

<p><b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</b></p> <p>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES October 5, 1999</p> <p><b>PRESENT:</b> AbuKhalil, Apodaca, Aronson, Bettencourt, Bowers, Campbell, Cartwright, Chu, Clark, Costa, Cruz, Farrar, Filling, Finley, Fisk, Gackowski, Hor, Keymer, Littlewood, Mayer, Miller-Antonio, Nelson, Olivant, Pandell, Peterson, Russ, Schulz, Thomas, Tordoff, Tuedio, Villanueva, Weikart, Wolf</p> <p><b>PROXIES:</b> Demetrulias (Curry), Grant (Riedmann)</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Dinse, Hernandez, Hilpert, Moren, Phillips, Zarling</p> <p><b>GUESTS:</b> M. Hughes, Klein, Strong</p> <p><b>Recording Secretary:</b> Diana Saugstad</p>	<p>7/AS/99/SEC--Accountability Resolution and Document, FIRST READING</p> <p>Community Service Resolution and Document, DISCUSSED</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, October 26, 1999 2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Steve Filling, Clerk</p>
---	---

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 pm by Speaker Tordoff. Tordoff asked that 5. Discussion Item a) Statewide Academic Senate Accountability Resolution and Document be moved to a new 5) First Reading Item a) including CSUS resolution 7/AS/99/SEC and renumber as appropriate. The agenda was accepted as amended. The minutes of September 21, 1999 were amended on page 5, change headcount from 4600+ to 6400+ and then accepted by consensus.

## REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### a. Speaker/SEC (Tordoff)

1. Speaker Tordoff welcomed newly elected Speaker-Elect Al Pandell.
2. Speaker Tordoff met with the Statewide Senate Executive committee and campus chairs September 10 in Long Beach. Most of the meeting was taken up with campus reports, but FMI was discussed. Within the next month, we should have copies of the FMI processes from other campuses. Two other topics discussed were accountability and community service. Also, year-round operation was discussed. It appears that since the Legislature is not willing to fund fully, it will only come into effect with respect to teacher credential programs and on those campuses which are impacted. There is seed money available to investigate year-round. Another issue discussed was PeopleSoft implementation. Vice Chancellor Ernst tried to explain why investing our money will benefit us. There is not much happiness among campuses about this. More on this later.
3. President Hughes reported that the system is going to appoint an administrative committee to review one-third admission standards.

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

1. Aronson thanked Andy Young and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning for sponsoring the poster session.
2. UEPC met with Linda-Bunney Sarhad re globalization plan. She will be moving forward with faculty fora to get information out to the general faculty regarding globalization and what that would mean.
3. UEPC will be meeting with Paula Crawford re General Education Task Force recommendations.
4. The Remediation Plan is before UEPC.

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

1. FAC will be receiving information from Don Bowers re post-tenure review. FAC will look at how best to implement and integrate this.
2. FAC is collecting FAR information from other campuses.
3. FAC is revisiting the Naming of Campus Buildings Policy.

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

1. Due to illness of Provost Curry, the scheduled meeting between him and FBAC did not take place.
2. Vice President Stephens will meet with FBAC at their next meeting.

**e. Graduate Council (Bowers) no report****f. Statewide Academic Senate (Russ/Thompson) no report****g. Associated Students (Cartwright/Villanueva)**

1. Two new Senators have been appointed: Tracy Meyers and Amanda Carr. There is one open seat to be filled soon.
2. Cartwright thanked Andy Young for the poster session.

**h. Other reports**

1. President Hughes thanked the Provost and academic leaders for preparation of the Remediation Proposal that has been forwarded to the Chancellor's Office. Remediation will be on the Board of Trustees agenda in November.
2. President Hughes reported that she is waiting to hear about the proposal on year-round operation. We might receive \$250,000 for a pilot study.

3. President Hughes further reported that the Cornerstones proposal will be acted upon at the November Board of Trustees meeting. Systemwide indicators and campuswide indicators will probably be passed at this meeting.

## **FIRST READING ITEM**

### **a. 7/AS/99/SEC--Accountability Resolution and Document**

It was MS Schulz/Russ:

WHEREAS: The faculty at CSU Stanislaus are concerned with the issue of accountability within the CSU; and

WHEREAS: The Statewide Academic Senate has referred the draft Accountability document to the individual campuses for comment; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate at CSU Stanislaus endorses the attached draft, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the draft be forwarded to the President at CSU Stanislaus and the Statewide Academic Senate.

Speaker Tordoff explained that we have a tight timeline on the issue. The Board of Trustees will be acting on this at their November Board meeting. If we want to contribute to this document, the Statewide Academic Senate needs our input by November 1. The next Senate meeting is October 26, so clearly we need to act on this by then. The SWAS Community Service response is not due until February 1, so we have some time.

Tordoff then explained that on page 3, the first three items are things that were added over the summer. Campus accountability starts on page 4. As it notes, we are dealing with 12 institutional performance areas (actually a 13th). What is being sought at this point is not to add or delete any of these 12, but input on indicators of each of the 12 areas to consider whether there are additional indicators we might want.

Russ questioned if we couldn't discuss the entire document. There is a big piece missing: quality of teachers e.g. recruitment and retention of quality faculty. This relates to the Chancellor's commitment to closing the gap, etc. There is also no mention of diversification/quality replacement of faculty. On this campus alone, we will have significant retirements over the next several years.

Demetrulias noted that on page 3, under "System Accountability and Responsibility", under "Performance Areas, there is a provision "competitive faculty salaries." Does this speak to your issue? Russ replied that it was a nice statement, but what is the CSU really doing?

Tordoff explained that we have two levels of preparation. The three the Chancellor and Board of Trustees added in August without indicators on how they would deal with things. The other nine have been discussed longer. Faculty salaries are both a system issue as well as a campus issue.

AbuKhalil asked why this document is "set in stone." Tordoff replied that as far as the twelve areas are

concerned, there have been a lot of discussion and input over the past year. For all practical purposes, none of the twelve will be deleted. But, as far as indicators go, we can have input on these. AbuKhalil replied that it seems like it is a fait accompli. This document in principle is too intrusive and motivated by political climate. It could be harmful to us as faculty and students. Why should we accept this. Why can't we resolve to dump this. The resolution as written implies that we agree with the document. Tordoff stated that the resolution was put together quickly just to get in on the agenda as a first reading item. It can be changed. AbuKhalil questioned that there doesn't seem to be a rationalization for why new measures must be established. The document seems to have quantitative indicators but not qualitative indicators. Specifically, why are we measuring some things, but not others? Page 8, under Quality of Post-baccalaureate programs, bullet 4, employer evaluations--Why? What is that going to tell them? How are hostile work environments being factored in? Why should employer evaluations say anything about what we are doing on this campus. And, on page 8, No. 11 Contributions to Community and Society, the first bullet "students performing pro bono community service." This is a real problem. This needs to be discussed further. Just some concerns are: 1) the definition of community service is ambiguous, 2) many of our students already work two or three jobs, 3) we are not responsible for providing the state good citizens. I don't think we need to so submissively provide what they want.

Tordoff stated that the intent from twice hearing Executive Vice Chancellor Spence talk about this is to present the different ways of dealing with accountability. None are mandated. What we have here are suggestions for ways of demonstrating accountability. Also, one of the things that has been stressed is that most of these things are simply reporting data that we already have access to, and much that we are already reporting to the Chancellor's Office. How the particular campus reports would be done with flexibility as per page 8, 11), under Indicator "These reports could include...."

Christopher stated her agreement with AbuKhalil that what is objectionable is on page 5, item 1 [so-called assessment]. The English Department attended a workshop on assessment two years ago, and we think this assessment comes from business management perspective, and doesn't represent quality of education we are providing.

Cartwright stated that although it was noted that these are only suggestions, it seems that they would not be in there unless that is what they wanted. Keep in mind that suggestions often become reality. Also, on page 8, No. 11, regarding pro bono community service by students is a real concern to students. Tordoff replied that although we may not want this in, the Governor does.

Thompson stated that on both of these issues, accountability and community service, it is crucial to have student input. Further, he agrees with AbuKhalil regarding process. We are being asked for a response and we can return whatever response we want. This is an opportunity to tell the Board of Trustees what local response is to the accountability section. We can't just do it by having this discussion today. It seems item 1, 10, 11 and 12 we might focus on. Tordoff agreed that what is at play are these items.

Fisk commented that presumably the reason for indicators is to have something that is comparable. It is difficult to explain why "regularly eligible students who are fully prepared in mathematics and english composition on page 6 isn't explained. Further, what is the process after we act on this? Tordoff replied that whatever the indicators are decided are reported to the Chancellor's Office on a 3-year cycle, and what happens after that, who knows. The purpose is not to make comparisons between campuses, but that could be done. Fisk replied then our final product is critical.

Farrar questioned the language on page 6, item 6 'fully prepared student.' Tuedio stated he thought it pertained to entrance requirements. Tordoff stated the more serious question on that indicator is what influence do we have under that number.

Keymer stated that although he is in favor of community service, but it doesn't fit in the center of our institution's mission. Also, it can be politicalized. Whether we have a clear set of indicators or not, we are assessed. We should try to make this document acceptable.

Weikart advised that the History Department has problems with the assessment issue and the entire accountability document. We are already being assessed and these documents take no account of what we already do. Is this another layer on top of what we are already doing, or will it replace what we are already doing? Tordoff replied that part of what we want to do is make this as painless as possible.

Christopher asked if service learning is mandated at the UC and Tordoff stated there is a difference between service learning and community service. The Governor supports community service at the CSU, UC and community colleges.

Gackowski noted that on page 2, the last bullet "To the extent possible, the CSU relies upon existing data, data systems, and processes in the development of indicators and reports." So, this doesn't mean we have to create a new layer. Tordoff agreed stating that most of the data to answer these questions are already available. It is more of a question, "do we want to use those data?"

Tuedio replied that we need to look at the existing data to see if it is useful. The process should evolve over time. It should have a strong developmental focus.

AbuKhalil asked if we could say we are fully satisfied with existing procedures, rules, regulations and that they meet the standards and criteria in the draft. Tordoff stated that at the next Senate meeting, the resolution can be amended or replaced. If anyone is interested in pursuing this line, please come up with replacement language or resolution before the next meeting.

Gackowski noted that the introductory cover letter asks for recommendations and insight, not endorsement.

Bowers stated that the Graduate Council is concerned with item 10 and we will be discussing it in a couple of weeks. Can the GC have input into this? Tordoff replied yes. Input could be given directly to the Senate or if after the next meeting, directly to the statewide senate or President. Bowers replied that the concern GC has is that these indicators do not measure quality, and it is difficult to measure quality every three years on these indicators.

Tordoff stated that it is in vogue to assume that state services are overfunded and not efficient. We're not in a situation where we can quantify what we do, so accountability is difficult. Perhaps we as an educational institution have in part ignored this stuff. We haven't done a good job with the public that we turn out quality products/services.

Clark stated that this is not new to the Nursing Department. We go through accreditation But, a word of warning, this is extremely time-consuming and expensive.

Costa agreed. He noted that Prop 98 report card was similar to this. It was to improve quality education, but

it didn't so schools just live with it. If we don't do it ourselves, someone else will do it for us. We have to convince the public we are doing a quality job. Page 7, items 10 and 11, we should come up with better things in the bullets for indicators.

Pandell stated that he feels specific suggestions will not go far. We should respond to the document in principle.

Finley suggested that since we have only one more meeting to act on this, we need to decide the process. Do we respond like Thompson suggested, or do we go on principle?

Russ suggested the rules be waived and go to a second reading.

Aronson suggested the following resolution as a replacement or as an addition:

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus fully supports and has implemented accountability and responsibility indicators; and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus has already implemented an effective five year review process; and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus undergoes periodic accreditation review by WASC; and

WHEREAS: Many professional development programs undergo additional professional accountability review; and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus has established an assessment program to assist faculty, programs, and departments improve and implement effective and

WHEREAS: CSU Stanislaus has established an assessment program to assist faculty, programs, and departments improve and implement effective and meaningful assessment processes; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CSU Stanislaus already has indicators of accountability and responsibility that are available for review by the CSU and the public.

Thompson stated that although he agrees with the spirit of the resolution but thinks the accountability draft we're looking at is an expansion of item 9 in the Cornerstones document previously approved by the Board of Trustees. So, Thompson stated his agreement with the intent, but we can be assured that it won't make a difference. Specifics need to be dealt with in this plan.

Olivant suggested blending the two resolutions together. Christopher asked if this was possible. Tuedio asked if we are rejecting practice or redundancy? Aronson stated that this acknowledges we are already doing it. AbuKhalil stated that we can have a practical and a philosophical document. Tordoff stated that he assumes Aronson's resolution would pass with no problem, but the handwriting is on the wall through cornerstones. If we want input, we need to be specific. Or, we could do both.

Costa voiced concern about perception If we vote to turn this down, we are perceived as not wanting accountability. We're better off saying "here's how we can improve the process."

Cartwright stated that this is our only chance to have input.

AbuKhalil stated that we should not worry about public opinion. Tuedio advised that if we go that way, we will have to be prepared to accept the consequences especially related to budget. We need to keep in mind this is a public subsidized operation.

Pandell stated that even if we send good suggestions, it will be thrown away. This is something about principle. How can they do any more to us? Tordoff replied that things can indeed get worse.

Clark suggested it might not be a do or die thing. Maybe we should toss it back to the statewide senate. Also, ask them why we should do this since we are already doing program accreditation, WASC, etc.

Keymer suggested stressing our concerns and we be allowed leeway as much as possible in substituting campus specific measures of performance.

Tuedio referred to page 5, one-third down, "Each campus provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the university, program, and discipline-specific levels....." What counts as evidence? The move is toward systemwide competencies. We need to stress campus control.

Keymer stated we can emphasize how we hope this is applied to us and, we be given power to make sensible choices.

Bettencourt stated his concern on page 9, last paragraph "In addition to the above, a campus may choose to identify its own performance areas and indicators. These performance areas and indicators may be used in cases where the campus believes that the system-defined performance areas and/or indicators do not fully address their unique goals and priorities." We need to build in self determination on how we are to be measured.

Cruz suggested listing what we are already doing e.g. WASC review, program review, program accreditation and attach them to their items.

Filling advised that Senators need to understand that what the Chancellor is after is standardized, cross-campus comparable information (which is a basic tenet of accountability, from an accountant's point of view). Senators must understand that offering suggestions for performance indicators (which typically means, telling them which indicators make us look good) will only serve to legitimate our agreement to the Chancellor's Office badly shaped plan without shifting the emphasis of this program.

Thompson stressed the importance of number 10 in the Cornerstones document "campus autonomy" Further, there is a chance to make a difference. The SWAS is meeting this Friday (committee meetings) and at Asilomar November 3-5. The Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and some members of the Board of Trustees will also be there. So, we do have some direct access to the decision makers so we can promote our points of view before the deadline.

Keymer stated his real concern is after this is passed. People not involved in academics are trying to determine what things actually mean.

Pandell suggested that since the Board of Trustees are changing a bit, wouldn't it be a good message to have 23 senates reject this thing. We only got this document because the SWAS gave it to campuses for their input. We need broad principles.

Russ reminded Senators that the new Board members are appointed by Governor Davis. If the Governor wants it, the Board will support him. But, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor want this, not especially the Board. This is probably a continuing agenda from Munitz.

Bowers agrees with Pandell that we should be clear to the SWAS that we agree with accountability and have been living it. We don't think this is necessary as we already do these things. Question: If we go along with this document, can we stop doing the other things?

Cartwright suggested we need to be more specific or the Board of Trustees or Chancellor's Office will interpret. There is too much wiggleroom. We either need to be very specific or reject the whole thing.

Gackowski reminded Senators that the purpose of this is to achieve the kind of public responsiveness which will achieve strong public support. If the 23 senates reject this, we must not carry the "no accountability" message. We should say we fully support accountability, and we have in place: 1), 2), 3), etc.

Christopher stated her agreement with Pandell. We need a statement of principle that we reject this document, but how can we go about that? Through the Aronson resolution?

Tordoff advised that we are obviously divided on process. We can either modify the draft or reject it. Tordoff suggested Aronson type up her resolution and get to Saugstad. At the next Senate meeting we will deal with it. If any Senators have specific points, please indicate what and how and at the next Senate meeting we can decide if we throw out one or adopt another, or amend the document, or adopt a statement in principle. The response we have will go to the Statewide Senate and they will provide a unified response to the Board of Trustees. We could also send two different responses to the Statewide Senate.

Fisk asked if we could ask other campuses what they are doing with this document. Thompson will ask at Friday's meeting in Long Beach and Saugstad will follow up through email.

Cartwright stated that it would seem to be beneficial if each campus individually adopt their own proposal, but similar to ours and Tordoff replied that would be up to the SWAS.

Tordoff stressed the importance of not doing anything on this today. The SWAS, campus chairs, Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and B of T meet in Asilomar November 3-5, so we still have time even though the deadline is November 1. Russ advised that this item is on the Asilomar agenda so nothing will be done before then.

Gackowski suggested on page 1, item 6, last sentence, change 3 to 5 years so it would coincide with program reviews. It was noted it probably wouldn't make a difference since departments have different timelines.

It was noted that in the letter from Vice Chancellor Spence hardly any turnaround time for input. Russ replied that this is constantly a problem. Document are moved too fast and we don't have time for a real review. Pandell questioned if it was a problem or a strategy.



Tordoff asked Senators to forward any suggestions, resolutions, amendments, statements to Saugstad.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM**

### **a. Statewide Academic Senate Community Service Resolution and Document**

Tordoff explained that this is a similar document from the Statewide Academic Senate. This original came from the Governor. The SWAS wants campus input no later than February 1. But, Vice Chancellor Spence hopes to move this deadline up rather than putting it off. Page 2 and 3 of the SWAS resolution has listed 26 questions dealing with the concept of community service. Again, this is not service learning, but community service. It may or may not be related to major and credit bearing. The Governor wants this and will be pushing hard for it. It seems that rather than having the Senate deal with it, we refer it to an ad hoc committee.

Cartwright felt we did not need an ad hoc committee to just say no to this idea. It's a bad plan and a bad idea. Tordoff replied that if we reply that way, we won't get too far. The Governor wants this. The question becomes what form will it go through or if we try to get it not approved, will have to go to the Governor and say why it won't work. We just can't say we don't want it. That is why we need to answer the 26 questions. This could present our case that it is not feasible.

Finley asked if we had the option to not mandate it and Tordoff replied that in meetings in Long Beach, there could be some exemptions. But, the feedback from the Governor is that he does not see it that way.

Bowers stated she found it kind of ironic that emphasis is on servitude rather than learning. Maybe we should focus on helping people learn and worry about finding appropriate ways for them to apply what they've learned.

Cartwright felt this is only a sham to make higher education look better. We should try to make students want to help people, but this defeats the whole purpose.

Tordoff noted that studies show that motivation is lower post servitude.

Schulz agrees that we should form an ad hoc committee to provide reasoned arguments against this rather than just saying no.

Grant stated there is public support for community service while in high school, but sense people would be on our side on this issue. College students especially have other commitments, plus it would take from their academic studies.

Thompson stated that we don't have enough information to determine how this would be an academic requirement that involves learning. It is framed as a type of payback to the State of California. Learning might not be involved and maybe it would not be an academic requirement. Plus, what constitutes a community?

Keymer stated 1) it intrudes on students with already complicated lives, 2) it is the wrong way to teach community service, 3) do not like the process that would exclude different types of students, 4) what

department would the burden of process fall on? If this is to pass, hopefully it would be a pass requirement only.

Clark stated that in theory, it's a good idea, but in practice, it's very difficult to deal with.

Bowers advised that there is another side to this issue and that is the community side. There will be a flood of students having to meet the requirement.

Cartwright noted we are confusing community service with service learning. Service learning is tied to the academic mission. Community service is the Governor's idea and it is not tied to the educational mission. It's a public relations issue for him.

Aronson noted that in the past we have had some type of committee on service learning Bettencourt replied that Lee Renner was a member. Aronson suggested getting information from him. Keymer stated that would be a good place to start, but they were looking at different issues.

Apodaca stated that in Chicano Studies, this is emphasized. In the 70's there were more opportunities for this. Further, her experience is that agencies have problems with this. Training is involved in most cases. Students usually come away disappointed. The Governor seems focused on 20 years ago when this was possible. It is different now. Most students have to work, sometimes two jobs. Some are married with children. There is no time for this.

It was MSP Fisk/Christopher to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Community Service that will report back to the Senate.

Tordoff stated the composition of the committee would be: one member from SEC, one member from Student Affairs, one student and two faculty.

Please let Saugstad know if you are interested in serving on this committee.

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 pm.