January 28, 2003 Academic Senate

Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm and welcomed Senators to their first meeting in the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center.

The Agenda was approved as distributed. The December 3, 2002 Academic Senate minutes were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Susan MacDonald passed out a summary of activities of the Second Hand Smoke Committee. Three models have been proposed, she reported. a) no change, c) a smoke-free campus and b) something in between. She will be holding a series of meetings to discuss these proposals. Speaker Thompson asked Senators to take this information back to their departments for discussion and asked MacDonald to return to the Senate at a later date.

2. Thompson advised that we have the information from the IDEA Student Assessment of Teaching Ad Hoc Committee, but the SEC has not had time to review it yet. This will likely be put on the next Senate agenda.

3. Filling advised that the California Postsecondary Commission will announce the latest CSU faculty salary gap. It will show an average of 12% below and senior faculty are at 19+% below. Thompson noted that CPEC funding will be cut a lot. The result: We may finally get rid of the CPEC gap by getting rid of CPEC.

4. Peterson announced that on Tuesday February 11 Dr. Don Maas, Professor from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo will be guest speaker at Instructional Institute Day. He will speak on the topic "Actively Engaging Students in the Learning Process."

5. Thompson asked that Senators complete the form on possible change in Senate meeting times and give to Bowman or Filling.

6. Thompson thanked the Provost for the refreshments and welcomed guests AD Klein and VPBFA Stephens.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

No questions.

CONSENT ITEM
a. 1/AS/03/SEC--Commendation for John Stuart Rogers

Whereas, the Mary Stuart Rogers Foundation has stalwartly supported and benefited education and has directly and generously supported California State University, Stanislaus, and,

Whereas, John Stuart Rogers is the President of the Mary Stuart Rogers Foundation, and,

Whereas, John Rogers has promoted a vision to develop a Faculty Development Center at CSU, Stanislaus in order to serve a great need in this region, and,

Whereas, the Faculty and Administration of CSU, Stanislaus have long planned and long hoped for a space dedicated to an improvement of education grounded in the enhancement of faculty skills; therefore, be it,

Resolved, that the Academic Senate California State University, Stanislaus join the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in thanking John Stuart Rogers and the Mary Stuart Rogers Foundation for their kind, far-sighted, and generous support in providing the JOHN STUART ROGERS FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CENTER, and, be it further

Resolved, that the Faculty of CSU, Stanislaus commit to extensive and intensive use of this superb facility to develop the vision shared by the Faculty, by John Rogers, and by the Foundation.

Oppenheim suggested adding another Resolved to send this to the Board of Trustees and Modesto Bee. Thompson stated, the reason we didn't put that in the Resolution is that we thought we would hang it in the building. We planned on distributing it.

There being no objection, the resolution passed unanimously. March 4 is the dedication or opening of the building.

ACTION ITEM

a. 17/AS/02/FAC--Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, Article VI, Section 2.3

Thompson noted that a request for the charge of the committee was sent out via email to Senators, but the charge is not included in the resolution. It is an action item and can be amended.
Oppenheim advised that at the last meeting, he suggested a series of amendments he thought might be helpful. He thought FAC would have time to meet and discuss these amendments, but he was told they have not met. He suggested if there is no immediacy to this resolution, the Senate wait until FAC has an opportunity to review these suggestions. Avilla stated he also has some concerns and would like FAC to review his suggestions.

It was MSP Oppenheim/Garcia to table this item to the next meeting of the Academic Senate so FAC will have time to review the suggestions from Oppenheim, Avilla, and from any other Senator that might have suggestions.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 2/AS/03/SEC--Consultation on Campus Accountability Report

It was MS Aronson/Sarraille:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University Stanislaus urge President Hughes to ensure that the Campus Accountability Reports (CAR) submitted annually to the Chancellor’s Office be shared directly with the Academic Senate and its standing committees and be made available electronically to the General Faculty before the Report is submitted, and, be it further,

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate strongly urge the President to provide the Report in time to allow engagement in a consultative dialogue with the Senate and appropriate standing committees concerning the contents of the Report before submission.

Rationale: To ensure accuracy and productive dialogue, accountability documentation for the campus must be made available to all stakeholders of the campus community. Most importantly, the CAR explains to Headquarters the performance of this campus related to quality of baccalaureate degree programs and specifically related to learning outcomes for general education, assessment of those outcomes, and use of the assessment “to assure continuing quality of programs” (coded memorandum AA-2002-50). The Faculty certainly has a vested interest, and should have a voice, in how this campus selects and presents information to account for quality of the baccalaureate degree; that is, accountability is a consultative rather than an administrative process. The accountability data for all of the remaining areas are also important to share and discuss with the Faculty: access, progress to degree, persistence and graduation, serving special
state needs, relations with K-12, remediation, facilities utilization, and fundraising.

Aronson advised that this is getting at the notion that accountability is a consultative process, not just an administrative process, so there is a need for this to go to committees as well as administrators. Thompson reminded the body this is a first reading item and we are just looking for comments, advice and no changes to the document. But, it is important we discuss the accountability report before it is sent to the Chancellor's Office.

Oppenheim stated he is in support of the resolution. He questioned if it was a question of time this has to be done now? Maybe this is something SWAS could take forward, he suggested. Given that timeline (originally October 15), it is difficult to have input. Further, what kind of control do we really have? Filling stated it would be good for people to look at this. His own department apparently has a $500,000 endowed professorship that faculty knew nothing about. Thompson advised that when the SWAS Chair was questioned about the accountability reporting process, Kegley said a letter was sent to campuses and a transmittal should come from the Provost and Senate Chair, but this document cannot be found. The intent is to get some reading of this report before it leaves campus. Aronson questioned what the timeline for preparation of the information is and the Provost replied much of the data is generated throughout the academic year and most likely it is being collected now. He is in support of the resolution if we have a workable timeframe. Thompson noted that the due date is keyed to the time the Board of Trustees want to review the campus reports.

This will reappear as an action item at the next meeting.

**INFORMATION ITEM**

**a. Revised Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers**

Lindsay advised the revised Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers were developed by the Graduate Council to implement the policy passed last year and signed by the President. Thompson advised that this is coming as information because it is just implementation procedures for what has already been approved by the Senate and President.

Aronson questioned why if the fee waiver is not processed and the student receives a bill, the student must pay and eat the late
fees. Lindsay stated that this has something to do with university accounting and he's not sure if we can do anything about it. Stephens stated that this would be an incentive to get the paperwork in on time by the department. The department has the option of paying the late fee for the student, she advised. Jaasma questioned how multi-disciplinary students would be handled, and Lindsay replied he feels the form is still adequate for that purpose, but that the Vice-Provost can be consulted for clarification. Floyd stated in looking at work descriptions, it seems inconsistent with qualifications. Lindsay replied that in order to get the fee waiver, a student has to be a student in good standing, and must meet the criteria and the qualifications. Tynan noted that the fourth bullet has to do with graduate assistants and teaching associates, not graduate scholars, and that the intent is that graduate scholar is different from the graduate assistant and teaching associate. Thompson stated that these are implementation guidelines that will continue to be refined. He added that the fee waivers are a good recruiting tool for graduate programs.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. CSUS Accountability Report

Thompson advised that this is open for discussion, comments, and observations on the report.

Thompson asked about assessment information coming forward to AS for the next meeting and the General Education assessment. Jaasma advised that the GE subcommittee has been doing questionnaires for goal meeting among GE students. Thompson stated his other question, taking a look at this report, he was struck when reading page 24, he didn't understand all the things on advancement. Specifically, does anyone know what constitutes special revenues, he asked? Stephens suggested it might be grants and contracts (research and scholarship). Stephens stated that we have a contract with the County Mental Health Department of San Joaquin County that provides a wellness center in Stockton. Thompson asked if all grants and contracts are counted like this as advancement funds, noting that voluntary support drops off in the report but special revenues really zoomed. Oppenheim, looking at alumni drop, plus Advancement has to raise 10% of their budget, etc. These are things FBAC addressed a few years ago. If that is the campus goal, we are going in the wrong direction, he stated. He also noted that we still need a better indication of the costs of fundraising. Provost Dauwalder advised that there has been some change in the way of reporting. Stephens stated that at some
point in time, the definition of alumni changed which may explain
the drop in this area. Morgan-Foster advised that on page 25
paragraph 1, there is a breakdown, so a huge part of this is
pledge commitments. Thompson asked Stephens to bring back a
breakdown of special revenues. Stone suggested that under special
revenues, we need to be clearer what is a grant and what is the
faculty's role in procuring those grants. Also, referring to the
bullet on page 25 about heightened public image, etc, that does
not produce better graduates. Stephens agreed, but noted although
there is no direct link, she believes we get a good response from
the community and some do donate. Beyond the instructional
mission, there is a role to be played in the community, she
stated. Several voiced that one of the purposes of a university is
to bring interesting speakers here and demonstrate that the campus
is an active one. Avilla advised that not all students can go to
these events because of the expense.

Thompson stated that what is coming out is, if this discussion had
taken place ex ante, the Accountability report might look somewhat
different. We need to see the way we present ourselves to the
Chancellor's Office. Sarraille noted that very little scholarly
talks are happening on campus. It really speaks to systemic
problems, and maybe that is why people react to the high-level
show events so negatively. Nagel noted how invisible faculty
labor is in this document. That is a real measure of our
accountability, he stated, and it seems it would be an important
thing to talk about. The Provost advised that the types of
numbers reported are mandated by the Chancellor's office, but
campuses do have an opportunity to report additional numbers. The
basic numbers reported are the ones all campus report on. Stone
stated that the narrative on quality of the baccalaureate and the
explanation of numbers is what we want. Oppenheim questioned that
in the past, department chairs would submit a detailed report to
their dean, but there was never a response. Does the Chancellor's
Office respond to this report? Dauwalder replied no, it is
presented to the Board of Trustees in summary form. Thompson
stated this would be a good question to ask Executive Vice
Chancellor Spence. Further, Spence has indicated that we have an
audience in the Legislature that wants us to demonstrate we have
accountability.

Thompson noted that, had this discussion taken place before the
CAR left campus, the Report might have looked somewhat different.
We will have a full discussion of the next CAR early next Fall.

b. University Goals and Priorities for 03/04
Thompson advised that the campus has a memo from the Provost and a website where this document was posted for perusal.

Provost Dauwalder explained that the Strategic Planning Committee is attempting to invite widespread input into the goals and priorities for 03/04. Further, that we recognize 02/03 goals were done mainly in August, and that the Speaker, Speaker elect and FBAC Chair were the only faculty who had input into the document. So this year this committee is charged with recommending goals for the campus for 03/04. The committee would like their set of recommended goals completed by early April. In order to do so, they are inviting input across the campus and are requesting input by February 1, although we can extend the deadline to February 24. This information will be incorporated into creating a draft. He would like some response from the Academic Senate. Thompson stated that we have an opportunity for input, unlike last year's process.

Myers noted that he attended the ALS retreat last Friday and hopefully some of that discussion will be incorporated into this document. Klein replied he would get that document to the Provost. Aronson noted it is important because strategic planning will set budget priorities for 03/04. It adds a certain importance to what we are doing. She further stated she would like to see a review process for support units outside their academic fields, much like the academic program review process. A process for faculty voice to see how support units help the University and the results of the analysis needs to come back to faculty. Thompson advised it is being articulated in assessment and accountability info we will be seeing at the next Senate meeting. Stephens advised there is a schedule for support unit review. Floyd asked that more attention be given to what is going on in Stockton (program development, long term goals etc.) Garcia suggested that faculty development should be expanded; Thompson added that relates to how we use the Faculty Development Center and how the Center is funded.

This item will be kept on the agenda for the next meeting as discussion. Please transmit suggestions to the Strategic Goals and Priorities Committee.

c. 2003/04 Budget

Provost Dauwalder gave a brief report consisting of what they are trying to do in Academic Affairs for 03/04 and the effects on students and faculty:
In 02/03, the campus was confronted with a reduction of $1.2 million out of a budget of $70 million, about 3%. It was decided to cover it with one-time funds since it would be a one-time reduction. But, there were rumors the campus might be hit again with mid-year reductions. Planning had the vice presidents thinking how they would cover these reductions. In December, student fees were increased 10%. It was decided to use $247,000 unallocated enrollment growth funds, which left $400,000 to fund. Each of the vice presidents had enough to cover.

A one-page report was distributed which describes what was not done for 02/03. Emphasized at the top of the list are systemwide reductions. The first 9 bullets represent target reductions. Half way down the report identifies additional student fee increase. Then monies that come into the system for new enrollment, overenrolled. Each campus got overenrolled money.

Another form was distributed showing the background on FTES and enrollment targets given to SEC, but they were not able to act on it due to time constraints. The campus is going through strategic planning and budgeting processes that involve a large number of committees and the relationships among those committees. A couple of forums will be held March 4-5. Klein will look at the old strategic plan (Pathways to the Future) and will hold an open forum to discuss the progress on that and see if the goals are applicable. Workgroups have been assembled to write white papers for this. This should be posted on the web. It is a way to focus on prior goals.

The Provost talked about what various strategic planning committees are doing. In Academic Affairs, their efforts to create a budget explains coordinated efforts. They are matching faculty workload against courses to get to the bottom line of needs for part time faculty. He wants to be able to cost out an academic plan for next year so he needs to know what he should be doing in Academic Affairs. There has been a lot of discussion on our academic mission, he stated. Weikart inquired how the budget impacts tenure-track searches. The Provost replied there is no full answer yet. Thompson advised that we need to watch the Chancellor's Office, because they promised to do a certain number of searches, but did not promise to hire tenure track faculty. Peterson asked if we are still planning on going through the CMS process? Are we still planning going forward on the new Assessment Plan? Are we also planning on another student fee increase to possibly 35%? Dauwalder stated we are still looking at CMS. Stephens reported we are not less committed, but recognize it is a big project. We have put together scenarios so we can reduce
dollars committed in the short term. It will be presented to a steering committee and will be part of an overall discussion. Hopefully this model will be a model on how we make our decisions, she stated. We do expect change in that project. Provost Dauwalder stated we need to continue doing assessment and our next step is to find out what our next step is. He voiced concerns to WASC accreditation related to assessment too. A 35% student fee increase really is more than that is true, he stated. But, California has not raised student fees in a while. It is still a relatively low cost. Filling pointed out we talk about increasing enrollment growth without getting money. Speaking as an accountant, in the long run, we will go out of business if we continue to expand without funding. Oppenheim stated it is happening all over, not just in California. He further questioned if the permanent reduction is accurate. Could it be more than that? Thompson stated he heard the CSU is supporting the Governor's budget because they believe it is best case scenario. The Provost stated that what would effect us is a change in the budget figures. We are not planning for a worst case scenario. Thompson questioned the Provost if we take on more enrollment with less money and most of the money is in personnel, would that mean we would cut instructional personnel? Provost Dauwalder replied that we need more instructional personnel to take care of enrollment growth. Thompson stated that it sounds magical that we can take more students and reductions and not cut instructional faculty. Dauwalder noted that there is an upward adjustment for SFR in the Governor's budget. Avilla asked if we are looking at 35% increase in student fees this year, could the legislature ask for an increase every year? Sarraille stated SWAS is looking at that. The SWAS and the Chancellor's Office seem to agree on gradual, reasonable, predictable increases in fees.

Adjourned at 4:30 pm