment (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 42711).

D. Participation in university affairs.

No criteria other than those in the section above may be used in retention, promotion or tenure considerations.

*The terms "department" and "departmental" refer to the faculty of a department within a school, the faculty of a division within a school, and the faculty of a school without departments.

VanderMolen explained that last year, the Academic Senate passed a resolution that required department elaborations, but the RPT document was not amended to include this language. This resolution incorporates that change. FAC is requesting the AS vote this up or down and it will then be taken to a General Faculty vote.

Farrar questioned if the URPTC does not approve the elaborations, is it required they give their reason(s) in writing? VanderMolen stated that he would hope the URPTC would work with the department when that happens. The department must state what constitutes research, scholarship, and creative activities.

Nelson inquired if there was a policy or guidelines of the criteria to be used for department elaborations, and VanderMolen replied there was no statement of policy. Nelson then asked if the URPTC had criteria when looking at department elaborations. VanderMolen replied no, but they would make sure the department was not trying to impose anything illegal or unprofessional.

Borba asked the effective date, if approved, and VanderMolen replied Fall 99. Borba then asked if this amendment would be grandfathered in so those people can avoid playing by a different set of rules than they were hired under. VanderMolen answered that he did not know. He did not think this would require new restrictions on those people. Hilpert noted that the department would have to make explicit the criteria that had been used. Borba suggested giving those people the choice to comply or not comply to the new elaborations. This would possibly effect faculty hired 4 or 5 years ago.

Sundar, past member of the URPTC, advised that it is in the best interest of faculty that written elaborations be sent to URPTC. If the elaborations are unclear, they are sent back to the department for clarification. In

her experience on the committee, UPRTC did not reject elaborations from departments. The departments are the ones who know what is of value.

Weikart noted that this amendment requiring department elaborations would make explicit what, in the past, has been unstated. This will protect faculty because, in the past, the rules could be changed and nothing had been required in writing.

Farrar asked if "grievance procedures" were included in this amendment. VanderMolen said no, that is another issue. But, of course, we can grieve anything. Farrar further commented that if position notices differed from the elaborations, this could be cause for a grievance.

VanderMolen advised that this amendment was sent to the URPTC, but there was no response. He also suggested that before position announcements are sent out, the departments should check their department elaborations.

VanderMolen asked Senators to send him any input before the next Senate meeting.

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

DISCUSSION ITEM

a. MAP Report

Jim Tuedio, Chair of the MAP Committee, explained that the Report attached to the agenda is the current MAP Report. He explained how the process used to get to this point grew out of the Strategic Planning process. Many priorities were identified in the Strategic Planning Framework, a central one being the formation of MAP. Out of that was suppose to come the identification of the key priorities and values of quality academic programs. MAP is designed to provide an academic-oriented context to make planning decisions. We have not had this before. In the past, strategic planning has been done primarily within the sub areas of the Vice Presidents. The MAP process has been developed to try to pull together a coherent picture of our academic priorities. We are still trying to address problems rooted in the budget cutting of the early 90's. We were forced to neglect crucial areas of support for academic programs. Furthermore, the funding picture has changed with a lump sum coming to campus for internal disbursement. MAP has identified areas which need attention and has set in motion a basis for academic planning. The document is not a policy document but written for the Provost as a recommendation to him.

Tuedio listed the MAP Committee: Six faculty from the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, one faculty member from the School of Business, one faculty member from the School of Education, three academic deans, Chairs of UEPC, FBAC and GC, Graduate Dean, Dean of Library, Associate VP of Information Technology, and Dean of Extended Education. He stated his hope that the Senate would consider a formal statement reflecting some kind of endorsement or criticism. Tuedio stressed the importance of the Senate's voice in establishing our academic priorities and refining the planning process. We need a strong academic voice in committees where budget money is disbursed, and a say in how enrollment growth money is spent. Faculty participation in our academic planning process is crucial, he stated. He then explained the handout he distributed: Summary of MAP Recommendations. The four top areas in respect to academic programs the committee chose to support in response to planning documents prepared by the Schools and College are: Liberal Studies and Teacher Preparation, School of Fine and Performing Arts, Honors, and Graduate

Programs. . All four of these initiatives came out of the College planning process. Tuedio then explained each recommendation: Liberal Studies and Teacher Preparation—Out of this, the Liberal Studies degree will be revised. We are ahead of other campuses in addressing the needs of our students plan to become teachers. School of Fine and Performing Arts—There had been some question about designating it a School, but MAP agreed it should have an organizational unit with a face that gives the public a clear sense of the importance we are attaching to the fine arts program, and that provides a more effective means of using resources and conducting recruiting and fundraising. Honors—This actually was a negative recommendation from the College planning process. But in subsequent conversations with the President, it became clear we should try to resurrect the Honors Program. MAP suggests seeking external funding and developing a program that will attract exciting student to campus and enhance our existing academic programs. Graduate Program—MAP believes we should sustain current levels of support for graduate program development, but should increase support for graduate student and faculty research, and for thesis supervision and faculty participation in graduate student recruitment. MAP does not recommend what the Graduate Council has requested. The feeling was we need to establish our undergraduate academic plans and not make graduate programs a priority for growth until we can support adequately our current undergraduate and graduate programs.

Tuedio further advised that this does not mean we don't have other areas for program development that could fit into the process, only that they have to be identified through the planning process at the schools and college level.

Tuedio then outlined the highest priorities related to areas of academic support: Instructional Equipment, Academic Computing, Library, Professional Development, Grants and Sponsored Research, Accreditation, and a revised approach to developing Distance Learning priorities.

Hilpert advised Senators that this is a good index of the kind of issues that have been addressed by the MAP Committee. One area the Senators might want to look at is elaboration of criteria applied by MAP for academic programs as well as for areas reflecting non-curricular academic initiatives. These have been appended to the MAP report.

Tuedio replied that the criteria at the end of the report are modeled on guidelines developed by San Jose State. MAP tried to insure they were consistent with criteria used in the 5-year program review, with the mission statement, and with any other statements we have regarding academic priorities.

Weikart explained that on page 16, the section with bullets is unclear. Is this information from the planning document or a recommendation from MAP? The type of heading found in the rest of the document is omitted here. Tuedio responded that these bullets reflect MAP's recommendations. The final draft of the report will reflect this.

Brockman questioned the distance learning component. This does not include support needed for faculty teaching at the MCRC. She recommended adding this focus regarding support for televised courses and for courses offered onsite at MCRC.

Borba agreed and further stated there is no mention of funding for faculty, equipment, and furniture for alternative teaching sites. Also, page 19 of the report, under distance learning, does not address the quality of the courses being maintained over distance learning. Every course may not be best on distance learning. Brockman agreed that this part of the document appears to focus more on cost effectiveness than quality.

Borba added that quality should be the first concern, and economics second.

Peterson stated that an ITV class is not as good as a regular class. It is a trade-off. Not having to drive, using the extra time for other things is a positive for the student, but the quality of the class is not the same as being there with the instructor and students. Tuedio suggested using the term "high quality."

Peterson suggested that some things have been lost in moving to the new ITV site. The old site had a small room for faculty to hold office hours. There is no such room now. Plus, a copy machine is needed for faculty to use. Provost Curry advised that these concerns are being addressed.

VanderMolen inquired about page 3 of the handout with the list of seven priorities: are they prioritized? Tuedio replied that the first five are high priority, and we are very serious about accreditation. Distance learning is a difficult area to get a focus on, but we haven't approached it yet through academic planning. We need to focus our attention on our programs and make it clear to faculty why their program would be involved or why they don't feel the need to invest in a distance-learning component. We have to rethink how we establish our distance learning priorities.

VanderMolen inquired on page 2, academic priorities list, how the process would work for approval. Will it go through the committee structure, FBAC, UEPC? Tuedio stated that it is going to the Liberal Studies Committee, then the College of ALS Curriculum and Resources Committee, and then to UEPC. Budget implications will go to FBAC. VanderMolen noted the importance of identifying additional staffing needs that would be required by new or changed programs. Provost Curry agreed.

VanderMolen further noted that the student/faculty ratio has grown compared to what we had in 1990. Tuedio agreed that it has gotten higher, due in part to spending enrollment growth money on other things, including academic support. We need to take a strong position in support of increasing faculty to balance an increase in students.

Hilpert explained that we need to identify where financial support from other areas can come from, such as development, grants, contracts, centers and institutes. Provost Curry noted that we also receive funds from student fees.

Tuedio stated that these types of issues will be discussed at the College of ALS retreat. He also noted that in the past we have not considered 5-year program reviews at the center of program planning, not as the basis for addressing the needs of programs.

Renner questioned how MAP fits into the larger picture, since there is a lot of planning going on involving various groups. How do we integrate it? Tuedio replied that we are trying to decide where to start. We have great projections for what we would like to do, but no clear sense yet of the relative priorities.

Nelson asked what the reasoning was to not recommend establishing a graduate school. Tuedio replied that there was a very serious discussion of this proposal. There were several concerns, but the key point was that because of our current budget practice, any proposal really needs to move through the department/school/college first.

Farrar noted that there is a potential problem with service courses. There is no clear control over the assignment of faculty or resources to cover courses in the LIBS major. Tuedio stated that in the case of

Liberal Studies, MAP recommends forming a Department of Liberal Studies, with a Chair. The College planning process supported this. We are moving in the right direction with the Liberal Studies revision.

Asher stated that we still have a major problem that is not resolved, and that is how these recommendations fit with the work of UEPC or GC. What is driving our curriculum? The Senate needs recommendations for how we are going to make decisions so we are not just driven by opportunity.

Tuedio advised that we need to understand the advisory role MAP plays. Any program that is going on the books must go through the academic governance process. We will follow the General Faculty Constitution. Provost Curry agreed that from the beginning, we are committed to take any curriculum related issue to UEPC. We should also deepen the planning process within the schools/college. Further, these recommendations do not reflect all of our priorities. We will continue, hopefully, to review and revise our priorities.

Hilpert reminded Senators that this report is in response to what the Academic Senate asked for—that they would have an opportunity to look at what was being considered by MAP. This report and the Senate's feedback will give credibility to the Provost's plan. If there are areas that are not addressed here, then rather than re-write here, we can form task forces. If the Academic Senate thinks there should be other areas of emphasis, Senators can and should address them.

Tuedio reminded Senators that they represent their departments. Please talk to your department about what happens here, and make it clear to them that the school and college planning processes are where departments link in.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.