

<p>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES January 25, 2000</p> <p>PRESENT: Aronson, Bowers, Cartwright, Christopher, Chu, Cruz, Curry, Farrar, Filling, Fisk, Gackowski, Jaasma, Hor, Mayer, Pandell, Peterson, Phillips, Riedmann, Russ, Schulz, Thomas, Thompson, Tordoff, Tuedio, Weikart, Wolf</p> <p>PROXIES: Carter (Zarling), Filling (Campbell), Fletcher (Moren)</p> <p>ABSENT: AbuKhalil, Apodaca, Bettencourt, Clark, Costa, Dinse, Finley, Hernandez, Keymer, Littlewood, Miller-Antonio, Nelson, Olivant, Villanueva</p> <p>GUESTS: Bowen, Clarke, Crawford, Katsma, Klein, A.Young</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>9/AS/99/SEC-Resolution on Community Service, APPROVED</p> <p>10/AS/99/UEPC-Resolution on GE Task Force Recommendation-Goals, APPROVED</p> <p>11/AS/99/UEPC--Resolution on GE Task Force Recommendation-Pilot, APPROVED</p> <p>1/AS/00/COC--Campus Representative on ACIP, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>2/AS/00/SEC--Out of Crisis, CONTINUED</p> <p>3/AS/00/SEC--Commendation for Jim Bowen, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>4/AS/00/UEPC--Resolution in Support of Modification of the University Honors Program, FIRST READING</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, February 29, 2000 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Steve Filling, Clerk</p>
---	--

The meeting was called to order by Speaker Tordoff at 2:35 p.m. Speaker Tordoff welcomed back Diana Saugstad. The agenda was amended to add 'Honors Program' as a First Reading under 7) a) moving the previous a) to b). Also, move Consent Item 5) b) to before approval of minutes. The amended agenda was

approved by consensus.

CONSENT ITEM

a. 3/AS/00/SEC--Commendation for Jim Bowen

It was MS Tordoff/Bowers:

WHEREAS: Dr. Jim Bowen has served CSU, Stanislaus faithfully as a faculty member and coach since 1970; and

WHEREAS: Jim Bowen led the Warrior Baseball team to NCAA Division III national championships in 1976 and 1977; and

WHEREAS: Jim Bowen has carried out his career with great integrity while maintaining good working relationships with his students, players, and colleagues, all with a good sense of humor; and

WHEREAS: Jim Bowen serves as a model of athletic participation and academic commitment that is well worth emulating; and

WHEREAS: Jim Bowen was justly honored on January 7, 2000 by being elected to the American Baseball Coaches Association Hall of Fame; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the CSU, Stanislaus Academic Senate, on behalf of the entire faculty of CSU, Stanislaus, warmly and with great affection extends its heartfelt congratulations to Jim Bowen on this wonderful career and achievement at California State University, Stanislaus; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the CSU, Stanislaus Academic Senate wishes Jim Bowen much success and happiness in the future; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the CSU, Stanislaus Academic Senate will send copies of this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees and to the newspapers in the University's six-county service area.

Unanimously approved by the Academic Senate.

Tordoff expressed his appreciation to Jim Bowen to what he has done for the University, dating back to 1970. He has been a friend and colleague.

Bowen stated his appreciation of this recognition. Bowen further noted that the resolution validates work which often goes unnoticed, both his and that of many others. He also stated that tears streamed down his face in Chicago at the awards ceremony, but having the award validated by his local colleagues, means even more. He stated his appreciation to the Academic Senate for passing this resolution, and for forwarding it to the Board of Trustees.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of December 7, 1999 were approved as submitted.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. SPEAKER/SEC (Tordoff)

1. Tordoff reported that last Friday he attended the semi-annual Cabinet Retreat. Issues discussed were: enrollment management (coming to Senate in the spring), some information on year-round operation (which will be coming to the Senate). Overall, the Administration is focusing on the same issues we are concerned with.

2. Next week, he will be attending a Senate Chairs meeting in Long Beach. The Chairs will also meet with the SWAS Executive Committee. A number of things will be discussed: FMI, Out of Crisis resolution, Accountability document. The Chairs have also been invited to attend the plenary session on enrollment management.

b. UEPC (Aronson)

1. UEPC looked at the draft Remediation Plan.

2. Discussed the number of units for a bachelor's degree. Considerable discussion in lowering this.

3. Reviewed and approved the University Honors Program.

4. At the next UEPC meeting, will be looking at the blended program, concentration in permaculture and accountability issues.

c. FAC (Schulz)

1. Merit Pay questionnaires are being tallied. This will be used to modify the FAR process. 70% response received from faculty and 90% from chairs or department committees. There were a lot of common concerns. This past week, documentation came from the President regarding FMIs. This information is available through the department chairs.

2. FAC is working on crafting a post tenure review policy. This will be brought to the SEC and then to the Senate.

3. The Range Evaluation Policy will be looked at.

d. FBAC (Fisk)

1. FBAC met on January 10 and discussed bringing a resolution to the Senate concerning institutional spending priorities. A draft was sent over Facnet asking for faculty input. The Provost will be meeting with FBAC at its next meeting and the main topic of discussion will be budget priorities.

e. GC (Bowers)

1. GC is continuing to work on five-year program reviews.

2. Also working on graduate program indicators

3. School Administration is completed and approved.

f. SWAS (Thompson/Russ)

1. SWAS report has been distributed over Facnet.

- a. There was a lot of talk about enrollment management, both increasing capacity and dealing with impaction. The concern is a two-tiered system (elite and remedial). Or, it could turn us into a 2 + 2 system.
- b. Also, whatever we think, the message from the Chancellor's Office and the Governor is that there is a problem at the Stockton Center.
- c. On the Board of Trustees agenda is a change in Title V that would reduce the number of units required for graduation to 120.

Russ explained that money would be held up for the Channel Island campus until the Stockton Center issue is addressed.

Russ further explained that Chancellor Reed mentioned that the CSU system needs to be on the same academic calendar; no more quarters or 4-1-4. We would really have to fight for Winter Term.

Further, Reed has been saying for a long time that he wants to reduce the number of units for graduation to 120. SWAS passed a resolution that stated we need more time to look at this issue so we could provide input. Curry explained that the groups he has met with have been told by Vice Chancellor Spence that if we reduce the units to 120, we would just have to justify variances.

Russ stated that enrollment management would be discussed at a special half day meeting. On campuses that are impacted, administrative criteria will be looked at. Pandell asked what is meant by enrollment management and Russ replied that some students are being turned away. Thompson further stated that the presidents were saying this is an administrative issue, but faculty are saying it is a faculty issue as well. Curry replied that what started this discussion was that local students living in the area that were qualified were being denied admittance.

Fisk inquired as to the uses of the Stockton Center and Russ replied that leases were part of the initial plan, but that is not happening. Curry replied that it might be interesting to invite Vice President Stephens to the next SEC meeting to provide an update on this. There is an outside review mandated by the Governor which will occur. CSUS was not given accurate information about the condition of the buildings.

Farrar inquired about the 2 + 2 system. Thompson explained that we are mandated to have a 60/40 split and we are now at 70/30. Tuedio expressed his hope that we would fight for lower division students/courses.

g. ASI (Cartwright/Villanueva) No report

h. PROVOST/VPAA (Curry)

1. Provost Curry reported that as a result of the UEPC letter recommending discontinuation of the COGS program, we are moving forward with a review of discontinuation. The policy calls for a special review committee be formed. After consultation with the SEC, the following faculty have been asked to serve: Tom Carter, Cathy Watkins, Ed Erickson and Jim Klein.

2. The Cabinet has had three meetings with Stanislaus County government officials. He stated they are coming up with wonderful possibilities which can be first explored in Continuing Education. We now have two certificate programs being offered at the Modesto 10th Street facility. There are at least 25 paid internships in Stanislaus County starting in the Fall (stipends for books and a decent salary).

3. Curry reported that we are now in the final stages of the search process for the School of Business Dean.

CONSENT ITEM (continued)

b. 1/AS/00/COC--Campus Representative on ACIP

It was MS Schulz/Aronson

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommends Robert Anderson be appointed as campus representative on the Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP).

Unanimously approved by the Academic Senate.

ACTION ITEMS

a. 9/AS/99/SEC--Resolution on Community Service

Tordoff explained that at the last Senate meeting, much discussion and many suggestions were voiced. Based on that, he has amended the resolution as follows:

Whereas: Governor Gray Davis has called for the University of California, the California State Universities, and Community Colleges to institute a mandatory Community Service requirement for all graduates of these institutions; and

Whereas: The Academic Senate of the California State Universities has requested that each campus Academic Senate consider this issue and respond in general and specifically to a series of questions; therefore

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus endorse the attached document "General Response to the Academic Senate of the California State Universities Resolution on Community Service"; and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus submits answers to the questions posed by the Academic Senate of the California State Universities; and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus oppose a mandatory community service requirement for graduates of the California State University System.

Tordoff further explained that he has expanded the document to deal with three issues: 1) a general response to the overall issue of the graduate requirement, 2) answers to the questions posed by the SWAS and 3) the

third Resolved just to make sure readers understand we are opposed to a mandatory community service requirement for graduates in the CSU.

Specifically, on page 3, the flowery language was deleted. Tordoff also suggested deleting "whenever possible" on page 3, first paragraph, fifth line. This was accepted. Tuedio suggested adding to that sentence "earning academic credit" after "service experiences."

Tordoff stated that Vice President Keymer said at the last Senate meeting that curriculum is the purview of the faculty and not dictated by the Governor. V. P. Keymer's language was not added to this document because the Governor has not suggested that this requirement be tied to courses or curriculum. We should not present arguments against something the Governor did not say. The SWAS at Asilomar strongly suggested we not get off-track.

Tordoff explained that on page 4 the answers to questions, language was added in all caps "IT DOES NOT ENDORSE THE CONCEPT OF MANDATORY COMMUNITY SERVICE" to emphasize we are answering the questions, but that does not imply we support the requirement.

On page 9, under fingerprinting, first paragraph, Tordoff advised that the reference to double use of fingerprinting is not feasible due to privacy requirements. In all probability, students will have to redo their fingerprinting. So, we should delete that language and clarify. This was accepted.

Christopher suggested on page 2. last sentence, a wording change from "indicate" to "indicates" and in the Resolution, last Resolved change "oppose" to "opposes." These changes were accepted. Fisk asked that the first Resolved change "endorse" to "endorses." This was accepted.

Tuedio suggested endorsing the answers to the questions. Tordoff advised that SEC had discussed this, but decided against that. Pandell further explained that these questions/answers have not been well-researched, so we may not want to tie ourselves down to these answers. And, the most important Resolved is the last one.

Bowers stated that the second Resolved should be structured like the first Resolved, listing the name of the document "Answers to the Questions Posed by the Academic Senate of the CSU." This change was accepted.

The question was called and vote on the amended document and resolution passed by voice vote. This document and resolution will be sent to the SWAS.

b. 10/AS/99/UEPC--Resolution on GE Task Force Recommendation-Goals

Aronson explained that the GE Task Force has amended the resolution based on input from the last Senate meeting. Resolution follows:

WHEREAS: The General Education Review Task Force (GERTF) was appointed in fall 1997 to review the General Education program and make recommendations to the University Educational Policies Committee for a general education curriculum plan and propose a structure for implementation and evaluation; and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus General Education program is guided by the University's mission and goals

statement and is committed to developing in its students not only a broad understanding of many subjects, but also the ability to see the essential connections among them; and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus' faculty and students and community advisers stressed the need for these goals in surveys conducted by the GERTF; and

WHEREAS: The proposed seven goals ranked within the top fifteen responses for each responding group, be it

RESOLVED: That the following goals for General Education be approved for implementation for Fall 2000:

Each GE course must demonstrate how it will meet Goals 1-5 and either Goal 6, Goal 7, or both Goals 6 and 7.

1. **Subject Knowledge:** To provide an educational experience that will enhance students' understanding of the disciplines' basic principles, methodologies, and perspectives.
2. **Communication:** To provide an educational experience that will enhance the ability to communicate.
3. **Inquiry and Critical Thinking:** To provide an educational experience that will enhance critical thinking skills and will contribute to continuous inquiry and life-long learning.
4. **Information Retrieval and Evaluation:** To provide an educational experience that will enhance the ability to find, understand, examine critically, and use information from various sources.
5. **Interdisciplinary Relationships:** To provide an educational experience that will enhance students' understanding of a discipline's interrelationships with other disciplines.
6. **Global Perspectives:** To provide an educational experience that will enhance the ability to look at issues from multiple perspectives and/or that will describe the discipline's impact on or connection to global issues.

AND/OR

7. **Social Responsibility:** To provide an educational experience that will help students develop the basis of ethical judgment and social responsibility and/or that will describe the discipline's impact on or connection to social and ethical issues.

RESOLVED: That these goals be phased in, effective Fall 2000, for each new General Education course and for each GE course undergoing its program review, and be it further

RESOLVED: That all GE courses will implement the new goals by Fall 2005.

Crawford explained that some of the concerns that had come up dealt with the wording of some of the Resolved clauses. In addition to making global perspectives and social responsibility either/or, there was some concern that a specific course might not deal with those issues. Thus, we have added a section that would describe the discipline's impact on social or global criteria. We are trying to take into account the

concerns raised at the last Senate meeting. There was a concern that human experience should be #1, so we moved it up, but these goals are not in any particular order. The thing is to see the essential connections between the goals. We do not want this to become a smorgasbord. There must be some coherence as well as flexibility so we have added a statement under Resolved 1 that "either goal 6 or goal 7". You also have some options within 6 or 7 as well. There should be something for everyone.

Young (member of the Task Force) advised that the task force felt that GE offers a unique opportunity to demonstrate connections between disciplines and the world and between disciplines themselves. Six and seven are addressing somehow how the material is relevant to the world we live in.

Peterson noted that you could have a course that looked at multiple perspectives in the United States, not in the world. She suggested a friendly amendment to call Goal 6 Multiple Perspectives. Crawford stated she did not object to that idea, but would not handle it that way. She suggested language such as "to provide an educational experience that will provide culturally diverse perspectives." Tuedio recommended an amendment to change the title to "global or multicultural perspectives." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Thompson thanked the task force for being so accepting of the discussion from the last Senate meeting. He noted that subject knowledge seems to be a substantive change and questioned if the 4th Whereas clause is still true. Crawford replied yes.

Farrar wondered if there is a need for a challenge test; If someone this year drops out and comes back in six years, what is the grandfathering on this? Tordoff noted that most courses could be challenged. This resolution won't necessarily change the list of courses.

Carter advised that there is an overarching set of guidelines for GE in State law, and there is no indication of that in this resolution, i.e. mandate for quantitative skills, nor are we changing the categories in which courses appear. This is an orthogonal paste on top of what we've already got. The idea that each course should do what the entire program should is a bit odd. He voiced concern that this list be viewed as our understanding how our GE satisfies the State mandates for education. Crawford replied that in this resolution what you are getting are the stated goals. We also included some specific examples where we tried to take into account mandated goals, she stated. We are looking at communication in its broadest form. This is basically on top of the current document.

Clarke voiced concern with some of the individual requirements. Not all disciplines can satisfy these without doing something meaningless. Crawford replied that the intent is not to water down what faculty are doing. We are saying these goals need to be brought into your courses. We are trying to give faculty the credit they deserve so that they can be creative in their classes. Further, all GE Task Force members reviewed their own courses in terms of these goals, and they reported that not a lot of modification would be required.

Young further expanded that the task force did look at Title 5 and Executive Order 595. We have bound ourselves to the five areas in the Catalog. No. 1 exists, 2 and 3 are No. 5, 4 is new, 5 exists, 6 exists but says "as appropriate," and 6 and 7 we feel are relevant to the World. Further, we should want to communicate that relevance to our students. We encourage faculty to think about what makes them excited about their discipline and communicate that to their students. Carter explained that in the past, we have seen how lists like this gets implemented. In practice, the list becomes a checkoff by the GE Subcommittee. Thus, making all of the goals mandated for each course is not good.

Tuedio suggested adding to the first Resolved clause, a second sentence "where exceptions are appropriate, rationale should be provided."

Tuedio further asked if the original intent was to cover the clusters and then make this rubric into an umbrella? Jaasma replied no, we started out with what we wanted students to have when they got out. Tuedio then advised that the question is that when students are done with GE, they will have these qualities; it's not a course specific thing?

Russ supports the resolution, but accountability issues arise. Will faculty be evaluated on this? Crawford clarified that we don't know precisely, but in the last two Resolved clauses, we are proposing that as courses are proposed, they need to meet these goals. Eventually all courses would (5 year review cycle) have to meet these goals. She further stated that since the GE Subcommittee reviews these courses, we should probably pay more attention to who serves on that subcommittee. She noted that in the pilot study, there would be a GE Coordinator. There may be a need for an ongoing coordinator for ongoing accountability.

Thompson asked for clarification regarding 7. There is not anything saying we have to try to make students ethically or socially responsible? We are only informing them? Crawford replied we are not trying to make students anything--just develop the basics. Thompson noted that the two parts under 7 seems to say two different things. Young replied that the intent is to make it optional, not required.

Christopher stated that the problem is that every course has to represent this slate of goals rather than the entire program. These seem heavily weighted toward the social sciences and humanities. Seems that some classes will have to strain mightily to appear to meet these goals. If the goals are for GE as a whole, that should be reflected in verbiage. Tordoff replied that not every course has to meet the same percentage. Crawford further explained that the addition of the 2nd half of 6 and 7 were from the science faculty on the task force. Tordoff advised that as a biologist, this seems doable. Any of the GE biology courses will fit within these parameters. Cartwright voiced concern with the 1st half of 7 regarding ethics. Ethics should be from an ethics course, not from GE. Is it the faculty's job to teach the course or the ethics of that course? Also, will this effect many GE courses? Crawford advised that this would not be a radical change. It opens up some things. One of the things the task force addressed is that current courses may need tweaking, some major, some minor. Cartwright voiced concern as to whose view of ethics and responsibilities would be taught. Morals drive ethics. Reidmann supported Cartwright's concern. Further, she suggested a friendly amendment under 7 to change "develop" to "understand." This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Question was called and vote on the amended resolution was 20 yes, 5 no with 3 abstentions.

c. 11/AS/99/UEPC--Resolution on GE Task Force Recommendation-Pilot

Aronson explained that this resolution is a pilot for the cluster idea and has a broad range of support. The idea is to try interesting and unique ideas while keeping existing upper GE in place while the pilot is being tested.

Crawford further explained that we had all-campus workshops concerning the role of upper and lower division GE, and the consensus from those attending were that they wanted to experiment with upper division GE. Then, we went back and had another workshop presenting four different examples of experimenting. This option (cluster pilot) was the preferred option. The point is to play around with 2-5

clusters to see what unique things faculty can do and then access the result. The proposal before the Senate is not committing faculty to anything. It does commit the Provost to money for a two-year pilot. What is clear to the task force is that faculty want the opportunity to experiment. We don't want elimination of all goals, but also see the freedom in meeting some but not all in specific courses, but all in the cluster. A yes vote on this is to allow the pilot project to begin.

Fisk asked if there is a report coming back to the Senate or SEC after the pilot study and Crawford replied that is not in the proposal. Young referenced Resolved two that the task force recommends a 2-year pilot program. Pandell noted that it is recommending and is not binding. Tordoff stated that the Resolved binds us to their recommendation.

Jaasma noted that the start date of Fall 2000 is not realistic.

Fisk asked if a Senate outcomes report should be part of the resolution and Tordoff replied yes. Crawford voiced no objection to adding that. Aronson noted that the report should first go to the UEPC. Tordoff advised that the report could come from the GE Coordinator, then GE Subcommittee, UEPC, and then to the Senate. A fourth Resolved clause will be added with the appropriate language such as, "that upon completion of the pilot project, a report will be forwarded through the appropriate faculty governance committees (GE Subcommittee, UEPC and Academic Senate).

There was consensus to change the start date to Fall 2001. The first Resolved clause will be changed to reflect that friendly amendment.

Question was called and vote on the amended resolution was approved by voice vote with one abstention.

Crawford reported that the task force worked very hard over the last two years to bring these resolutions forth. She thanked Senators for their support.

Tordoff expressed the Senate's thanks to the GE Task Force.

FIRST READING ITEMS

a. 4/AS/00/UEPC--Resolution in Support of Modification of the University Honors Program

It was MS Russ/Schulz:

WHEREAS: The former Honors Program was based on an exclusive General Education package, not strongly connected to a student's major, and not adequately funded; and

WHEREAS: An external reviewer recommended that a new program be explored; and

WHEREAS: The Honors Task Force met throughout 1997-99 to formulate a new Honors Program with broad consultation through forums, workshops, and retreats; and

WHEREAS: The Honors Task Force has proposed a program that is strongly connected to the student's major, emphasizes an enhanced skills set, and builds a learning community of faculty and students; and

WHEREAS: The Honors Task Force has proposed a program that will attract and retain motivated, high achieving students and will model core elements of student learning which include communication, inquiry, and community; and

WHEREAS: The Honors Task Force has proposed a program that will be supported by extramural funds; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus support the modification of the University Honors Program and implementation of the Gateway Honors Program to begin in Fall 2000.

Tordoff explained that we have been aware that for a couple of years, a new Honors Program was being looked at. A committee has been consulting with faculty and Tuedio has made a number of reports to the Senate. This resolution has been approved by the UEPC for implementation Fall 2000. This has not been discussed in SEC, but Tuedio, Associate Dean Klein and Dean Cullinan pointed out that in order for this to be implemented this Fall, information has to go out to potential honors students regarding scholarship application (March 1 is the deadline to apply for scholarships). Our next Senate meeting is not until February 29, so they asked to have this item placed on the Senate's agenda today.

Tuedio further advised that a brochure has been prepared and distributed to Senators explaining the program. Further, that we are focussing on what the program offers from an academic standpoint. If this is approved, he stated we will be looking for juniors to the program. \$3,500 for scholarships is available. This will come from the Mary Stuart Rogers money. There is no money for freshmen yet. This is a research-intensive program for the students. Tuedio further advised that so far, we have not figured out how disciplines participate, but there will be opportunities as we further develop this. Funding is the big issue. What we have is a building endowment (Rogers Foundation) that is the source of money that will support the program.

Curry advised that the plan would be to set up a quasi-endowment (\$200,000) plan and to aggressively build that. By no means do we think that is sufficient, he stated, but it is a tool. Curry further advised that we are getting \$50,000 for operating funds per year, and see that money being used to provide direction/administration for the program. It is hoped that within a year it will stand on its own and be a net student attractor. Direct instruction will be funded out of enrollment money from the state. Further, Curry stated he would consult with FBAC to work out how FTES will be credited. Outside speakers, marketing and administration will not be from state money.

Tordoff advised that this will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting.

a. 2/AS/00/SEC--Out of Crisis-Reforming Governance of the CSU (continued to next Senate meeting)

Tordoff advised that 2/AS/00/SEC will still be a first reading item at the next Senate meeting, but we hope to waive the rules and go to a second reading so this resolution can be voted up or down.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.