CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES NOVEMBER 10, 1998 **PRESENT:** Alvarez, Asher, Bettencourt, Borba, Broin, Cruz, Curry, Erickson, Gackowski, Hilpert, Hor, Jaasma, Klein, LeVeck, Li, Lindsley, Miller-Antonio, Moren, Nelson, O'Brien, Pallotta, Peterson, Phillips, Russ, Sundar, Thomas, Thompson, Tynan, VanderMolen, Weikart **PROXIES:** Lindsay (Campbell), Savini (Olivant) Watson (Wolf), Sarraille (Zarling) **GUESTS:** Barrera (Signal), Tuedio **Recording Secretary:** Diana Saugstad	12/AS/98/FAC–RSCAP SUBCOMMITTEE OF UEPC, FIRST READING CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF CORNERSTONES IMPLENTATION PLAN Next Academic Senate Meeting: 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room Tuesday, November 24, 1998 Minutes submitted by: Marjorie Jaasma, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. It was MSP Lindsay/LeVeck to approve the agenda as submitted. It was MSP Thompson/O'Brien to approve the minutes of October 27, 1998 as submitted.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Speaker/SEC (Hilpert)

a. Met with Associate V.P. Manoharan and Provost Curry regarding the concern expressed at the last Senate meeting during the Open Forum. There
are two committees that exist that give faculty input into technology concerns: 1) Administrative Users Advisory Committee that has two faculty
members: Tom Carter and Larry Giventer and 2) Academic Users Advisory Committee that includes Jim Byrd, Ron Lodewyck, Priscilla Peters, John
Sarraille, Harold Stanislaw, Joan Wink, Dawn Poole and two Senate representatives: Robert Danziger and Michael Schmandt. Since Danziger and
Schmandt are no longer Senators, we need to replace them. Paul O'Brien expressed interest.

b. The Ad Hoc Committee for Assessing Administrative Review and Hiring Practices is still working. Their target date to report to the Senate will
not be met. Their work will be carried over until the Spring semester in which they will report to the Senate.

c. SEC is addressing questions regarding MAP and its report. The MAP Chairperson will make available their report and address the Senate at the
January 26th meeting.

d. The Task Force on Globalization has been formed. Members are: Linda Bunney-Sarhad, Chairperson, Nael Aly, Bob Santos, Sheryl Lindsley, Ida
Bowers, Steve Stryker, Sari Miller-Antonio, Diana Demetrulias, Doni Kobus, Enrique Lopez-Contreras and Melissa Aronson.

e. Thank Andy Young for identifying a new web site for information on the IDEA instrument. The ad hoc committee is continuing to explore and develop
the design to compare SATE with IDEA.

University Educational Policies Committee (Asher)
a. Approved 1999/00, 2000/01, and 2001/02 academic calendars.
b. Reviewed new degree proposal: Bachelor of Music.
c. Began review of program changes in the BA in Music.
d. Discussed Cornerstones Implementation Report
e. Met with Gary Novak regarding the Assessment Plan.
f. Appointed Melissa Aronson to the Task Force on Globalization.
g. Met with GE Subcommittee.

Faculty Affairs Committee (VanderMolen)
a. Rewriting RPT Policy that would change one-year appointments to two years in relation to review.
b. Rewriting RPT Policy that would require department elaborations on scholarship. This will conform to the resolution passed by the Academic
Senate and President last Spring.

Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Erickson)
a. Continuing to discuss ways to become a regular part in the budget process.

Graduate Council (Pallotta)
a. The Research Committee and MAP issues are being focused on.
b. Graduate fellowships and the lack thereof will be discussed.

Statewide Academic Senate (Thompson/Russ)
a. Have distributed information electronically to faculty regarding Cornerstones.

Associated Students (Starkey/Alvarez)
a. Collecting clothes and blankets for the people of Honduras.

Provost/VPAA (Curry)
a. Reminder that this Thursday, Friday and Monday are interview days for the position of V.P. for Business and Finance.
b. The campus is receiving $46,000 for the collaboration between School of Education and Math to work up educational materials in Mathematics to help
middle school teachers get up to standards.

Other
a. O'Brien reported that the Academic Users Advisory Committee presented a proposal to MAP asking for funding in the amount of $150,000. They

received $200,000.
b. The Student Research Competition and the Faculty Research Symposium are co-sponsoring a logo design contest that will award the best logo design
for their events. Entries are due by December 18, 1998.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 12/AS/98/FAC—RSCAP Subcommittee of UEPC

VanderMolen asked that this item be continued as a first reading item so FAC can accept alternative wording, if necessary, until November 20th. At the November 24th Senate meeting, it would then be an action item. Further, he noted the attachment to the agenda that chronologies the events and positions from September 97 to current. It explains why the FAC is presenting this resolution. This attachment will refresh the minds of those continuing senators who forgot and update those who are new.

Pallotta noted that from the May 12 statement, it did not seem the UEPC agreed to this proposal. VanderMolen stated that although no meeting took place between UEPC and FAC, the Chairs of both committees met. Whether UEPC has to agree with the proposal is uncertain. Pallotta further explained that if this is a subcommittee, it loses its importance. She stated her hope that the different parties could meet to try to resolve the issues. VanderMolen stated that this was done last year and this resolution is the result of those meetings.

Asher voiced her concern that structurally she wasn't sure it would work as a subcommittee of UEPC. She also stated her hope that various representatives from interested committees could meet to discuss this proposal.

A Senator asked for the rationale in thinking the committee would lose status if it were a subcommittee of UEPC.

VanderMolen replied that FAC did not feel the subcommittee would lose status. FAC felt it should report to an elected body since the Senate didn't want it as a separate standing committee.

Several Senators asked about the duties of this committee.

VanderMolen replied that FAC did propose the duties in writing last semester, but that was also kicked back to FAC. He reminded Senators that a research policy statement was passed by last year's Senate and defining those things in the RPT Policy is the job of each department.

When Senators asked what kind of policy will be made by this committee, VanderMolen advised that whatever has been done by the UEPC in the past should continue to be done by this committee.

The role of this committee in relationship to IRB was questioned.

O'Brien noted that the IRB's role is to see if research passes the guidelines that are in place.

Asher indicated that the definition or mission is not in place. Further, in the past, subcommittee members are mostly junior faculty. They may not have the experience or knowledge to effectively do the job of this

committee. We need faculty with knowledge and experience to serve on this committee.

Other points brought up included the following: one purpose of this committee could be to support more opportunities for research, and one issue about research which hasn't received much attention is the role of scholarship as teaching versus the traditional role of research.

A Senator inquired where the need for such a committee came from. The answer from another Senator was that it came from Associate V.P. Demetrulias because of the WASC Report. It was uncertain what the concern from WASC was.

A suggestion from a Senator was that we should not have to create a separate committee for research policy. The responsibility should reside with the Faculty Development Committee. If we want to weaken research--then spread it out.

Hilpert encouraged interested Senators to meet with VanderMolen to discuss possible amendments before November 20th.

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

DISCUSSION ITEM

a. Cornerstones Implementation Plan

Speaker Hilpert announced that moving to a committee of the whole informal would allow minutes to be taken and it removes restrictions.

It was MSP Erickson/Jaasma to move to a committee of the whole informal.

Speaker asked the body how they would like to handle discussions: item by item or a more global discussions. A straw vote indicated the body wished to discuss globally. It was also noted that the body could have a general response to our campus administrators or directly to the Chancellor's Office and Statewide Academic Senate, or we could have individual responses.

Key points of the discussion:

One idea proposed was to eliminate (A) "Each university will strengthen baccalaureate education through student learning outcomes and assessment."
The reason given is that this document ignores the role of faculty and students.

Senators agreed that we should not and could not realistically follow the satellite model. What we have is a traditional university that is evolving. Technology should not drive what we do. Furthermore, accepting less than rigorous standards is not acceptable.

Senators commented that faculty-student interaction is what is important. Students have valuable comments and suggestions we should take a look at.

Representatives from both Teacher Education and Math indicated that student needs have already been

addressed.

UEPC's discussion on this document reflected agreement that outcomes are important but not to the detriment of programs. This document leaves room for mandates without faculty input.

Whereas some Senators supported rejection of the document, others felt that we should act. Inaction would give away our authority. Also, we could view this as an opportunity to put forth suggestions on the role of higher education.

Another idea expressed was that this document lacks emphasis on campus autonomy. Whereas the original Cornerstones document had this in it, the reverse is happening in this document. In addition, process and time for a response is a concern.

Senators were reminded that the Board of Trustees approved the original document. They have asked the Chancellor how it is going to be implemented. The question before us is what are the priorities we went to start with and will we be comfortable with these as priorities? Questions about outcomes assessment include the following: Can the campus define program outcomes? Where will they be reviewed? At what level? Is the system going to give outcomes?

A suggestion was to move item (G) "The CSU and each university will make systematic progress toward achieving the conditions that will allow faculty to play their integral role in implementing the plan" to the front of the document. By moving that to the front as the first priority, we can discuss the other points when that is met.

The Speaker noted that the Senate can forward information from the campus to the Chancellor. Different CSU campus Academic Senates are approaching it differently. He advised that we have two more meetings during Fall semester before the report is due. If we are going to express the sentiments of the Academic Senate, then we need to bring a resolution forth for the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 pm.