Academic Senate Meeting  
May 10, 2005

Speaker Filling called the meeting to order at 2:40 pm.

Agenda is approved as submitted.

The minutes of April 26, 2005 were amended as follows: Last page b. 6th paragraph, 3rd line “O’Brien stated Vice President Ruud did a short presentation to SEC, and indicated the Gallo team put in over a week of time on it for free.” The minutes were approved as amended.

Announcements

1. Filling reminded faculty that BeerBQue tickets are still on sale. He encourages all to attend the May 21 event at Teague Park. It’s a nice way to end the semester, it is inexpensively priced, and we will be celebrating the life of Hobart Hamilton.

2. Morgan-Foster reported that the campus just received a $100,000 endowment for the Faculty in Residence Program from a private source, with some hope of renewability. We will be getting five annual installments of $25,000 to help offset the cost of the program. She thanked faculty for their support of this program, which helped attract the donor.

3. O’Brien announced that the SWAS has been working on looking at faculty compensation in recruiting new faculty and retaining current faculty. Cherny is spearheading this. The SWAS passed a resolution supporting his report. Since his report is too large to email, a powerpoint presentation is available for review.

Questions about reports

No.

Action Items

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

A slightly revised policy was distributed which incorporates comments from the last Academic Senate meeting. 4.1 reflects the majority of Senate concerns expressed at the last meeting. 3.3 was added hoping to contextualize a notion of appropriate writing style that makes proposals understandable to all.

Zarling suggested a friendly amendment to 3.3. It is not parallel to 1 and 2. He suggested under ‘applicants shall’ to read ‘write a proposal in a style that makes the project comprehensible to a broad university audience.’ This was accepted as friendly.

Oppenheim suggested an editorial correction under 6. The reviewing committee with the administrative assistance of the Executive Secretary, …. Either a comma should be placed after ‘committee’ or remove the comma after ‘Secretary.’ Davis suggested using two commas.

It was MS Feldman/Thompson-to add “4.1.g) the likelihood this research, scholarship, and/or creative activity will lead to more extensive research, scholarship or creative activity.”

Zarling suggested the level of research we are expecting is premature. We can’t predict that early if it will lead to publication. Feldman explained that we want to give our faculty an additional option to strengthen their proposal. The idea behind these grants is this is research in its infancy.

Johnson asked for clarification. Are you adding g) because of e) and f)? If grants are in the early stage, do we even want e), f) and g)? If we put these in, they will become criteria. Plus, student involvement should be meaningful, not just inputting data.

Schoenly stated that involving students is a big motivation. This may not be implemented by all that applies, but many proposals will rely on student help and in turn it will be meaningful for students. When these grants were originally conceived, they mentioned student involvement in research.
Burns read an excerpt from a memo from the Chancellor’s Office dated 1988: “It is the intent of the Legislature that CSU allocate $2.5 million for research, creative, and scholarly activities in a manner which affirms the commitment of the faculty to the instructional mission of the system. Further, it is the intent of the Legislature that student learning, not publication, remain the central measure of the success of CSU faculty and academic programs. These funds are intended to ensure that faculty (1) remain current in their disciplines, 2) pursue new ways to enrich student learning and 3) contribute to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally and economically.” So, the original intent says they do want student involvement.

Petrosky stated that if f) is to remain consistent with the other sub-criteria, it should have ‘involvement of students in research and the creative process.’ Johnson stated that in response to Burns’s statement, nowhere does anything indicate student involvement should be a part of the research process, only student learning. That is different. f) disadvantages those of us in an area where student research doesn’t play a part, such as in business. There is no academic benefit for students to participate. Sarraille urged us keep in mind that research means different things in different disciplines. Many times, this is a way to pay a student for performing a clerical task so the proposal could be written stating they need research funding so faculty can increase their knowledge so it will benefit students. He also suggested e), f) and g) could say ‘it might be strengthened by including a statement of one or more of those below.’

Nagel pointed out by amending the policy, we are out of order.

It was MS Doraz/Oppenheim to waive the rules. Filling explained that the original resolution asks that you vote it up or down. You can’t amend the policy. But the ruling is if we waive the rules in order to amend the policy, and it is approved by the body by a 2/3 vote, it is in order.

There being no discussion on the motion, a vote was taken and passed. The policy is available for amendment.

Oppenheim suggested e) and f) be removed, and to add language under b. It is good for students to participate in some projects, but the 1988 statement does not require student participation. De Katzew agreed that student involvement or participation was not in the statement, and should be optional, not required. Tynan stated that b) covers this by the faculty member addressing how it enhances student learning.

Demetrulias noted that the language from the legislative body that led to the executive order and MOU language was negotiated between SWAS, CFA, Associate Students and administration. She read another section that is a stronger statement regarding student involvement “5) Campus criteria for evaluating proposals must explicitly address the educational impact of the proposal on students, and the nature of student involvement.”

Doraz stated there are different forms of research: Questionnaires, experimental design, immersion involvements. When the research is done, faculty will learn something which will be incorporated into their curriculum package. Indirectly there will be student learning taking place.

Thompson stated if we want to talk about whether to get rid of e) or f), we first have to decide about g). Johnson advised that adding g) is only necessary if we have e) and f).

There being no further discussion, vote was taken on the amendment and failed with a vote of 10 yes and 18 no.

It was MS Johnson/Floyd to strike e) and f) and that we modify 1. c) by adding at the end of it ‘including the nature of student involvement, if any.’

Thompson suggested we divide the motion in two parts. Peterson objected. Based on the reading by Demetrulias and Burns, we have to have student involvement. She feared if we delete e) and f), but fail to add language to c), we will be in non-compliance. Thompson stated student involvement is not a requirement. He disagreed with the rationale for not dividing. The question should be addressed separately.
Demetrulias explained the 1988 EO and the language in the MOU is identical, and came from involvement with those people previously stated. In that section 5) it states it must explicitly address the educational impact on students and the nature of student involvement. If we take it out, we don’t address that element.

Sarraille suggest we investigate the statement. Is it a side letter to the agreement? Demetrulias was unsure. Filling stated that phrase does not occur in the current MOU in that context. Zarling voiced support for separation. Item b asks that proposals include educational enhancement, so we are talking about the education of our students, we already have an adequate reference.

Thompson stated if we base our action on past practice, in that sense, people have received RSCA grants since 1988 and didn’t have student involvement. Peterson disagreed stating that was one of the criteria when she was on the LAC. Having students enter data would be better than no student involvement. She suggested sending this document back to RSCAPC since it doesn’t seem like they read the executive order or the MOU. Filling pointed out that a lot of our faculty worked hard on this document, and we should respect our colleagues for their work, even if we don’t agree. Zarling voiced it seems the typical student involvement is entering data. Maybe that is true, and if so, he prefers the original language about educational enhancement. Other types of student involvement may do very little for the student.

Miller-Antonio, Chair of the RSCAPC, assured Senators the committee did review the executive order and MOU when preparing the document.

There being no further discussion, vote on motion to divide passed.

It was MS Johnson/Floyd to strike ‘the proposal will be strengthened by including a statement of:’ and to strike ‘e) and f).’

Schoenly spoke in opposition to striking e). Published research is the gold standard in many disciplines, and a high standard is the kind of thing we think about that is associated with getting one of these awards. Johnson stated that ideally most of us would like our research disseminated in whatever is appropriate for their discipline, but when we apply for funding, it is difficult to assess the likelihood of publication. It is really easy to write a proposal saying it will be published, but it is not a meaningful assessment of whether it actually will be.

There being no further discussion on the motion, vote to strike ‘the proposal will be strengthened by including a statement of:’ and strike e) and f) passed by voice vote.

It was MS Johnson/Brown, to modify 1. c) by adding at the end of the sentence ‘including the nature of student involvement, if any.’

Oppenheim asked if the language offered satisfied the measure of the 1988 EO. Demetrulias replied it implied there would be student involvement. Sarraille explained that even if there is no direct student involvement, when faculty do research, usually they will come up with something they can share with students. It is not necessary to have students receive a portion of grant funding. And it is not necessary to have it as a criteria for it to benefit students.

Young stated you have to acknowledge in the proposal the type of student enhancement or learning. Sarraille disagreed. This cannot be measured. Oppenheim agreed that we shouldn’t have to do that, but what was read from Demetrulias says clearly we have to do it. That is what the regulation says. He is not speaking for it because he likes it, but because an explicit account of student involvement seems to be the intent, we have to do it. Young stated it goes back to the skill of grant writing in meeting the criteria.

Doraz suggested we meet the intent by letting the LAC decide. Zarling stated that nothing in the MOU requires student involvement. Filling agreed that the current MOU does not address this, but conceded it could be a side letter.

Demetrulias asked Johnson if ‘if any’ could be taken off, and still meet the spirit of the statement. Johnson stated she had thought about it, but would it then imply there has to have student involvement. Demetrulias stated the interpretation generally could be it is requested, but is not the deciding criteria.

Nagel voiced that the issue of student involvement is disturbing. If LAC looks at a grant, does not educational involvement have to be meaningful and appropriate? Also if you include that language in 1c,
we do meet the language of the MOU. Young stated that the idea that merely entering data is not beneficial is not true. As a student, she did this, and it proved to be very beneficial to her later as a grant writer and as a teacher.

Myers suggested there are two issues bundled together that need unbundling. One is the value of student involvement in different types of research projects. The second, but the one driving the debate, is the exact status of the executive order or MOU suggesting some type of requirement of student involvement. We have to have clarity on this. Is it demanded or simply nice to have?

Thompson, speaking against the amendment, stated if we worried about not being in compliance about student involvement, we have been out of compliance for a while. We have enough language here to satisfy the requirements. Also, if we take off ‘if any’ it will make it into criteria and will change what we do with RSCA money. Overall, he is opposed to the amendment.

Peterson stated that related to past practice, it depended on how much money was available. You don’t have to meet every criteria, but the more you meet, the better chance you have of receiving a grant. Further, she agreed with Young that inputting data is valuable. She also did this as a student and found it to be beneficial. It is important we have some language on student involvement.

Demetrulias clarified that she was reading from an August 2004 memo from the Chancellor’s Office and attached was language from previous executive orders, the MOU and other fiscal budget language. Even though the original executive order is from 1988, these are the documents that provide the framework for campuses to use. You may quibble with the terms of interpretation, but you can’t challenge the veracity of the documents.

There being no further discussion, Schoenly called the question. Vote was taken on the motion and passed.

Body returned to the resolution as amended. No further discussion. Vote on the resolution as amended passed, with abstentions.

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

Filling explained that our students have gone through a multi-year process in developing a new mascot. This resolution says we accept their right to engage in that activity and we honor their efforts.

Estrella introduced Bridgett Gyorfi, VP Finance and team leader. Estrella explains that having a mascot will boost our campus pride. It will be used in athletics. An unveiling will be on Warrior Day. He suggested a friendly amendment to the last Resolved, last word change ‘Senators’ to ‘Senate.’ This was accepted.

Sarraille questioned why students care about what the Academic Senate says. Estrella replied they just want the Senate to acknowledge that students can choose. It ties into campus pride. It will be on clothing, athletic gear, etc.

Petrosky asks if the mascot is gender neutral, because it definitely looks male. Gyorfi replied it is gender neutral; they surveyed ASI members and athletes, and all saw it that way. The muscles signify strength.

No further discussion. Vote passed with abstentions.

**THINGS YOU MIGHT NEED TO KNOW:**

Filling asked Senators for issues we should pay attention to next year:

- Feldman: we have a policy that prohibits giving tests the last five academic workdays of any term, but it is not being honored. Uncertain if this means a quiz. Take home exams can be given, just can’t be due the last five academic workdays. Sarraille suggested rescinding the rule because it infringes on academic freedom.
- Myers: faculty compensation, and how it relates to the cost of housing in this area. This especially affects new faculty. Look into purchasing land for faculty housing. With Yosemite Hall land available, this should be looked into. Stephens advised we are looking into the housing issue. Auxiliary has 5 acres by Public Safety as part of our Master Plan. And Giventer has put that in
writing as a request so it is now on the radar screen. The Chancellor is aware of it too. O’Brien advised that the SWAS passed a resolution to create a task force to develop housing programs for faculty. It gets really tricky, so we have to be careful. Other campuses do have housing programs for faculty.

- Nagel: The way the Senate does business. We no longer have oral committee reports, but on-line and very few questions about the reports at the meeting. Limits the discussion about what goes on in committees. Also, we should have a parliamentarian named to the Senate.

- Mantz: Space allocation. How do we meet enrollment growth with the classrooms we have?

- Thompson: The Board of Trustees feels the implementation of Cornerstones is through graduation facilitation. They will charge Presidents and the Chancellor to implement their 22 recommendations. SEC and AS needs to review it early next year and take control. The recommendations are just that, but may be interpreted as marching orders. If faculty don’t get involved early, we will have problems.

- Feldman: Nowhere in the Vision/Values/Goals recently approved by the AS is the mention of academic integrity as a goal. Due to our negative publicity of late, you think it would be addressed.

- Doraz: Suggested adding administrative integrity. Further, some key issues continue to come up and one is a clear understanding of what YRO is about. We take money from Fall, Winter, and Spring and call it Summer. If we want it, we need to fund it. Also, we need full funding for our graduate programs. Also, we need to look at the funding relationship of the Stockton program. It was set up to be self-supporting eventually, but the Center does not have adequate technology for CODEC and ITV. Also institution outlook for assessment tied to curriculum. Don’t see it, and want to see the criteria used to develop our targets. Also, the failed search in the College of ALS. He recommends the nomination of Cynthia Morgan to return to campus as interim dean. She has demonstrated lots of growth and development and is the best candidate.

- Schoenly: Revisit restoring funding for the Library. It will especially help support our graduate program.

- Tynan: To have quality faculty members coming here, we have to look at what we can offer. Also retention of faculty.

- Davis: Distributed one page information about WASC, and introduced faculty members of the team: Gary Novak, Steve Stryker, and Davis. We have a longer process, but it may offer more latitude and certainly offers greater involvement. Our Institutional Proposal (a kind of prospectus) is due May 2006, so next fall the faculty members of the team will be visiting faculty groups in hopes of getting feedback. If any questions or comments please direct them to him.

Filling thanked Senators for their attention this year. As Speaker, he had an incredible amount of respect for our colleagues.

Adjourned at 4:08 p.m.