

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

March 9, 1999

PRESENT: Alvarez, Apodaca, Asher, Borba, Brockman, Broin, Campbell, Curry, Erickson, Farrar, Gackowski, AbuKhalil, Hilpert, Hor, Jaasma, Klein, Katsma, Luo, Miller-Antonio, Nelson, O'Brien, Phillips, Russ, Thomas, Thompson, Weikart, Wolf, Zarling

PROXIES: Nelson (Pallotta), Floyd (Tynan) Renner (Keymer)

GUESTS: Davis-Russell, M. Hughes, Tuedio

Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad

15/AS/98/FAC—Amendment to Article II. of the RPT Procedures, APPROVED
1/AS/99/FAC—Amendment to Article III. of the RPT Procedures, APPROVED
MAP Discussion

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, March 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 2:34 p.m. It was MSP Klein/Farrar to approve the agenda as submitted. It was MSP Farrar/Erickson to approve the minutes of February 23, 1999 as attached.

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

1. Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli and Trustee Goldwhite will visit our campus on Tuesday, April 27th.
2. A memo from Speaker Hilpert and Provost Curry was distributed to faculty asking for their participation to administer Student Needs and Priorities (SNAPS). It is a system-wide survey of students' needs and priorities. SNAPS also includes twenty campus-specific questions which address topics of direct interest to the campus. The CSU uses data from SNAPS to chart changing student concerns and needs, demonstrate changing financial need to legislators and trustees, track student work habits, and document student involvement in academic discipline-related community service.
3. Speaker Hilpert expressed his appreciation to Provost Curry in hiring a 1/2-time clerical to assist UEPC subcommittees in their work.
4. The Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Committee resolution was passed by the General Faculty. It has been sent to the President for approval.

University Educational Policies Committee (Asher)

1. Sam Oppenheim has brought three concerns to UEPC regarding the MCRC: 1) weekend usage of CODEC at MCRC, 2) Stockton students in ITV classes, and 3) the request to tape ITV classes for MCRC students.
2. UEPC reviewed the draft description of the Endowed Chair in Agricultural Studies. UEPC forwarded their recommendation to the faculty committee that is working on this issue.
3. Jim Tuedio, Dave Blankinship and Mark Thompson met with UEPC regarding the Title III Proposal for funding that would support developing and implementing programs to significantly strengthen students' academic writing.
4. UEPC will review and discuss the MAP document.
5. The Off-Campus Programs Subcommittee will hold its first meeting of the year.

Faculty Affairs Committee (VanderMolen) No report

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Erickson)

1. FBAC will meet with the Provost regarding the budget outline for the next year. Provost Curry advised that he will work closely with FBAC to identify priorities for new funding as well as looking at keeping our commitments to faculty positions and other priorities like instructional equipment and faculty travel which have been identified.

Graduate Council (Pallotta) No report

Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson)

1. Thompson reported that the SWAS will hold a meeting this week. Discussion will more than likely focus on the faculty contract. As soon as there is any information, it will be posted to Asnet and Facnet.

Associated Students (Alvarez/Starkey)

1. Alvarez reported that SFAC is discussing an increase in student fees. Possible increases in fees are for the Student Union, Athletics and the Health Center. All want additional fees. The ASI supports an increase in Student Union fees, but without the one-third allotment that goes to Financial Aid. They want the University to fund the allotment. This weekend, the CSSA will meet and discuss the issue of student fees.

Provost/VPAA (Curry)

1. Provost Curry updated Senators on the Merced Tri-College Center. Although it is up and running, a more formal opening will be held on March 19th.
2. Provost Curry has met with the School of Business department chairs, faculty leadership within the School and the entire faculty to discuss the future leadership of the School of Business.

Other Reports

1. Apodaca reported that the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women has organized many events during Women's History Month (March). Tomorrow is poetry reading at the Quad honoring Wild Women. Thursday, the Women's Center is celebrating it's reopening followed by an evening musical performance by Magalin Hsu-Li, in PSB 167. She encouraged Senators to attend and also tell their colleagues.

2. O'Brien reported that the CSUS Foundation met Friday and Saturday to discuss the needs of the university. Chancellor Reed attended and voiced his support for Foundations.
3. President Hughes updated Senators on WASC Reaccreditation. The President, Provost Curry and Associate Vice President Demetrulias met with the WASC Commission. They indicated we will hear from them within the next couple of weeks for their final recommendation. Our self-study was so well written, some chapters are being used as a model. The President has been asked to present our self-study at the upcoming WASC Conference. She thanked Senators for a job well-done.
4. President Hughes reported that she has met with the Legislature regarding the budget for next year. Enrollment growth of 3% appears to be supported. The technology initiative was also discussed. The CSU is requesting \$23 million and the Governor's proposed budget has \$2 million for technology. There is 4% across the board for compensation with 2% additional for faculty. One campus initiative outside of the compact is the initiative for the base budget in Stockton. The Chancellor has endorsed this. Next week Friday the cabinet will meet with our legislators in Stockton to discuss MCRC. The President will participate in Legislator Day in Washington D.C. on March 23 as a means of keeping our agenda before legislators.
5. President Hughes explained the Chancellor has many critical initiatives before us; one initiative is restructuring the auxiliary group. We have already done this and are undergoing an audit. Another initiative to be discussed is remediation. Comparing us to all other campuses, we are in the middle. We anticipate the Chancellor will ask for a formal proposal from each campus to address remediation needs as they relate to our campus. There is a strong accountability component. President Hughes stated we will appoint a campus-wide committee on remediation. It is necessary for us to have an ongoing organizational structure including outreach administration and K-14.
6. Cornerstones Implementation Plan is an action item on the Board of Trustees agenda next week. There is a new accountability section in the document, but it will not be an action item until the next meeting.
7. Year-round operation is a priority for the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. We have made a determination that because it is important, that we need to have a group here devoting time to think through the implications of this and how we should approach it. Further, the Chancellor will not impose year-round operation until he has one-year of budgeting in advance. But, we need to study the impact it would have on us. A committee has been appointed chaired by Cecil Rhodes. Members are: Diana Demetrulias, Shelley Bartenstein, Barbara Corona-Sutton, Juan Flores, Lisa Bernardo, Melissa Aronson, Al Tsacle, Cynthia Morgan, Jim Klein, Pam Russ, Becka Paulsen, June Boffman, and Diana Saugstad.

ACTION ITEMS

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

Hilpert explained that based on discussions from the last two meetings, the FAC amended language in Article II as attached to this agenda. The major change was to delete the last sentence under Article II. and add the following "Each RPT file must contain copy of the current as well as any applicable prior elaborations. A faculty member has the right to be evaluated according to elaborations in effect when he or she was hired or to which the faculty member subsequently has agreed.

Klein reminded Senators that this amendment will go to a faculty vote.

There being no discussion, the question was called by Klein/Erickson and vote to close debate passed. Vote

on the resolution as amended passed.

b. 1/AS/99/FAC--Amendment to Article III. of the RPT Procedures

Hilpert explained that the FAC amended Article III based on the discussions from the last two meetings. The only change was to add 3. Times of Review a) First review; Fall semester of the second year and b) All other reviews; Spring semester.

There being no discussion, the question was called by Thompson/Nelson and vote to close debate passed. Vote on the resolution as amended passed. This will also be sent to a faculty vote.

DISCUSSION ITEM

a. MAP Report

Klein asked Senators what they feel was omitted in the MAP Report.

Thompson asked the process of getting something before MAP. Klein replied that it depends on what kind of proposal it is. Anything dealing with academics would come from the School/College planning process and then to MAP. If it deals with University-wide, such as enrollment management or remediation, it would come from a particular committee that is studying the issue and then to MAP.

Provost Curry explained that he was here to listen to Senators' input. He did require administrative leaders to submit a plan to him, but he didn't want that dialogue just between him and them but with the entire campus.

Brockman asked how MAP deals with off-campus centers that have no designated person. The answer was that MCRC responds through Dean Morgan. Off-campus sites have an on-campus administrator responsible for them.

Asher noted that there are many different liaisons that are interdisciplinary in nature that don't fit in a School/College. How would they send something forward? Provost Curry replied that we can follow the model used in the Liberal Studies Program. The request came from a school and a college. Asher stated that it is important to have this discussion to see how all the pieces fit.

Farrar asked if the MAP Report gives us a process to deal with the Agricultural proposal, and Provost Curry replied that it will be on the next MAP agenda. Farrar further inquired about the previous agreement by CSUS to not compete with other area Universities with an Agricultural Program, and Provost Curry replied that we are not developing an Agricultural Program at this time. We are gathering the expertise of faculty and are coordinating in an interdisciplinary way. We currently have a Ag Business Program (not active) on the books and an Applied Studies Program. We could develop an Ag Studies Program possibly later.

Floyd inquired if MAP addresses our University partnerships, and Klein stated that we do at the MCRC. Provost Curry further explained that the School of Education is a good example of partnerships they've developed with other schools. He added that there are different levels of partnerships and, at some time, MAP may look at that.

Thompson asked about the four top areas the MAP Committee supported. Specifically, the Honors Program was not supported at the College of ALS retreat. Tuedio clarified that MAP recommended that money for the program not be state money. Hilpert further noted that although the College of ALS faculty recommended discontinuation of the program, the President stressed the importance of this program through the Mission and Goals Statement. Furthermore, it would be a university-wide program and funding would

be from donated funds.

Erickson emphasized that the MAP Report doesn't give strict priorities or identify costs. We need to be careful how the document is used. If a program or item is expensive, it might need to go to the bottom of the list. A cost analysis is needed.

Hilpert stated the important parts of the MAP document are guidelines for evaluation of curricular priorities and non-curricular initiatives. We need to look closely at the criteria. We need input from the Academic Senate. Anything in the MAP Report that the Senate doesn't agree with should be discussed.

Tuedio explained the Committee dealt with what was sent to it. They tried to take positions on initiatives/priorities that were sent to them.

Weikart noted that funding faculty positions is not included in the report, and Provost Curry explained that MAP would not deal with that, although it is a number one priority with him.

Erickson stated his concern of continuity from year to year. He would like the Chair-Elect of FBAC to attend some of the budget discussions this year so he will be prepared for next academic year.

Hilpert advised that the Senate can do many things. They can identify certain issues in the Report to act on, they can endorse the Report, continue discussion to the next Senate meeting.

Tuedio recommended the Senate look closely at areas which Senators would like to put into policy or set up a task force to do concrete planning. Two issues that need to be looked at further are distance learning and accreditation.

Klein suggested another possibility is for UEPC to come up with resolutions on various issues that are policy issues.

Farrar noted that policy should be in place if we have a low budget year. This could affect programs.

Tuedio stated that criteria appended to the MAP document would be helpful.

Hilpert advised that the document is subject to review and recommendation by the SEC, UEPC, AS and all other governing sources. It serves as a backdrop of what could be brought forward. The purpose of this item on the agenda is if there are overriding concerns of certain issues in the Report, the Academic Senate could address them. In the absence of that, we can leave it to the governance committees to look at the document and come back with specific proposals.

Asher asked if there was a particular timeline for input, and Curry replied no, the planning process is always open. Several other groups are sending forth proposals. He is trying to pull together themes from several planning documents. So, input should be forwarded as soon as possible. The President's one goal this year is to integrate all planning documents into one coherent document.

Hilpert stressed that the intent here was to lay everything out on the table and, in terms of an ongoing process, if there is a specific area you wish to bring forward as a proposal or recommendation, bring it here.

Thompson noted that at first it was hard to understand what was going on with MAP. But, the more he found out, the more comfortable he's become. It is important to keep it as exposed as possible. He hopes the Senate will make a formal response. The MAP Committee wanted the Senate to send a formal response to them and we should do it.

Renner advised that he felt the MAP Committee was very well developed because a number of people on the committee were on other planning committees. Integration is important.

OPEN FORUM

- a. Zarling asked for a clarification of motion to close debate. Speaker Hilpert explained that a motion to close debate prevents a filibuster. A motion to close debate can also be challenged, but another way is to move to table, which takes precedence over a motion to close debate.
 - b. Weikart asked the status of the GE Task Force report. Jaasma stated that the task force is currently looking at competencies and discussing whether they apply to lower and/or upper division GE. The committee plans to submit a proposal for a pilot program using clusters for upper division GE by the end of April.
 - c. Alvarez announced the deadline of March 16th to declare intentions to run for the Student Senate, President and Vice President.
 - d. Tuedio reported an open Liberal Studies Committee meeting to be held on March 19th at 2:30 p.m.
- Meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.