Academic Senate
Minutes: March 8, 2005

Proxies: Karlstrom for Mantz; Regalado for Oppenheim; Sutherland for Everett
Absent: Petratos, Sankey, Tan.
Guests: Boffman, Demetrulias, Klein, Sayers, Stephens, Wendt.

1. Called to Order at 2.39pm.

2. Agenda approved.

3. Minutes of 2/22/05. Amendments: text for 6/AS inadvertently printed as 5/AS. Change has been made, and a new set of minutes distributed over ASNET. New Amendments: On page 5 paragraph 3, delete second sentence starting “Except.” Page 6, paragraph 7, delete final clause of last sentence, beginning, “…rather than.” Approved as amended.

4. Announcements

Speaker Filling reminded the body that this meeting will be shortened to one hour to accommodate member attendance at the Presidential Candidate Reception. He also reminded members of the other two candidate visits on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. Please send comments to Filling, Hilpert, Morgan, Robbins, or Thompson.

Speaker Filling also announced that today, March 8, is International Women’s Day.

Filling reported an agreement with President Hughes on Excellence Initiatives; the committee will be meeting later this week.

Thompson asked for information on the workload agreement process. Filling reported that information has been disseminated to faculty governance members. CFA & Administration are basically in agreement; they’ve sent out a draft looking for things to catch, will go out to general faculty soon. Thompson asked what the process is after this. AVPFA Wendt replied that the provost has latest version, and is planning to discuss with the President. Then, it was his understanding that CFA intends to give it over to SEC for any further action by Academic Senate or the General Faculty.

5. Questions about reports
None.

6. Action Items
a. 4/AS/05/UEPC—Editorial Changes for Student Academic Policies in Faculty Handbook

Floyd drew attention to two minor editorial changes: Credit by exam: 120 units (suggested by Feldman), “European History” requirement changed to “World History” (suggested by Department of History).

There was no discussion.

Vote to adopt 4/AS/05/UEPC passed unanimously by voice.

b. 5/AS/05/UPEC—Faculty Computer Replacement Policy

Floyd drew attention to three things. First, the language of the First Resolved Clause is changed to read:

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urges the University administration to prioritize and allocate annually, as stated in the Academic Technology Plan (7/AS/03/UEPC), an amount sufficient for the purchase of new computers for faculty, and be it further

The rest of the Resolution reads the same. Second, a telephone survey of departments (25% reporting) reveals that 24 Computers are 1-2 years old, 15 3 years old, 26 4 years old or more; further, that 17 replacements have been requested but not fulfilled. Third, Floyd reported that the Speaker and UEPC Chair met with President Hughes to open up communications and get a sense of her stance on this issue. Reviewing her notes from that meeting, Floyd reported that the President thought the upgrade process was already happening, and wanted to consult with Provost Dauwalder about which parts of the plan were already implemented or in process. The President’s tone suggested that if the process was already happening, she wouldn’t be against prioritizing replacements. Also, the President felt strongly that her successor would see this issue as a priority, and this Resolution probably wouldn’t tie their hands. Lastly, while we have differences in naming the source of funds, she was not against prioritizing the replacement, and suggested the First clause should have: AS urges the academic administration to prioritize and allocate money.

Zarling observed that we already have a resolution on the books, signed by the President, in the form of the Academic Technology Plan, that mandates a three-year cycle of replacement, and asked what further effect this resolution would have, and second, why this newest version was less comprehensive than that already in the ATP? Why should faculty computer replacement be singled out for more consideration? Dauwalder reported that the ATP has a specific outline for actions to be taken, and provision for 3-4 year replacements was one. However, maintaining tech support was the highest priority. The ATP calls for the Academic Technology Subcommittee to review and prioritize items each year for budget process, and we should go through that group this year. He reported that he tried to pull from our records better data regarding what we have. OIT records
show from AY2001-04 the following data: 03-04, out of 369 work assignments only 19 computers were over three years old (19%); in 02-03, 237 under three years old, 22 were not; in 01-02, 214 were under three years old, 16 were over. He hasn’t had a chance to confirm these numbers with AVPOIT Manoharan, and acknowledged that it is now two years later, and so may have produced a much larger problem.

Dauwalder suggested a modification to the resolution to strike the third clause, noting that the first resolved has what we want to do. What the third clause does is to require that a provision is mandated through the budget process. A stronger statement is just to say it; if what we are trying to achieve is a three year replacement cycle, clauses one and two do it, three is a follow-through process that may make it more confusing.

Jaasma reported also having problems with the third clause, noting it mandates budgeting which, if passed down to the colleges, would restrict their ability to fund other initiatives, such as science, musical equipment. Feldman also spoke against the third clause, noting that in some years we may get gifts, and we can use that money somewhere else. Schoenly wondered if the third clause is just a fallback in case OIT doesn’t get it done, and would be in favor of a backup.

VPBF Stephens relayed a message from the President that she supports the importance of every one maintaining currency in equipment, and appreciates that this was brought to administration attention. From her (Hughes’s) perspective, AS shouldn’t have to send a resolution to get her attention. In the future, a better communication device is to raise the issue with the provost where you will get a hearing, a formal resolution is not required for it to move forward. Floyd asked if this message was given today. Stephens replied yes and added that she (Hughes) appreciated the consultations with Floyd and Filling.

It was MS Thompson/Dauwalder to amend the resolution to delete the third resolved clause.

Thompson asked if someone could relate UEPC’s reason for its inclusion.

Floyd reported that it was a fallback, basically. Non-utilized funds would come back to colleges and depts.

Sayers reported that as AT Sub chair, he was wondering about the process, if the President says it is not necessary. In two years, despite yearly recommendations, nothing has been done on this, and the Subcommittee was pleased some action was finally going to take place. Is contact with the provost the right way to go? Stephens replied yes. Sayers then observed that the AT Subcommittee reports to UEPC, and direct reporting to the Provost was not in their charge. Stephens claimed a more informal consultation could resolve the issue more quickly.

Sayers then questioned the reliability of the Provost’s reported numbers, noting that nineteen computers over three years old would be accurate for COE alone. He reported that there hasn’t been a single replacement in his dept in over three years. Department has
a policy to approach replacement year to year and by need, but the reality is that policy is fine, but the procedure doesn’t work. Dauwalder replied that the ATP assigns a number of tasks to different individuals and groups. We need to go back to the ATP and identify our priorities for actions and cognizant individuals. Some things are budget related; but some not. We can separate out.

Thompson raised a point of order, asking the body to remain on the motion.

Johnson supported the motion to amend, observing that she liked flexibility in a budget. If you mandate something, something else may end up being important in another year, and won’t be able to be funded.

Vote to amend the resolution, deleting the third resolved clause passed by voice vote.

The body returned to the main motion.

Zarling reported being disturbed by the resolution with so many needs for money here. Cherry picking one above the others, he was not convinced that this is the most pressing issue. Stephens has reported that the President is reportedly willing to work on an informal basis on this issue, and suggested we try to resolve it informally, and if we can’t to return to it later.

It was MS Zarling/Brown to table the motion indefinitely.

Vote to table the motion failed by voice vote, verified by a counting of hands (16 for).

The body returned to the main motion.

Thompson reported that in the Department of English, fully 2/3 of department computers go back to at least 2001, some to 1998. Speaking for the resolution, he noted it has come from the AT Subcommittee, a faculty committee has given it priority, and it’s been through UEPC. He observed that sometimes information on the ground looks different than from the Provost’s level, and trusted the faculty governance process.

Floyd asserted that it was not UEPC’s intent to say that this is more important than other resources, and that there are other aspects of the ATP that need attention. The AT Subcommittee felt that prioritizing was what they were doing. This one rose to the top, but by no means should it take precedence over other needs. She concluded by agreeing with Johnson, and that it was not our intent to say that if there were no pressing need, one couldn’t go to FBAC and UBAC and make adjustments. AT Subcommittee came to us, and we consulted with FBAC.

Regalado questioned the numbers, noting the variance between them, and asked whether we had some idea as to how to get a sense of the depth of the problem. Dauwalder replied that we have 269 tenure track faculty, and we do need a plan to replace up to 100 or so computers for faculty quickly. That’s the bottom line. College budgets can cover a lot of
the replacement; Academic Affairs can find a fund to do it, but the bottom line is that we need to make it available and work toward it. Filling raised a point of information, noting that the ATP passed in 2002, but we have no information on where we are with it. Dauwalder acknowledged that was true, but also noted that the past two years have seen a severe budget crunch, with some department budgets cut by 25%, and said it was time to return to the plan and carry through with it.

Sutherland observed that much of the discussion had been conceptual, and asked if there was a big old pile of denied requests somewhere that would indicate a need. Floyd repeated that the 25% of departments UEPC contacted reported a total of 17 over three years old. Dauwalder replied that those requests were surely in varying stages of the process, and that some were verbal requests and some written. Part of the problem with getting good information is that there is no single process. One way would be to do a survey. Inventory records don’t work well because sometimes a computer is replaced but the old one goes to some other office or even a storage closet, and is still on the department record.

Thompson said there was another way to see it, and that was, looking at his own department rotation, he could ask for 20 replacements. If he sent in that request, would he stand a good chance? Klein retorted that the department would get an allocation that he could spend to his heart’s desire. He also reported that he has been advised that ALS were looking to spend $80-100K. The hands of many ALS faculty rubbed in anticipation.

Schoenly asked if that number reflected provision of computers for new hires. Klein responded that a faculty committee makes the recommendation. Sayers reported that in COE, a new faculty member gets a new computer, but that $2K has been allocated for replacements for all faculty in all three departments; there doesn’t seem to be sufficient funding. Klein reported that in ALS, we have a base budget, then sometimes a little extra. All the rest of the college allocation is blown on equipment.

Vote to adopt 5/AS/05/UEPC (amended) passed by voice vote, with 5 abstentions.

7. First Reading Item
   
a. 7/AS/05/UEPC—Academic Affairs Committee for Student Petitions

It was MS Floyd/Lawson

Resolved: That the Academic Affairs Committee for Student Petitions be appointed by the Committee on Committees and adhere to the stipulations outlined in the attached Membership and Charge.

Rationale: The California State University, Stanislaus has already established a standing committee for the review of student petitions for exceptions to University requirements. This standing committee acts in an advisory capacity to the Provost/Vice President for
Academic Affairs. The membership required revision as the appropriateness of voting and non-voting status needed clarification. Also, a Counseling Faculty member has been deemed necessary on the committee due to the psychological issues that come up frequently in student petition deliberations.

Floyd introduced the resolution by noting that it was referred from SEC, and that it had been 15 years since the Committee charge and membership had been reviewed. There were several incidents prompting this review. The resolution includes a new membership structure and a new charge. The changes include: appointments to the committee will be made by COC; a counseling member was added; the Student Advocate and the Director of First-Year Services are both now non-voting. In the charge: the committee now advises the Provost, and submits a yearly report. The resolution has been through SEC and UEPC.

Dauwalder asked for the reasoning behind moving to COC appointment instead of appointment by the UEPC chair after consultation with COC, and also asked if there been consultation with college curriculum & resources committees. Floyd said not to her knowledge. Filling reported that COB had not, Davis reported that ASL had not.

Rogers pointed out that student representatives to university committees are named by the ASI President, per the ASI Constitution, and asked that the language be changed to reflect this. Johnson suggested that the appointment section be amended simply to say that COC will appoint faculty members.

UEPC will handle revisions and return the item for action.

8. Discussion Item

   a. Enabling What We Value (deferred, again).

9. Adjourned at 3.30 pm for the Presidential Candidate Forum.