

<p><b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</b></p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES March 14, 2000</p> <p><b>PRESENT:</b> AbuKhalil, Aronson, Bettencourt, Cartwright, Clark, Curry, Farrar, Filling, Finley, Gackowski, Hernandez, Jaasma, Luo, Mayer, Pandell, Peterson, Phillips, Riedmann, Russ, Schulz, Thompson, Tordoff, Tuedio, Villanueva, Weikart, Wolf, Zarling</p> <p><b>PROXIES:</b> Danziger (Thomas), T.Nelson (L.Nelson), O'Donnell (Dinse)</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Apodaca, Bowers, Chu, Costa, Cruz, Fisk, Hor, Keymer, Littlewood, Miller-Antonio, Olivant</p> <p><b>GUESTS:</b> Blankinship, Coffey, Klein, O'Brien</p> <p><b>Recording Secretary:</b> Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>5/AS/00/RSCAPC--Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Award, <b>FIRST READING</b></p> <p>Faculty Development Center, <b>DISCUSSED</b></p> <p>Network Use Policy, <b>DISCUSSED</b></p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, March 28, 2000 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Steve Filling, Clerk</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Speaker Tordoff called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm. The agenda was approved by consensus. Provost Curry suggested clarifying the minutes on page 3 under FBAC report, line 3 to read "...using new enrollment money to reduce student/faculty ratio." Tordoff will check with Fisk, Chair of FBAC on this amendment. Consensus was to approve the minutes of February 29 as amended (if amendment approved by Fisk).

**REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**a. Speaker/SEC (Tordoff)**

1. June Boffman asked the Speaker to point out that YRO is probably not going to happen. It will only be used for high demand and impacted programs. With the exception of Teacher Education and some other departments, it probably won't effect us in a major way. This does not imply that we can drop the current pilot study which has been funded by the Chancellor's Office. The study is separate from the potential of our campus going YRO. Information is still being requested.

2. Warning what is coming up: The SEC has spent quite a bit of time on a couple of items and is thus behind, which accounts for the recent short meetings. Expect the following issues to come forward: Title V changes, FAC proposed changes to the FMI process, Resolution calling for the system to abolish FMI, Range Elevation Policy.

**b. University Educational Policies Committee (Aronson)**

1. There will be two faculty forums on YRO this Friday; on campus in the Event Center, 9-11 am and in Stockton, 1-2:30. Agenda is to provide a quick overview of YRO and ask groups to consider 1) benefits, 2) problems and 3) questions that need to be addressed.
2. UEPC has approved blended programs (liberal studies and multiple subject credential program); also approved Art and Science Subject Matter programs.
3. At the request of the Institute for Study of Pension Systems, UEPC discontinued it.
4. Student retention issues were discussed. V.P. Keymer will attend the next UEPC meeting to discuss this issue.
5. Permaculture Concentration was approved.
6. UEPC discussed the Campus Accountability Report format. That should go to SEC and AS this Spring.

**c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Schulz)**

1. FAC is finishing the Range Elevation Policy as well as Post Tenure Review Policy and FMI/FAR Procedures. The FMI/FAR Calendar will be a separate item.

Thompson questioned the survey results and Schulz replied that SEC has this information, but because of the agenda backlog, has not been discussed. Thompson asked how FAC saw their role; as staying within the MOU or are they bringing a separate resolution addressing the concerns of the faculty? Schulz replied that probably a separate letter, resolution or addendum would go along with the proposed amended FMI/FAR Procedures.

**d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Fisk) No report**

**e. Graduate Council (Bowers) No report**

**f. Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson)**

1. Thompson explained the Statewide Academic Senate report he recently distributed over Facnet:
  - a. The Chancellor reiterated that these are great economic times. The CSU is requesting an additional \$250 million funding from the excess money in the state budget. Further, he stated the CSU must work together (as a family) as one voice in Sacramento.
  - b. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence has an initiative on improving consultation and shared governance. This includes: early agenda setting involving faculty, direct face to face communication, and frank explanations when there is disagreement on issues. Thompson stated he assumed that there would be local campus initiatives as well.
  - c. MCRC was discussed. There was some miscommunication by the State about the property before its transfer. One option under consideration is to keep the portion we want and give the rest back to the State. Another option is to get a grade school to house itself at the Center. A decision must be made by April 1. The Chancellor noted that no money would be taken from any campus or program for the MCRC.
  - d. A question was raised by the faculty trustee as to whether Upper-Division G.E. is accomplishing its purpose and whether it is working well. This may be revisited.
  - e. Community Service/Service Learning resolution was developed in response to the Governor's proposed mandatory volunteer community service program. The resolution is based on input from 15 campuses and

supports the ethic of volunteerism as well as community service and service learning, but does not support mandated volunteerism. The plan now is for community service or service learning as a requirement or as an expectation to be set by the local campus.

f. FMI--many campuses are providing faculty with individual spreadsheets to allow them to double-check whether they have received the correct amounts.

Tordoff explained that regarding c) MCRC, Trustee Farar met with people at the Stockton Center and noted that a feasibility study will be done April 3 [which is after the April 1 deadline--see (c) above] and will go to a Chancellor's Office committee.

#### **g. Associated Students (Cartwright/Villanueva**

1. Cartwright reported that student elections are upcoming. Packets are due March 23 at noon. Please announce to your students.

### **FIRST READING ITEM**

#### **a. 5/AS/00/RSCAPC--Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Award**

It was MS Aronson/Russ:

WHEREAS: RSCA are an important component of each faculty member's development as a teacher-scholar; and

WHEREAS: Faculty RSCA contributes to the prestige and visibility of CSUS in the community and throughout the world; and

WHEREAS: Faculty at CSUS are doing exciting RSCA that deserves greater recognition by the university and community; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CSUS institute, beginning in academic year 2000/2001, an annual Faculty Award for RSCA in the amount of \$1,000 to recognize the scholarly achievements of its faculty. The recipient will be selected by the Leaves and Awards Committee based on his or her productivity, considering primarily work accomplished at CSU Stanislaus. No one may receive the award more than once.

O'Brien, Chair of the RSCAPC explains the history of how and why the RSCAPC was created and current activities the committee is working on: 1) RSCA award, 2) defining research and 3) dealing with Human Subject Policy. The proposed research award is written in such a way that it is all-inclusive in terms of faculty 'research' activities. We are a diverse group, he stated, and thus we are trying to celebrate all of those activities. Provost Curry came up with the money (\$1,000) as an expression of his support. The committee's idea is that teaching is the primary mission here, thus the award amount is less than the Outstanding Professor Award. The OSP would be increased to \$2,000. The award would be given by the Leaves and Awards Committee.

Finley supported the award, but asked that language be added clarifying that it is a single person award. O'Brien stated his support with this addition.

Curry stated since this award would be parallel to the Outstanding Professor Award, asked if the procedures would be the same, which is, the LAC would recommend to the Provost. O'Brien stated that this could be clarified in the resolution.

Curry further stated that he would hope on next year's agenda would be several other faculty awards. The Leaves and Awards Committee has been consulted, he stated, and they are supportive of this idea.

Zarling asked what the rationale is to recommend to the Provost. Curry stated that it is a tradition, but that he did not have to participate if that's the Senate's wish. Tordoff replied that in the case of Outstanding Professor, it may relate to the eventual systemwide nature of the award. This award would be parallel. Curry further stated that he assumed that the overview of the process is intended. Zarling replied that the Academic Senate could oversee it. If it is really an award by the faculty, the Senate should award it. Tordoff asked O'Brien to check with other campuses to see how they deal with this. Russ voiced no opposition to the LAC recommending to the Provost. He has interest in scholarship as well, and he has shown his support by financing these awards.

Pandell asked if LAC forwards one name for Outstanding Professor and Curry replied it can be different depending on the LAC that year. It ranges from making a strong recommendation for one among several, to a strong recommendation for one. Pandell stated there should be one name that goes forward. Curry replied that LAC is never shy about stating their recommendations.

Luo asked what the nomination procedures are and O'Brien stated that the committee is coming up with the criteria, but self-nominations will be fine. This resolution only speaks to establishing the award. The committee is also working on defining research, and that will be sent to URPTC for their review as well as over Facnet, and eventually be brought to the Senate for approval. All of this will be in place by the time the RSCA award process starts. Tordoff clarified that the title will reflect the award "Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Award."

Zarling questioned why the award would be given to only one person. Faculty could collaborate on a project worthy of this award. Tordoff replied that this award is not to be given for a single project. It is to recognize a consistent pattern over a period of time. Peterson supported the idea of giving the award to more than one person, as an example, the Nobel Prize.

Gackowski asked why a person couldn't receive the award more than once and O'Brien stated that the committee discussed this at length and felt that having one person receiving it again and again would preclude other faculty from receiving it. Tordoff noted that the concept is to recognize a person's record over a period of time. If you have been recognized once, then you have been recognized. Gackowski stated that if the intention is to grant it on a lifetime achievement, then we need to clearly state that in the proposal.

O'Brien distributed a draft statement of "defining research" the RSCAPC is working on. All three areas will be defined in one definition. Definition reads: "Any activity of an intellectual or professional nature, which extends knowledge, understanding or appreciation for work within one's discipline, which includes basic and applied investigation, as well as the production of creative works." O'Brien reminded Senators that this is still before the committee.

Reidmann suggested debating whether it is to be a lifetime achievement award. O'Brien stated that he envisioned it would be like the Outstanding Professor Award, which is a lifetime achievement award. It was questioned whether this award would be awarded every year and Tordoff replied that it would be hard to imagine that a university our size doesn't have at least one person per year to recognize. O'Brien stated that he would hope it would be awarded every year like the Outstanding Professor Award. Tordoff stated that some campus give out not only Outstanding Professor Award each year, but Outstanding Teacher, Outstanding Researcher, and Outstanding Public Service. They are parallel to the OSP, but they receive less money.

Tordoff stated that this will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **a. Faculty Development Center**

Tordoff explained that three weeks ago President Hughes and V.P. Strong came to the SEC to present to us an exciting opportunity in that the Rogers had requested the remaining \$3 million they had donated to the University be used to build a Faculty Development Center. Apparently, there had been a misunderstanding about what the initial \$4 million was to be used for. When it was clarified that the Rogers donation was to be used for a building, President Hughes asked Coffey to come up with conceptual drawings. Using information from the FDC proposal approved by the Senate December 1997 and approved by the President January 1998 (16/AS/97/FDC), Coffey developed a building to house the Faculty Development Center. This was shown to the Rogers and they liked this idea. The plan before the Senate today is the result of that discussion.

Coffey explained that he has worked with the master plan architect to come up with a 10,000 sq. ft building which can be built for \$3 million. This includes infrastructure. Issues of parking, views surface access and outdoor private space was all taken into consideration. This building will be built at the south end of Warrior Lake. Included in the proposal: conference room to house up to 50 (possibly the Academic Senate meetings), conference room to house up to 30, instructional computer lab, drop-in lab to do instructional technology projects w/student assistants, warming kitchen, interactive space to seat up to 100 w/adjoining library and reading room, restrooms, administrative offices to house the Faculty Development Center, Student Assessment Office and Instructional Technology Consultant. There is a possibility the Academic Senate Office could be housed here. Coffey further explained that John Rogers liked this concept and agreed to accelerate his gift to fund it. We can be building by next winter if we can get a committee together; so will be done about the same time the Mary Stuart Rogers Educational Services Gateway Building is completed. The FDC will be named the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center.

AbuKhalil commented that although this is nice, we have many other needs. Tordoff explained that the Rogers Foundation funds two things: scholarships and buildings. This money cannot be used for anything but a building. Typically, donors specify what their money will be used for and Rogers specified he would fund this building with the \$3 million donated from the Rogers Foundation. Curry further commented that this project excited members of the Rogers Foundation. That is why they have accelerated their money for this project. We need to develop a sense of priorities, but this is a nice project that will allow faculty to come together to facilitate discussion.

Zarling voiced his support of the project. There is a need for faculty to have a place to congregate. This will strengthen the bonds between faculty.

Young gave an overview of the history of this project. It first started with the Academic Senate approving 16/AS/97/FDC December 1997 that set up the Faculty Development Center. It was passed unanimously. The resolution included the budget and space projections short and long term. This building proposal comes out of the long-term projections. In order to develop this project, Young and Coffey worked together to develop this model before the Senate. The idea behind the initial request is that we are all busy and lack a space where we can interact and create kinships which enrich our professional activities. Faculty development is new on this campus. The idea is to provide resources to people wanting to use them e.g. space for workshops, department meetings, discipline-based conferences, and cultural events. Given the nature of our work, it is difficult to draw people in. If the space is there, people will use it creatively.

Luo voiced his support of this project. As a junior faculty member, he stated he would not only benefit greatly from workshops, but from interaction among colleagues.

Clark stated her agreement with Luo and further that interaction among colleagues is vital and has been lacking on campus.

Cartwright commented that this project is not a program but a building. Is there funding for these programs in faculty development that have been proposed when this building is completed? Further, this project does not provide for student/faculty interaction. The students will not go there.

AbuKhalil commented that faculty need to be involved in budget priority setting.

Thompson asked Cartwright how student government reacted when the President discussed this project with them? Cartwright replied that the response was mostly positive because it does look like a good thing. But the Academic Senate is the appropriate group to bring up any concerns.

Danziger commented that this project identifies a real need on our campus. Further, there is no reason why students could not use it with faculty.

Klein reminded Senators that this proposal was a priority of the Senate two years ago. The expectation was that there would be a separate building to house the FDC. Secondly, this is a wonderful opportunity for faculty to have a place to go for help in teaching and interaction between faculty. The real beneficiaries of this place will be the students. Cartwright replied that he personally developed from interactions with faculty. Not that this is a place students can't go, but a place we probably won't go.

Aronson noted that food service is an important issue. Secondly, maintenance is also an issue. How will it be maintained? Coffey replied that it would be submitted to the Chancellor's Office as a building that will be funded operationally by the CSU.

Farrar asked how flexible space planning is for faculty using it in a block of time and Coffey stated that this proposal is only conceptual and a committee will be formed to design it. Space is very flexible now.

Tuedio stated that this campus has been missing an interaction center for a long time. Has Young got the impression from other campuses that this sort of space is used well? Young replied that different campuses approach it differently. In general, centers lacking this sort of space have a hard time.

Peterson stated that she is happy that the Faculty Development Center (Young) will have more resources; he's done well with shoestring arrangements. But, she voiced concern about the earlier misunderstanding of what the Rogers money was to be used for. We need to be very careful in clarifying what the donor's money is to be used for. This should be done when the money first comes in. But, the donor's wishes have to be respected. Also, the hope is to make these facilities useful in multiple ways, including with students.

Clark hoped we would graciously accept the money from the Rogers Foundation. Also, be aware the U.C. Merced is coming in and they are aggressive fundraisers.

Cartwright agreed and further that the problem is not that you don't need the center--you do. My frustration, he stated, is with the Administration. They could have shown Rogers anything, but chose this.

Weikart replied that there is a bigger part of the picture and that is Development in general. There were administrative decisions made and priorities passed on in this process. Although Development is doing good things, the concern is that the concept of a learning-centered university is being pushed aside by money from private donors. We need to press Development to do things on the academic side. Tordoff replied that the Senate Executive Committee is pursuing this and we anticipate something to the Senate by the end of the term.

## **b. Network Use Policy**

Since Manoharan is out of town today, Filling gave an overview of the process used in developing the Network Use Policy. It has taken approximately 3 1/2 years to come up with this policy. The President's

cabinet, CSU legal staff and faculty have looked at this policy.

Aronson questioned page one, second line "While not providing guarantees of availability, CSU Stanislaus has the stated objective of providing access to both campus and offsite network resources for the groups identified above." Since Modesto dialup is to be eliminated, how does that effect this policy? Filling replied that when the committee talked about access, they did not talk about dialup. Aronson stated that although Manoharan has talked to UEPC and SEC about this issue, there has been no resolution. Tordoff replied that Manoharan had stated at SEC that her budget was \$80,000 in the deficit and she had to cut somewhere. Because of low usage, this service was cut. There is still dialup service in Turlock and Stockton. Zarling commented that the line is usually busy, so he is unable to use this service. Aronson further asked if all of OIT is funded out of Academic Affairs and Curry replied yes. We do not split administrative and academic computing on this campus. Aronson suggested the need to readdress this issue. Curry replied that Manoharan has put a proposal before BPAC.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.