

<p><b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</b></p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES May 2, 2000</p> <p><b>PRESENT:</b> AbuKhalil, Aronson, Bettencourt, Bowers, Chu, Clark, Costa, Filling, Gackowski, Hor, Jaasma, Luo, Mayer, Nelson, Pandell, Peterson, Phillips, Riedmann, Russ, Thompson, Tuedio, Weikart, Zarling</p> <p><b>PROXIES:</b> Anderson (Schulz), Bowers (Curry), Filling (Campbell), Thompson (Christopher)</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Apodaca, Cartwright, Cruz, O'Donnell, Farrar, Finley, Fisk, Hernandez, Keymer, Littlewood, Miller-Antonio, Olivant, Thomas, Tordoff, Villanueva, Wolf</p> <p><b>GUESTS:</b> Demetrulias</p> <p><b>Recording Secretary:</b> Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>CSU Accountability Plan, INFORMATION ITEM</p> <p>10/AS/00/FAC--Amendment to Article VI. Section 2.3 of the Gf Constitution, APPROVED</p> <p>11/AS/00/FAC--Range Elevation Policy, APPROVED</p> <p>12/AS/00/FAC--Post Tenure Review, TABLED</p> <p>Department Chair Release Time, DISCUSSED</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, May 16, 2000 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Steve Filling, Clerk</p>
---	---

Speaker Elect Pandell called the meeting to order at 2:43. The agenda was approved by consensus. The minutes of April 11, 2000 were approved by consensus.

**REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

Pandell reported on the CSU Chairs meeting held in Long Beach last month. Issues discussed were: a) faculty recruiting-campuses feel they can't get their first or second choices. Some problems were: high

teaching load, low salary, and lack of reasonable housing. The Chancellor is considering subsidized housing for Channel Islands and after that, looking at the Irvine model (campus condos); b) CMS-PeopleSoft-this is a huge issue because the Chancellor's Office is taking back money off the top from campus budgets to pay for this; c) WASC changes are coming. WASC is trying to become more of an assisting agency rather than an auditor; d) 120 graduation unit requirement-Apparently the Finance Department always wanted the UC and CSU to have the same requirements. The UC has 120 unit requirement and the CSU 124. It seems the Finance Department will get their way and the CSU will require 120 units. The question is now on the language. Would it be a minimum or a standard?

Jaasma asked if hiring problems from the small campuses came up, or was the discussion centered on the metro campuses? Pandell replied that Chairs decided to get data from the last five years regarding faculty hiring and assess the factors. The focus continues to be on housing. But if this was true, then we should be getting our first choice every time. Zarling stated that someone needs to make that point. We do not have a housing problem and we continue to have trouble attracting people.

AbuKhalil stated his agreement with Zarling, but it is a generic social problem and every campus is different. This needs to be addressed on a statewide basis (teaching load, research funding, etc.) and also locally (location, housing costs, etc.).

Russ advised that consistently throughout the system, teaching load is the number one issue. Only on five CSU campuses is housing an issue.

Gackowski noted that during his last leave, he was at the University of Melbourne where faculty received \$5,000 per year for research. There are also very strong incentives for teaching foreign students.

Aronson suggested forming an ad hoc committee next year to look at the issues and collect the data.

Pandell advised that there is an attempt to compile data led by the Chair of SLO and using the resources of the Chancellor's Office. This may or may not work.

Russ stated that CFA has had consistent data on complaints from campuses about the inability to get their first pick candidates. This is a bargaining item as it affects salaries. This data could be shared, she stated.

D. Bowers advised that the Chancellor's Office has periodically collected this sort of data. Whether or not they have done so recently is open to question. However, the information they have collected probably does not have the detail we need. They were only looking at success in filling positions. Last year we filled 17 out of 22 searches, but we don't have the data to say if they were first, second or third choice. The education area is especially hard to hire. Aronson replied that it is difficult to get K-12 faculty to take a salary cut and no tenure to come here.

Thompson stated that if there is limited money and if it goes to a housing subsidy, that could also end up in differential pay. Russ stated that LA State starts their Assistant Professors at \$55,000 for that very reason.

Jaasma noted that unless we have money to carry on a search, that would influence the makeup of candidates.

Peterson stated that housing might not be important to every campus. AbuKhalil agreed stating we need to focus on our own interests here, not the metro campus problems. If money is available, we should have a

choice what to use it for.

Aronson stated we need additional discussion on this. We should form an ad hoc committee to investigate these issues.

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

Aronson reported that the UEPC will be meeting this week to review subcommittee reports. UEPC will also be looking at the draft annual report.

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

No report

**d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Fisk)**

No report

**e. Graduate Council (Bowers)**

Bowers reported that GC met on the 20th. They reviewed performance indicators from UEPC for the Accountability Plan and agreed on two indicators, academic program reviews and external accreditation reviews. GC also passed a Graduation Admissions Statement and approved the MBA and MSW five-year program reviews. GC passed three course proposals for the Masters in Criminal Justice.

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

SWAS meetings will be held this Wednesday-Friday.

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

No report

**INFORMATION ITEM**

**a. CSU Accountability Plan (Category 10)**

Bowers stated that the CSU Accountability Plan, Category 10, went before the UEPC, then she, Aronson and Demetrulias met and discussed the issues. It was then taken to Graduate Council where they made two changes and came up with two performance indicators: academic program reviews and external accreditation reviews. This has been sent to the Chancellor's Office.

**ACTION ITEMS**

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

Anderson explained that the changes made from the last Senate meeting are attached to the agenda. They are, second line delete "terminate" and add "discontinue." Then add "as" after "working subcommittees" on the same line. Then the last paragraph, eighth line add "may be appointed as needed." and delete "may be

composed of more or less than five members and the length of service may vary as needed."

There being no discussion, the question was called and vote on the motion passed. This will now go to a General Faculty vote.

#### **b. 11/AS/00/FAC--Range Elevation Policy**

Anderson explained the purpose of the Range Elevation Policy is to allow part-time lecturers an opportunity to increase their salary. This is actually a part of the MOU. The FAC molded this program around the MOU.

Aronson asked if FAC received input from part-time faculty and Anderson replied that FAC has not met as a committee since the last Senate meeting, but Schulz did discuss this with several part time faculty.

Jaasma stated that part-time lecturers should not object since it gives them a means to get a salary increase. This is similar to what full time faculty go through.

Pandell stated that this is parallel to the RPT process. This came up briefly at the SWAS Chairs meeting. One or two campuses were concerned because it would throw the budget out of kilter. It would cost more money. But, this is written pretty tight. It looks like the FAC put in other criteria rather than just teaching experience. Anderson agreed stating departments could apply their department elaborations. This is not an automatic raise.

There being no further discussion, the question was called and vote on the motion passed with one abstention.

This will go to the President for approval.

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

Anderson explained that this policy is mandated by the MOU. FAC searched for a current policy, but it has disappeared. So, we started pretty much from scratch, he stated, using the MOU. Highlights of the policy: reviews would take place every five years and faculty would create a five-year plan (teaching, research goals). If problems are found, a Personal Development Plan would be done on an annual basis.

Peterson stated that there seems to be serious problems here. The biggest one is that the purpose is unclear. If it is some kind of disciplinary action, we already have that. If the purpose is to help faculty develop goals, then it infringes on academic freedom. If faculty go through the RPT process, then to tell them what their goals are seems a bit much. This undermines the whole point of tenure. Also, there are problems for small departments. There is no one in Economics to review the single full professor. After checking with Saugstad, she advised that there are 13 of 26 departments that do not have enough full professors to review their colleagues. External review would have to take place.

Anderson stated that the MOU says this will happen. If we really look at the spirit of this, it is basically developmental. The negative tone is the PIP. Anderson further stated he didn't know how to handle that, but we need to be realistic. There are some people that could use a kick in the --!! Peterson stated that is the question to ask. Is that the real purpose?

Thompson questioned the process. Is there a problem on campus this document is intended to address? The

MOU talks about periodic review, but performance review is limited to specific items. The document could be construed as a performance review, and that is not the way the MOU reads. Although FAC had this last year, nothing was done because of the state-of-strike, and the creation of the proposed policy was contained within FAC. This is in contrast to the FMI document or Globalization, both of which have been presented for much broader and thorough faculty consultation. We need to have a broad discussion about this as we had for FMI and globalization. Also, how many Senators actually discussed this issue carefully with their departments, especially with those who are subject to PTR? Further, it is another major, complex initiative coming at the end of the academic year.

It was MS Thompson/Filling to table 12/AS/00/FAC. Motion to table passed.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **a. Department Chair Release Time**

Weikart questioned the status of this proposal and Pandell replied it is currently in limbo. The Provost or President could institute it at any time. It does not require the Senate's approval.

Tuedio stated that this is a proposal that has been discussed in other meetings. It was discussed at UEPC and at the ALS Chairs Council. At UEPC, there was strong dissent from some faculty based on funding being derailed from reducing student/faculty ratios. In the Chairs' meeting, there was near unanimous support, but there was concern that non-chair faculty were not giving this policy sufficient airing. So, it came here primarily to raise the profile and give it a fresh look. This is a place where it is important for Senators to discuss with departments, especially with their chair. Tuedio encouraged this to come back to the Senate for a vote of support or opposition.

Jaasma asked if this proposal was faculty or administrative driven and Tuedio replied it started when he was Speaker. A faculty leadership meeting was held with Provost Curry and Curry came away thinking this issue should be addressed.

Pandell stated there was not wide input into this proposal. The Provost developed it with the help of Dean Cullinan. This was then presented to the Chairs, not the General Faculty. There were some significant concerns about amount of assigned time.

AbuKhalil voiced support of this proposal. Further, he has faith in the chairs deciding this. He would hope chairs would come here to discuss this with Senators.

Thompson advised that FBAC is not in support of this proposal. Although he is not nor has he been a chair, this years' FBAC is made up of current and past chairs. When the Provost attended the FBAC meeting to discuss this proposal, they agreed to disagree. There was also no clear support from SEC on this.

Pandell agreed, stating when administrators want something, there is money for it, but if not, there is no money. FBAC is seeking to prioritize this. No one is opposed to this idea, but they are wondering what we have to give up to get it.

Luo voiced approval for the proposal stating a more aggressive approach would be to make chairs an administrator.

Clark stated that as a new chair getting only 3 units of release time, she is in favor of more release time.

Dean Cullinan brought it to her attention that this is a very unique opportunity when administrators support us. We should not turn this down.

Gackowski stated that the CIS Department supports this proposal.

Weikart noted that this is not an either/or situation. The chairs could have more release time, but could scale down if it is too expensive.

Thompson advised that he is neither for or against this proposal. But, Tordoff said this is linked to department autonomy. This needs to be made clear what this means. A department's idea of autonomy may be different from the administration's position.

Zarling stated that before we can make a reasonable determination about this, we need to know: the cost? where the money is coming from? is this new money? what do we give up to get his? could we channel this money elsewhere? is the \$215,000 the total cost?

Weikart stated that the \$215,000 is not the only cost involved. Quality in classroom teaching is also an issue.

Clark suggested the administration look at the money part of it. Tuedio stated that the money probably comes from enrollment growth. We could use this money for other things. This is a legitimate issue. Also, department chairs are being deluged with other things to add to their workload. Because we do have a history of department autonomy, we get a lot more work. This does alleviate pressure on chairs of large departments. If we are going to turn 5-year reviews into planning documents as well as histories, we need to compensate for it somewhere. If you don't give that workload reduction, then attention to that workload will be diminished. We have a quality of work issue that we need to address.

Filling noted that last year the issue of department chairs becoming administrators was a controversial issue. If this is approved, this will be a step in that direction. Maybe chairs should say no to other people than junior faculty.

Peterson stated that department chairs are overworked, but we have to know what we are giving up to get this. Further, most chairs do not want to give up teaching.

Pandell noted that there is nothing in the MOU that says faculty have to teach 24 WTUs each year. The department chair or department could teach bigger sections. This has been suggested in the past, but the question is whether you really want to have large sections. It is an academic issue. This is complicated. The money has to come from somewhere. Maybe a large department could give their chair some release time by working with their sections.

Clark suggested inviting the people who know where the money is coming from. It was suggested to invite Provost Curry to the next meeting. It was noted that although this is currently a discussion item, the Senate could form an opinion on this or take action in the form of a resolution.

Demetrulias noted that her understanding on this is that when you look at the bottom line, there was some discussion about phasing this in or reducing it. The money would come from new enrollment money and FBAC/BPAC would make the choices. So, this may or may not find it's way through the budget process. Bowers further expanded that besides phasing it in, we could utilize existing funds as well as new money. Zarling noted that this sort of balancing has already been done in FBAC and their judgment was negative.

Thompson further explained that this was on the Provost's list as second tier priority with a cost of \$56,000 for ALS only.

Luo asked if there had been consideration hiring chairs as 12-month positions? Money could then come from a different pot. Tuedio stated this has been mentioned, but this is not just about priorities between academic affairs. It is about distribution of money at a higher level. Would it come off the top of enrollment growth money and not go to areas like Advancement, Recruitment?

Thompson referred back to Pandell's point of teaching large sections. That relates to the autonomy issue. Can departments keep the money from this or does the dean take it back? Currently, we do not have autonomy over the budget. If there is money left in a department, we do not get to keep it.

Pandell stated that this is a workload issue.

Bowers advised that regarding 12-month chairs, the money does not come from a different pot. Twelve-month chairs would mean three more months at full salary. Also, the MOU reaffirmed that chairs are faculty members.

Costa stated that the thing positive about this is that it looks at the complexity of a department. The current system does not.

Pandell stated that we should put this into perspective. The CMS money is so big in comparison. This should be a concern of the faculty. We do not have excess money. Enrollment growth is supposed to fund Honors 2000 and lots of other things. The point is, that is why we have FBAC. It's more complex than meets the eye. We should have the Provost at the next Senate meeting to discuss this issue. We need to know where support comes from for this.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.