Academic Senate Meeting
April 26, 2005


Proxies: Manrique (Oppenheim)

Absent: Nelson, Petratos, Senior, Tan, Tavernier

Guests: Asher, Boffman, D. Brown, S. Burns, Demetrulias, M. Hughes, Gallegos, Sarraille, Wendt

Filling called the meeting to order at 2:43. The agenda was amended adding 15/AS/05/SEC sense of senate resolution on the Mascot. Agenda approved as amended.

Minutes of April 12, 2005 were approved as submitted.

Announcements

Davis was congratulated for continuing as Clerk. Filling reported the Ad Hoc Excellence Committee met with the President last Friday and was informed the prospective donor and the committee had a different philosophy on how the money should be used. It seems it will be a longer term project rather than short term.

Nagel was congratulated on being elected to the new position of Lecturer representative on the Academic Senate.

Bowman was welcomed back.

Thompson welcomed back Barbara Manrique who recently retired. She is filling in for the Emeritus/Retired representative Oppenheim.

President Hughes reported on the following system-wide directions: MOU being prepared by the Chancellor’s Office and approved by the Board of Trustees and forwarded to us. Tobacco and alcohol sponsorship is an issue on many campuses. We have no such items here and so won’t directly affect us. Many campuses earn lots of money as result of that. It is a critical issue. Another issue increasingly important is the focus on graduation rate; BOT member Achterberg is effective and powerful at making education more concrete in terms of outcomes, and she will likely be the new BOT Chair. UC/CSU challenges still continue. Math/science training initiative: UC requested an endowment so CSU can do the work. We believe it shouldn’t happen that way. The need for math/science teachers is a great need. Other challenges is granting of selective doctorates. It appears we will be able to have support from our legislators. There is seed money available to improve advancement and university relations on campus. As far as the budget goes, we lobbied for the Compact and still are hopeful it will be honored by our legislators. We won’t know until the May Revise. Then we’ll have another lobbying period to convince them to abide by it. There are two additional funding sources she was trying to tap. Yosemite Hall received money ($620K) from the Chancellor’s Office, a big investment for us. The Excellence award that Filling mentioned was where a private donor was interested in the excellence award. With all the shifts occurring, it is not feasible at this time.
She is still meeting with the donor. She will continue to cultivate this until the end of June to see if we can still get resources. In terms of capital projects, the outlook is not as optimistic as we wanted. We have Science I retrofitting in the current cycle. It will be necessary to cultivate the Long Beach group and here to keep this in the cycle and try to get it moved up. Naming opportunities or a major donation will get it moved up. The Legislators passed an agreement to provide an opportunity for a bond, but no activity has occurred yet. She projects probably next spring there will be bond activity. Legislative day in Sacramento was productive for us. We featured the Nursing Department, with faculty, student, and alumni participation. We will get support from our Legislators for doctorate program. The Provost and she went to Washington DC and lobbied there. They represented our campus and the CSU. If we are to get support of the CSU as entity and the Board as entity, we must enter into systemwide multi-campus projects. Other opportunities include food safety management, family business, expanded nursing prelicensure, and a program in the Azores.

Provost Dauwalder added that we got support from our Legislators, specifically from Cardoza, who said he would take the lead for the Nursing program; Radinovich on a family business proposal. And we are able to generate support for those proposals from three additional Legislators: Pombo, Costa and Nunez. They need for us to pursue our part in systemwide initiatives. He proposed among the Provosts that we discuss the process, and generate more widespread cooperation. He will feature this issue at the June retreat.

Sarraille question if the President or Provost has requested more than the Compact. The President stated that they did in the Nursing area. Each campus was asked to choose an area. The other areas outside of the Compact were: support of doctorate, and affinity program (for Alumni Association).

Boffman asked why the “Goals and Objectives” section of the Vision material was not in the minutes. Filling will check it out and get back to her.

Action Items

a. **9/AS/05/SEC—Definition of Consultation**

   It was MS Thompson/Doraz to withdraw the resolution.

   Thompson stated his understanding from discussions in SEC was that concerns were raised that could be addressed with some minor changes, but that there was also a desire to wait and see how consultation looked or worked with the incoming President and that the best tack was to withdraw the resolution. We could bring back next year if needed.

   There being no discussion a vote was taken and motion was passed by voice vote with 1 abstention.

b. **11/AS/05/GC—Proposal for a Child development Graduate Certificate**

   There being no discussion, a vote was taken and resolution was unanimously passed by voice vote.

c. **12/AS/05/SEC—Resolution on Proposed Retirement Plan Modification (CALPERS)**
Peterson suggested several changes as follows: 2nd Resolved, insert “unilateral” after “to oppose any.” 4th Resolved, delete “with stabilized employer contributions.” Rationale, second sentence to read, “Proposals to alter that system should be made only as part of collective bargaining, cautiously, and only after consideration of all ramifications to both state finances and to the quality of the state’s workforce.”

Sarraille shared that “stabilized” was not intended to mean constant or fixed. It refers to the fact the state contribution plans have varied wildly in the past decade and in fact for many years there were no contributions made. We might perfect it in another way. Peterson stated there may be a misunderstanding. Sarraille stated it is up to the body, cutting it wouldn’t be harmful, but if the resolution would amplify that we are fixing the plan, the idea is to bank money and make contributions. Peterson shared that in her department they are opposed to the Governor changing our retirement plan without negotiation. But, they do not like to get into this degree. They don’t like the long rationale. Filling reminded Senators that the rationale is not being approved; it is just to add context.

Filling asked for a second to the Peterson motion or to accept her changes as friendly. Senators accepted the amendments as friendly.

The clerk reads the resolution as amended.

There being no further discussion, vote was taken by voice and passed with two abstentions.

**d. 13/AS/05/UEPC—Amendment to Academic Calendar Preparation Policy**

There being no discussion, vote was taken by voice and passed unanimously.

**First Reading Items**

**a. 14/AS/05/LAC/RSCAPC—Amendment to RSCA Grant Policy**

It was MS Petrosky/Thompson

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus accept the attached amendments to 14/AS/88/SEC concerning Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Grants as recommended by the Leaves and Awards Committee and the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Policy Committee. The revised Policy and Procedures will be effective immediately upon signature by the President.

RATIONALE: The original RSCA Policy and Procedures incorporated criteria for granting of awards. During the past several years the RSCAP Committee, in concert with the Leaves and Awards Committee, has been reviewing the criteria in place. Faculty comments that the original criteria were not clear have hopefully been addressed.

Further, pursuant to state statutes we need to remove references to affirmative action

Discussion:

Petrosky said this was the result of two years of negotiations; the changes effectively reorient grant awards to avoid “affirmative action,” while changing the process to address the two forms of grants, addressing means as well as ends in the process.
Rodgers advised that it states recommendations for awards will be sent to the President or designee by a reviewing committee comprised of the Leaves and Awards Committee, augmented by a graduate student appointed by the Graduate Council. She explained that the ASI should appoint the graduate student, not GC. Bowman stated that she does send the request to the ASI President asking that he/she work with the GC. Rodgers asked that the language be changed to “Appointed by the ASI President and recommended by GC.”

Nagel advised that faculty in his department raised the criteria issue. The Committee’s judgment of methodology of research and 4 (e), “likelihood that funding this research, scholarship or creative activity will lead to publication in a refereed journal in the investigator’s discipline and/or external funding,” is beyond the expertise of committee members to be able to judge the methodology used especially in Humanities and Social Sciences. There’s lots of people that don’t understand methodology of those disciplines. As to the likelihood of publication, it’s a strange criteria and it’s out of the hands of the researcher to predict this. It may not be appropriate to use as a criterion.

Myers advised that many of his colleagues in the Politics Department have complained over the years when they apply for travel or equipment and are turned down because LAC won’t fund it. It seems to them that only when you use students, such as for data entry, are those grants funded. So, they no longer apply for a grant. He suggests those problems be taken up by the committee.

Regalado inquired about the over use of ‘appropriateness’ on b, c, d. He’s from the old school, where the onus is on the integrity of the professor and the department to determine “appropriate.” The committee shouldn’t be making that case. He suggested eliminating all use of the word ‘appropriateness.’ Further, under (g) he doesn’t believe collaboration among faculty is necessary, and should not be mandatory. It could be there is no one in the faculty member’s department with the necessary expertise to collaborate. Burns explains it is not mandatory, but it would strengthen the proposal. On a national level, collaboration is very much the way you get your foot in door for external funding. This could be seed money for applying for federal funding. Regalado suggested it be made clear it is not mandatory. Burns agreed it not be mandatory, but suggested it be “recommended,” with reasons for doing so listed.

Feldman suggested that many things start out individually but then collaboration comes later. If this is seed money, it should be made available for those just starting out. Nagel stated it is rare in Philosophy to collaborate. He voiced concern that specifying the committee to use these as criteria was inappropriate. It asks the committee to generalize about the appropriateness of methodology, appropriateness of research. Are any of us in a position to make that judgment?

Schoenly commented that if so, we shouldn’t have research funding. You have to have general criteria. LAC needs guidance. He suggested expanding the review committee to include more disciplines. That could help with concerns voiced. Thompson suggested it has to have a methodology. Although he hasn’t been on LAC, he thought these wouldn’t be applied on the criteria. It’s just a handy check list. The proposal has to fulfill the criteria. Peterson advised that she has been on the LAC. It is frustrating to have so many requests and not enough money. It took a long time to go through the proposals. She stated that the grants that did not meet all the criteria were usually put aside. If they meet all the criteria, then they should be funded. It was explained to her that other money could be used for travel, such as from departments, but it was important to get students involved.

Petrosky suggested using the term “inherent appropriateness” rather than “grant appropriateness.” Justification is important, and you need to ‘sell’ it to the committee.
Myers stated it is true in trying to evaluate research projects in different disciplines that it is hard to find appropriate techniques. But we have to have some type of criteria to evaluate research projects. Keeping that in mind and it is a first reading, looking at the list under 4.1., it seems a-d are more important than e-g, and the latter should be offered as secondary.

Jaasma commented that under 2. her department is faced with a switchover to Peoplesoft, and her secretary has been involved in the changeover. We should look for ways to build money for secretarial support, and wondered if this was the place to do that. Feldman stated that these grants are in the developing stage. We need to keep this distinction in mind. This is not for external funding. Regalado voiced concern that decisions are being made on value judgments. Value judgments are not merit. Decisions should be made at the department level.

Johnson suggested deleting the term “appropriateness.” You would still get criteria for evaluations. Also, she could support the resolution if the attached policy didn’t include (e) and (g); (e) because she’s not sure research always leads to publication, certain types of disciplines this is not germane, and (g) in some disciplines collaboration is not appropriate. Peterson stated she likes the old (e) better, and maybe it could suffice. Burns explains that for “d) appropriateness and clarity of both the timeline and the budget, including the rationale for each budget item,” the reason ‘appropriateness’ is there is that sometimes people build superfluous things into their budget and the evaluation process in a competitive grant process looks closely at what the project is about and what the goals are. The original thinking of the word “appropriateness” refers to what kind of expenditures are build into it.

Doraz stated that historically the RSCA Grant helped junior faculty get started, they were for formative development, and we should encourage that. Further, he sees no need for collaboration. Thompson clarified that we will be voting for or against the resolution, not modifying policy. Given that, he stated before he can vote, he needs an explanation of the purpose of the RSCA Grant and if (e) and (g) stay, that we have an explanation for how these relate to the basic purpose of the grants.

Sutherland voiced concern that this affects the more traditional disciplines, and leaves out the Arts. He explained that he needs to develop certain skills to put into a test so he can apply it to his students so they learn. This grant does not allow this. Schoenly suggested using department elaborations in the evaluation process. Sarraillé agreed that it may be a good idea to base the acceptability of proposals on how well a person’s RSCA proposal is consonant with their department elaborations. Mantz voiced surprise that this award was available. If this is designed to be more inclusive, maybe the answer is more inclusive RSCA elaborations. Doraz urged caution if using department elaborations. Maybe use it as a tool for generic criterion. Feldman suggested using it as a stepping stone for external funding. Rules should be written to consider all things legitimate. Wendt suggested using something like “appropriate to one’s discipline.”

Nagel stated that because there are so many concerns all over the board, it might be better to refer back to committee.

Sutherland stated that one way to get more information from the proposer is to have LAC call the person in and they can address their concerns directly to him/her. Peterson replied she doubts that would help. The problem is we have far more proposals than we have money. It would just make the process longer. LAC understood the proposals. But we had to pick. And we spent the money until we had no more. People had to go through lots of work for very little money.

Rodgers suggested it seemed a matter of good grantsmanship; if you’re proposing new techniques or new expressions, you need to bring this to mind so reviewers are aware so they can
access the value. We will justify it in context of our disciplines. Most external grants are reviewed by peers within the discipline. There should be extra emphasis to make it understandable to the reviewers outside the discipline. Young added that there is a craft to writing grants. You learn how to pose your project based on where you’re applying. Those that aren’t getting grants should step back to see how to write their proposal to better state what they’re doing. Myers suggested these are different issues: one side is how a grant is written and how clear it is to reviewer but that question is different from the criteria for assessment. If you establish criteria a certain way, it doesn’t matter how it is well written; it won’t go through. Young stated how clear you are in addressing and explaining your proposal is important.

Filling thanked Senators for their feedback and he will ask the RSCAPC and LAC to discuss again. Hopefully something will come back for the next meeting.

b. 15/AS/05/SEC—Resolution in Support of the Mascot

It was MS Petrosky/Davis

Whereas: The Associated Students Inc., the official governance body of the students of California State University, Stanislaus, have commissioned a study of various mascots, solicited input from across the campus, and expressed their wishes; therefore be it;

Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus acknowledge the authority of ASI to select a mascot for the university, and be it further

Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus congratulate ASI on the successful conclusion of their efforts to review a mascot, and that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus communicate their appreciation for the efforts of ASI senators.

Filling stated it is a gender neutral greco-roman style Warrior. O’Brien asked for a large photo of the Warrior for the next meeting. Rodgers will provide.

Regalado inquired as to the cost and Rodgers stated that Gallo Winery donated their time. Morgan-Foster added that Gallo did the consultation for free; the only real cost is the costume. O’Brien stated Vice President Ruud did a short presentation to SEC, and indicated that Gallo team put in over a week of time on it. Rodgers added that ASI would like to unveil the new mascot at Warrior Day.

Filling clarified that we are talking about a Mascot for athletics and on clothing. This is not a formal seal that goes on stationary. Vote here is whether mascots are within the purview of students, and whether we support them on this.

Adjournment at 4:07 p.m.