

<p>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES</p> <p>April 11, 2000</p> <p>PRESENT: AbuKhalil, Aronson, Bowers, Cartwright, Chu, Clark, Costa, Curry, Farrar, Filling, Fisk, Gackowski, Hernandez, Hor, Jaasma, Keymer, Littlewood, Luo, Mayer, T.Nelson, Olivant, Peterson, Riedmann,m Russ, Schulz, Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Weikart, Wolf, Zarling</p> <p>PROXIES: none</p> <p>ABSENT: Apodaca, Bettencourt, Cruz, O'Donnell, Finley, Miller-Antonio, Pandell, Phillips, Tordoff, Villanueva</p> <p>GUESTS: D. Bowers, Cullinan, Klein, Savini</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>9/AS/00/UEPC--CSU Accountability Plan, POSTPONED</p> <p>6/AS/00/FAC--FMI Policy and Procedures, APPROVED</p> <p>7/AS/00/FAC--FMI Calendar, APPROVED</p> <p>8/AS/00/SEC--Resolution to End Merit Pay, APPROVED</p> <p>10/AS/00/FAC--Amendment to Article VI, Section 2.3 of the GF Constitution, FIRST READING</p> <p>11/AS/00/FAC--Range Elevation Policy, FIRST READING</p> <p>12/AS/00/FAC--Post Tenure Review Policy, FIRST READING</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, May 2, 2000 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Steve Filling, Clerk</p>
---	---

Speaker Tordoff and Speaker-elect Pandell are ill today. Schulz, Chair of FAC, will chair the meeting except when FAC items are on the floor. During that time Aronson, Chair of UEPC, will assume the chair's position. The meeting was then called to order by Chairman Schulz. Aronson asked that 5) 9/AS/00/UEPC--CSU Accountability Plan be postponed. The deadline has changed which will allow additional input by the

Graduate Council. It was then MSP Russ/Fisk to approve the agenda as amended. Page two of the March 28 minutes were amended to reflect the new Dean is from the School of Business and his name is Amin Elmallah. It was then MSP Fisk/Thompson to approve the minutes as amended.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Speaker/SEC (Schulz)

1. Please elect your Academic Senator by May 15 and send the name to Diana Saugstad.
2. The Faculty Recognition Dinner is this Thursday, April 14, 6:30 pm in the Main Dining Hall.
3. Ballots are due in Diana Saugstad's office (DBH 109) by Friday, April 14, at 1:00. Ballot counting is at 1:30.
4. The Spring General Faculty meeting is Thursday, May 18, at 2:30 pm in South Dining Room.
5. A letter dated March 31 from Executive Vice Chancellor Spence to campus Presidents was received indicating that the Board of Trustees approved a resolution on March 15 which articulates CSU's commitment to providing community service and service learning opportunities for all CSU students. This resolution was developed in response to Governor Davis' call to all public segments of higher education to promote student participation in community service. The resolution is as follows:

WHEREAS: the California State University has a tradition of such community-based activities as service learning and community service; and

WHEREAS: Governor Davis has called on the CSU to establish a community service requirement for CSU students; and

WHEREAS: the CSU endorses Governor Davis's interest in strengthening an ethic of service as an important part of undergraduate education; and

WHEREAS: CSU Monterey Bay already has a service-learning requirement for graduation and a number of individual academic departments and programs throughout the CSU currently require community service or service learning; and

WHEREAS: the Academic Senate CSU, the California State Student Association, and the CSU Advisory Group on Community Service have carefully studied the place of community service and service learning in the undergraduate-education experience; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: by the Trustees of the California State University, that the Chancellor require each CSU president to ensure that all students have opportunities to participate in community service, service learning (deemed academically appropriate by faculty), or both; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees, through the Chancellor, endorse campus efforts to make service an expectation, condition, or requirement for the undergraduate-education experience; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Chancellor report to the Board of Trustees, on an annual basis, CSU's increasing efforts to provide those opportunities to all students.

b. University Educational Policies Committee (Aronson)

1. At the last UEPC meeting, a presentation was made on plans for a Wellness Center in Stockton. For further information, please contact Paula LeVeck.
2. UEPC asked FAC to consider a constitutional amendment to change APRC membership to mandate at least three tenured faculty members on the subcommittee.
3. The next meeting of UEPC is May 4.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Schulz)

1. Schulz reported that most of what's on the Senate agenda is from FAC.
2. FAC is looking at Voting Rights of the Faculty.
3. Any comments/suggestions on the resolutions from this meeting related to FAC items will be revisited.

d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Fisk)

FBAC has not met since the last Senate meeting.

e. Graduate Council (Bowers)

Graduate Council will meet this coming Thursday.

f. Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson)

Neither Russ nor Thompson was able to attend the last SWAS meeting.

g. Associated Students (Cartwright/Villanueva)

Keymer reported that there are five fee referendums on the ballot as well as election of student body officers.

h. Other

1. Provost Curry reported that a Stockton feasibility study has come in. Since President Hughes nor V.P. Stephens can be here today to give an update, we would like to hold a meeting tomorrow or Thursday to brief the Senators. A straw vote was taken and Wednesday at 1:00 in South Dining (if available) will be held. Consensus was to open this up to all faculty. A notice will be sent out over Facnet. The report will also be available on the web.

Action Items

a. 6/AS/00/FAC--FMI Policy and Procedures

Thompson proposed a series of amendments as follows:

It was MS Thompson/Zarling to insert 'satisfactory' on page 2, Criteria II, line 3 to read "Faculty shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases, pursuant to the provisions of this Article, for demonstrated satisfactory performance commensurate with rank, work assignment, and years of service, for:..."

Thompson explained that we are not restricted from inserting 'satisfactory performance' and that is what most understood we were getting with the FMI. Question was called and vote on the amendment passed.

It was MS Thompson/Fisk to delete 'merit' and add 'satisfactory performance' on page 3, line 4 to read "Overall performance shall be reviewed in assessing satisfactory performance for receipt of this permanent salary increase."

The question was called and vote on the amendment passed.

It was MS Thompson/Fisk to add 'A. General Criteria under II. Criteria before a), b), c), d) and on page 3 delete all text under 1, 2, 3; add before 1. Teaching 'B. Specific Criteria' and add under that 'Departments shall establish criteria for the determination of satisfactory performance and forward the criteria to subsequent levels of review.' It would then read:

B. Specific Criteria

Departments shall establish criteria for the determination of satisfactory performance and forward the criteria to subsequent levels of review.

1. Teaching

2. Scholarly or Creative Activities

3. Campus or Community Service Central to the University's Mission

Thompson explained that this is a drastic change, but it has become clear to him that we have a PSSI that is now called an FMI. When 'merit' language was inserted in FMI policy and all that is now required is 'satisfactory performance' we are moving in the direction of 'merit criteria' rather than 'satisfactory performance criteria.' That is to say, the criteria currently in the document was proposed for the PSSI document when merit was required. This proposed amendment allows departments to make their own criteria.

Jaasma advised that FAC never intended to have this as specific criteria. This was driven by the results from faculty surveys who specifically asked for examples.

Keymer suggested changing the language to read 'include, but not limited to.'

Fisk asked if FAC talked about departments setting their own criteria and Schulz replied 'not specifically' but FAC referred to elaborations departments might already have. This was in response to faculty saying they needed guidelines or statements.

Thompson suggested withdrawing this motion. It was agreed to by Fisk.

It was then MS Thompson/Fisk to add 'A. General Criteria under II. Criteria before a), b), c), d) and on page 3 add B. Specific Criteria before 1. Teaching. Then add under B. Specific Criteria 'Sample criteria are listed below; departments may alter and elaborate on criteria. Alterations and elaborations shall be forwarded to subsequent levels of review.'

Thompson explained that the first part tries to address what bothered people in the previous motion. The second part speaks to librarians and counselors having department criteria while teaching faculty are held to university-wide criteria.

Zarling stated he thought it helpful to have examples. We just have to be clear that these are examples. Further, giving the departments the option to 'codify' criteria may make it worse. We aren't really requiring any specific mandates.

Tuedio noted that both options push for departments to establish criteria and report to subsequent levels of review. This seems to be a 'shall establish.' Thompson replied that this is a 'may' not a 'shall.' Tuedio stated that if we don't make them, then what is on the list is assumed to be in play. Peterson suggested inserting 'may.' Costa suggested having an intro paragraph stating that the following are examples. Thompson asked what happens if FARs are sent forward? What goes with them to the next level for review? Do examples become criteria?

Keymer stated that as written, teaching faculty are treated differently than librarians or counselors. Secondly, Thompson wants a statement that departments can elaborate, but don't have to. Tuedio is right that you do need a 'common list' if departments don't elaborate, but Thompson's opening paragraph is a good one. Thompson stated he was willing to divide and leave in the listed part.

Tuedio suggested using 'possible criteria' rather than 'sample criteria.' This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Fisk suggested adding 'any' before 'Alterations.' This was also accepted as friendly. Farrar suggested adding 'all' before 'subsequent.' This was accepted as friendly.

Zarling stated he did not see a teaching category here determined by the department. Further, he stated that he should be able to put whatever he wants in his FMI file.

Jaasma advised that if a department has elaborations, then the dean and president must go by them. But leaving it open allows for more play. If these are just examples, we should not say 'any.' Also, the word 'elaboration' is bothersome as it relates to RPT.

Fisk replied that nothing precludes faculty from putting whatever they want in their FMI file. As far as the RPT relationship, departments should be able to stress whatever they want.

Klein voiced his opposition against this amendment. The more open the process is, the better. Further, examples are a better option than specific criteria.

Zarling stated that as he understands this, the department will forward their reasons for their recommendations to the next level, so if a department agrees that what the individual has done is good, they have the option of agreeing. The question is where is innovation recognized? Adding the elaboration requirement is too complex. He voiced his opposition to the amendment. The introductory statement should be modified to state that they are examples rather than requirements.

Thompson stated that if we send up our reasons, are we going to assume that the deans/president will agree? What we are going to end up with is no criteria yet again, and the examples will become the criteria.

Gackowski stated his support for Klein's notion of keeping it simple. Let this evolve over time rather than trying to do it all now.

Peterson stated that it is important to call these 'examples,' and keep the first sentence 'possible criteria are listed below; departments may alter and elaborate on criteria. Zarling noted that the problem with that wording is that it implies that we have criteria. Reidmann stated that if criteria can be elaborated, we assume there already are criteria.

Tuedio asked what is the understanding here of policy related to recommendations? Is there an assumption these will be carried forward with recommendations to departments? If we are going to give reasons as part of the recommendation, the higher level review needs to think about this.

Schulz stated that FAC and faculty comments suggest that there should be a reason given at all levels to faculty as well as to other levels. Tuedio suggested it should say that specifically. Schulz stated that in each of the sections it specifies that reasons go to the next level.

The question was called and vote on the amendment passed with a vote of 18 yes, 7 no and 5 abstentions. The amendment is:

Page 2, under II. Criteria, after the first paragraph add 'A. General Criteria.'

Page 3, under the third paragraph add 'B. Specific Criteria: Possible criteria are listed below; departments may alter and elaborate on criteria. Any elaborations and alterations shall be forwarded to all subsequent levels of review.'

It was MS Thompson/Fisk to amend page 5, IV. Procedures A) 4., line 6 after 'for' 'any changes in recommendations or amounts.'

Thompson explained that this language is to resolve the conflict. Levels of review just can't say they concur with the decision, but must notify of the reasons for any changes in recommendations or amounts.

Tuedio asked why the end of the sentence 'basis for decision' is taken out?

Peterson stated that this seems like a lot of work. Why write out that you agree? Writing should be mandatory only if you disagree. Schulz stated that FAC was hoping to make it agree with the language in C) Dean Review 'shall notify each applicant in writing of the stated reason(s) for the basis of the recommended change or acknowledging that they concur.' Tuedio asked if this allows the department to say they concur with the individual's reasons for applying and Thompson replied that is not the intent.

Tuedio suggested adding after 'applicant' the language 'shall be forwarded to all levels of review. This was accepted as friendly.

The amendment then reads 'In addition, each level shall notify each applicant and all levels of review in writing of the stated reason(s) for any changes in recommendations or amounts.

Bowers questioned why they have to explain if they concur and Thompson replied that this is covered in

general guidelines. Costa asked if an increase requires an explanation, and Russ replied yes.

Bowers suggested deleting 'stated' before 'reason(s)'. This was accepted as friendly.

The question was called and vote on the amendment passed with three abstentions.

Amendment is:

Page 5, IV. A, 4., line 6 'In addition, each level shall notify each applicant and all levels of review in writing of the reason(s) for any changes in recommendations or amounts.'

Thompson asked that the following amendment be accepted as friendly: 'page 6, line 4, add after 'notified' 'immediately if the PAF is reviewed...'

Fisk asked for a point of order, and asked Associate Vice President Bowers how he would interpret the word 'immediately?' Bowers stated that is a difficult question because faculty might be difficult to locate. Thompson replied that he would interpret this as 'as soon as possible.' Keymer urged that we have a time and method in writing. Bowers replied that he could possibly do this in a day or two. Provost Curry stated that this could mean that the message was sent, not necessarily the faculty has got it. It was suggested to have two or three working days.

The sentence now reads 'The faculty member will be notified in writing within three working days if the PAF is reviewed as part of the FMI evaluation process.' This was accepted as friendly.

Thompson asked that on page 8, V. 1. Line 8 be amended to delete 'stated', add after 'for' 'any changes in recommendations or amounts' and delete 'the basis of the decision.' This was accepted as a friendly amendment. The sentence would then read 'The President shall include the amount of increase for those faculty receiving a positive recommendation and shall notify each applicant in writing of the reason(s) for any changes in recommendations or amounts or acknowledge that she concurs with the Deans' recommendation.

It was MS Thompson/Costa to amend page 9, VIII. To add as a last paragraph 'Each faculty member will receive a spreadsheet designed to assist in determining the accuracy of the amount awarded.'

Thompson stated this amendment was prompted by reports of such assistance on other campuses.

Schulz stated this would require a considerable amount of staff hours.

Zarling stated that his FMI award seemed pretty easy to understand, but he would be interested in Item VII being presented as one spreadsheet.

Filling stated that in the bargaining committee minutes they are trying to get that type of information for faculty. Further, this information could come from the Chancellor's office, not Bower's office.

Schulz stated that this time was complicated because of dealing with two time lines.

Keymer stated that he doesn't feel we should vote on something we're unclear on. It doesn't seem to be a sound principle. This could be brought up later on.

Thompson withdrew his motion.

The body returned to the main motion as amended. There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the motion as amended passed with three abstentions.

The FMI document as amended will now be sent to the President.

b. 7/AS/00/FAC-FMI Calendar

Schulz explained that FAC discussed the input from the last Senate meeting, but no changes were made to the document.

Thompson stated that one of the concerns from the last Senate meeting is whether the FARs are linked to SSIs in the contract. There is no mention of this. Schulz replied that to the best of his knowledge, that is an administrative interpretation and it would be important for CFA to raise this issue rather than FAC. Further, FAC felt this was not in their domain, but rather they were to streamline the process.

Thomas asked why there are two dates for FAR submission and Schulz replied that some faculty qualify for SSI and must submit earlier. Bowers clarified that SSI money and FMI money are in the same pool.

Thompson asked if faculty would have recourse to the PAF for SSI and Bowers replied he didn't think it exclusive in that regard.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the motion passed with six abstentions.

The FMI Calendar will be sent to the President.

c. 8/AS/00/SEC--Resolution to End Merit Pay

Zarling inquired as to CFA having a proposal currently on the bargaining table that puts a moratorium in place for merit pay. Should this be mentioned in this document? Russ stated that at the Spring assembly meeting a moratorium was discussed.

Tuedio asked if that is why we are doing this and Russ replied no, but we should take a stand on this issue.

Olivant stated his objection to the last Resolved clause that suggests we use post tenure review as an evaluation tool.

It was MS Tuedio/Olivant to strike the last Resolved clause. There being no further discussion on the amendment, the question was called. Vote on the amendment passed with two abstentions.

It was MS Thompson/Fisk to reorder the Whereas clauses as follows: 1, 5, 2, 6, 7, 4, 3.

Thompson explained that this groups together the four Whereas clauses on research and transits to the CSU-specific section with a mention of the CPEC gap, saving the 'pitting faculty members' till just before the Resolved.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the amendment passed with three abstentions.

Discussion returned to the main motion as amended. The question was called and vote on the main motion as amended passed with two abstentions.

The resolution will be sent to the CSU Academic Senate and California Faculty Association.

First Reading Items

a. 10/AS/00/FAC--Amendment to Article VI, Section 2.3 of the General Faculty Constitution

It was MS Schulz/Fisk:

BE IT RESOLVED: That amendment to Article VI., Section 2.3 of the General Faculty Constitution be approved effective Fall 2000.

2.3 UEPC shall, in consultation with the Committee on Committees, establish and terminate working subcommittees it deems appropriate and necessary. There are four standing subcommittees of UEPC: General Education; Off Campus/Distance Learning; University Writing; and Academic Program Review. 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.~~ Subcommittee membership shall be:

General Education Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at large. There shall be at least three tenured members on the subcommittee.

Off Campus/Distance Learning Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at large.

University Writing Subcommittee: 7 members from the faculty; three faculty from the English Department, two additional faculty from the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, one from the School of Business and one from the School of Education.

Academic Program Review Subcommittee: 5 members from the faculty; one from each college/school and the other members appointed at large. There shall be at least three tenured members on the subcommittee.

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. 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.

Schulz explained that most of the changes bring everything in line with current practice.

Aronson explained that UEPC had requested FAC look specifically at the makeup of the APRC to consider adding tenured faculty as a requirement because many of the committee members felt it was difficult to voice their opinion because they were not tenured.

Farrar asked why Off Campus/Distance Learning Subcommittee does not have this requirement, but GE Subcommittee does. Schulz noted that when FAC first started their discussions, they felt that since APRC and GE subcommittees approves/disapproves programs and courses, committee members should also be tenured. Off Campus/Distance Learning Subcommittee does not.

Peterson clarified that the Off Campus/Distance Learning Subcommittee looks at general policies and resource concerns and has an advisory role.

Weikart suggested an amendment to the last sentence 'Ad hoc subcommittees may be composed of more or less than five members and the length of service may vary as needed' change to 'Ad hoc subcommittees may be appointed as needed,' but it was ruled out of order, but Schulz will take the suggestion back to committee.

Olivant suggested FAC consider using a different word in the first sentence 'and terminate.' Schulz will take the suggestion back to committee.

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

b. 11/AS/00/FAC--Range Elevation policy

It was MS Schulz/Jaasma to approve the attached Range Elevation Policy.

Schulz explained that this is called for in the new MOU. What this does is deal with part-time lecturers and full-time lecturers and try to make their process parallel with tenured/probationary faculty.

Bowers further explained that faculty members get a SSI increase, but there is a limit in the numbers (salary cap and SSI limit). That means that full time lecturers and part time lecturers reach ineligibility for SSI until they get to a different range (which are parallel to assist/associate/full professors). We wanted to see if we could put a similar to RPT policy in place for non-tenure track faculty. The new MOU requires all campuses to develop this type of policy.

Aronson inquired if part time faculty have reviewed this document and Schulz replied FAC has not received their input, but copies of the document have been given to several for their review.

Curry clarified that this is also parallel with faculty tenure track promotion policies.

Farrar questioned if there is something about multi-year contracts that would complicate this and Bowers replied no.

Weikart asked if in the last section is there a maximum amount for award range and Schulz stated it cannot go higher than 5%.

Thomas questioned A.1 seems to be a typo and Schulz noted it would be corrected to read 'lecturers' not 'lectures.'

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

c. 12/AS/00/FAC--Post Tenure Review Policy

It was MS Schulz/Bowers to approve the attached Post Tenure Review Policy.

Schulz explained that although the campus currently has a Post Tenure Review Policy, no one knows where a copy is. FAC studied several other university's policies and AAHE advisories and picked and chose which we liked the best. Further, FAC spent a lot of time creating a positive pro-active policy for those professors that are at the full level. The contents set into place some philosophical principles for post tenure review. FAC hopes this will also help faculty get funds to facilitate their continued growth. The deans' council has a counter version which is much condensed that FAC has not discussed yet.

Weikart voiced concern about page one which this claims to help establish goals for the next five year plan. How will this be used if people adapt goals, but later change them? Will they then be rated as unsatisfactory if they have not met their goals? This could drive faculty to set very low goals. Schulz replied that FAC was trying to look at perceived needs departments may have and how talents might best be utilized in those departments. We would hope if that situation happened, justification would be provided for changes in goals.

Curry asked if FAC discussed how specific things should be? In some cases it depends on specific projects or an emphasize on something. It is different between goals and objectives and goals and plans. Schulz stated FAC did not define it.

Olivant asked how this could be enforced. Suppose a faculty member would rather spend time doing things rather than pretending and recording them. Schulz replied it is possible, but these are only guidelines. FAC tried to make this department centered. SEC voiced similar concerns that we should not tell faculty what to do, but FAC viewed it differently.

Olivant asked what would happen if faculty did not participate and Schulz stated he guessed it would be referred to the President.

Thomas asked if there is an automatic five year period for promotion to full and Schulz replied yes. This is really a post Full procedure unless you decide not to go up for full.

Farrar inquired as to the sanctions and Schulz replied we do have the PIP Plan. The idea there is that an unsatisfactory rating will result in a department level developmental plan. This would have specific one year goals with monitoring and feedback. The purpose of the plan would be to improve performance. I guess the dean would intervene if it goes beyond that he stated. Farrar stated his concern that the department group may not have other senior professors which will make this unworkable. Schulz stated that FAC did talk about committee structure. Aronson stated that Article 3.2.1. talks about the departments PTR Committee being composed of members from the department or drawn from outside the department and further that the department may choose to use the RPT Committee for this process.

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

