1. Speaker Filling called the meeting to order at 2:38 pm.

2. The agenda was amended as follows: 6) RPT Report is deferred. 7  a) Vision Statement is deferred. Add new item 6) Report from President. The agenda was approved as amended.

3. The minutes of October 5, 2004 were amended as follows:
   1) Page 2, 4th full ¶, 1st sentence: Bids for Science II construction came in $6-7 million over what had been projected. Should be: Bids for Science II construction came in way over what had been projected; the lowest new bid was $7.5M over the original.

   2) Page 2, at “b. President Hughes”: President Hughes advised that one topic that needs to be discussed is UC Merced. They will be opening Fall 05. An issue was raised with UC Merced about the extreme over-bidding they had to deal with. They shared some strategies with her. Partnerships are also being discussed with them. This might be an opportunity for the campus to do things differently to remain competitive. It should be a healthy competition. Should be: President Hughes advised that UC Merced and CSU Stanislaus Cabinets meet regularly to discuss partnerships and issues of mutual concern. One such issue is the extreme over-bidding that both campuses encounter on construction projects. With respect to partnerships, this is an opportunity to do things differently and engage in healthy competition.

   3) Page 7, 1st ¶, 1st sentence: The question was called by Thompson/Petrosky. Should be: The question was called by Floyd/Petrosky.

   4) Page 7, 1st ¶ after 1st “Comments,” 3rd sentence: Our OIT has the smallest budget in the system. Should be: As a percentage of the budget, our OIT has one of the lowest rates of funding in the system.

   5) Page 7, 2nd ¶ after 2nd “Comments,” 1st sentence: The question was called by Thompson/Petrosky. Should be: The question was called by Floyd/Petrosky.

The Minutes of October 5, 2004 were approved as amended.

4. Announcements

1. Filling announced that President Hughes’s mother passed away. The Academic Senate offer her our sympathies. The President has asked that those wishing to remember Ms. Alverta Hughes may contribute to the Judge and Alverta Hughes
2. The Presidential Search Advisory Committee met for the first time this morning. The Chancellor and four Board of Trustee members were in attendance. The position announcement has already gone out. Press releases for the finalist will go out in early March. Filling corrected misinformation regarding the campus visits by candidates. The campus visits are a very important part of collecting information. The committee will strive to get information from the campus community. He urged faculty take advantage of the forums.

3. A special thank you to the Faculty Development Center, and Ximena Garcia for providing the Senate with pies today. Filling also remarked on the Faculty and Staff social following Sunday’s performance of *The Mikado*, which drew 110 theatergoers.

4. Jake Myers announced that Wednesday, October 27 in P166, the CFA is hosting a meeting to discuss budgeting and bargaining issues. CFA President John Travis and CFA Treasurer Patricia Hill will make a presentation and take questions and input. Sarraille added that Assemblywoman Barbara Matthews will also be in attendance to receive a campaign donation from CFA. They urged Senators to attend, as a democratic union requires both contributions and input.

5. *The Mikado* is playing, and closes, this weekend at Main Stage Theatre.

5. **Questions on Reports**: there were no questions.

6. **Report from President Hughes**

President Hughes updated Senators on CSU system matters pertaining to CSU Stanislaus. This is simply a report; the Board has not yet taken action. The Board of Trustees will meet October 29 in special session to address the proposed support budget for 05/06 that is tied to the compact. The important elements are: FTE growth of 8,103, proportionately distributed; the compensation package of 3.5% (to a total of 4.75% with benefits); proposed fee increases of 8% for undergraduate and graduate students pursing a teaching credential, and 10% for all other graduate students. The latest estimates of state budgetary debt place it at $6-10B.

She stated that the highest priority for CSU Stanislaus is our enrollment management target. This target is more firm than has been in the past, as it was the targets that drove the augmentation of funding we received last summer. The campus will probably be asked whether we are on target by the Chancellor and the Board. There will be discussions on alternatives for campuses that don’t believe they will make their target. One alternative is they can absorb the FTE and the money will follow
later. She said that she has added money to the proposed budget for enrollment management to meet this bread and butter issue, and is also working with the Provost to further augment it.

The President’s final response to the budget has been sent out. $1.4M came from restoration of enrollment and other budget units were assessed $1.89M carry forward. That is why we were able to contribute additional money to OIT and the Library. $1.8M has been distributed to units; they were instructed to adhere to the priorities received by UBAC.

The President’s Excellence Incentive proposal came at a time when there was no opportunity to spend time with faculty to develop it. Funds that were proposed $150,000 base funding and $50,000 for one-time funding. She decided to ask the vice presidents if they would make a recommendation on how to redistribute this money among themselves. The proposals she has received for redistribution are miniscule. She has not made decision yet on this money. She received a number calls from interested colleagues to possibly send forth proposals. But she stated we should all take a break from this because she is concerned that we have the time and possibility for further consultation. She is working on ways to promote consultation and on finding ways to fund the proposal.

7. Vision Statement (Boffman): deferred

8. Open Forum

a. Divisional Excellence Initiatives: deferred to allow the Senate to digest the impact of the President’s report.

b. Alternative Course Evaluation Instrument Process

Filing explained there are two issues. One is in the 1993 Academic Senate resolution (9/AS/93/FAC), which states “Departments are encouraged to develop and test alternative teaching assessment instruments, using the IDEA long or short form or other theoretically grounded standards for establishing reliability and validity. If specified in department RPT elaborations, and if explicitly approved by the URPTC, results from such instruments may be substituted for or supplement the IDEA short form placed in the employee’s Personnel Action File.”

The other is the 1998 resolution (5/AS/98/FAC), which states “That the AS adopt the SATE for administration with the IDEA instrument during the 1998/99 academic year…that SATE be one part of a multifaceted approach elaborated by the department….that during the 1998/99 academic year an ad hoc committee of the AS coordinate with the Office of Institutional Research to complete a reliability and validity study for the SATE….that the IDEA instrument be retained for the 1998/99 academic year….that by October 1999 the GF will vote on which instrument(s) to retain.”
Both resolutions were approved by the Academic Senate and the President. Filling advised that no vote has been taken on the SATE or IDEA. And the Ad Hoc Committee was not able to do a reliability or validity study for SATE. But last year a new Ad Hoc committee was charged to develop a process for using an alternative instrument, but they did not adhere to that charge. The committee spent time looking at the IDEA instrument, looking at alternative instruments, surveying other CSU’s, asking for input from department chairs, and trying to come up with ideas of what to do relative to the IDEA instrument.

Filling asked for input whether we need an alternative instrument, and if so, what kind of mechanism should be in place to ensure it works.

Comments:

--Feldman noted the IDEA instrument does not have enough emphasis on the course as a learning experience. There is room for improvement in the way we evaluate teaching on campus.

--Tan asked what was available in the market, which companies develop student evaluation instruments. Can we get samples of products, and an idea of the costs and services available.

--Filling stated that IDEA is the major player in student evaluation instruments. Plus, the Ad Hoc committee surveyed other CSUs and found that they didn’t spend much time on validation of their form. Our concern is that there is a difference between student evaluations to help faculty teach better (“formative”) and what goes into the Personnel Action File (“summative”). The MOU only mentions faculty must do student evaluations and that the results currently go in the PAF.

--Saraille pointed out that the contract doesn’t say which evaluation must be used.

--Nagel mentioned that CFA will be proposing that student evaluations have to be validated and the criteria has to be available for each campus (posting). There is also talk about requiring students to have training in order to evaluate.

--Thompson stated he feels the issue more narrowly. The penultimate paragraph of 9/AS/93/FAC (amending 3/AS/89/FAC) states that “departments are encouraged to develop and test alternative teaching assessment instruments” and that “if specified in department RPT elaborations, and if explicitly approved by the URPTC,” results from the alternative evaluation instrument can replace IDEA. We said we need a way to have an alternative, but we never made explicit how that’s done. The question now is: “what is the process and criteria for explicit approval by URPTC?” That was the charge of the ad hoc committee, but they never did it. So we either have to rescind 3/AS/89, or say how to implement it.
Myers stated that the use of student evaluations in personnel decisions lodges itself in a model inappropriate to education. It is much like customer satisfaction. It leads to students rating faculty higher if they look good, are funny, and give high grades. It is high time to think about whether we want a customer satisfaction model to evaluate our teaching or not. The experience is far more valuable down the line, but not immediately graspable; yet we evaluate only in the immediate context. Further, there is a need to add to the model of student evaluation some type of peer evaluation.

Sarraille advised that one issue is how IDEA is treated when it gets in the PAF. IDEA is not meant to be used for retention and promotion, and says so. If it used as a gauge of how effective one is as a teacher, it should be considered a very rough instrument, with very little precision. The other problem is what goes on in individual departments. If a department wants to develop an alternative instrument, they can run it past URPTC, but there has to be a process to validate it.

Feldman felt that another problem with IDEA is that open-ended comments by students are not encouraged. The previous instrument encouraged open-ended questions and they were very helpful. You really can’t tell much with multiple choice questions on it. But the problem with open-ended questions is how to make it statistically valid. He recommended if the Senate reconsiders a student evaluation instrument, that it encourage open-ended comments.

Thomas asked if it would be difficult for the Provost or URPTC, in reading 6 or 7 different department student evaluation instruments, to compare across those instruments. Would this create a hardship for URPTC and other reviewing entities? Doraz replied that an evaluation instrument could change yearly. There is a need for quantitative measure or it will be totally subjective. In his classes, he has students evaluate their learning and the effort they put into their learning. That gives him more information.

Nagel suggested that if the IDEA is in RPT files and it is being looked at for promotion and tenure decisions, and it is not designed for that, that is serious: why is it there? Further, the fact that the IDEA form has a Leikart scale does not make it objective. The questions are pretty subjective. Lastly, what was the rationale of 3/AS/89?

Oppenheim noted that the History Department has its own department form, but is still told they have to use IDEA for the two required (per MOU) classes per academic year. As former member of URPTC, he recalled going through student evaluations in exhaustive detail, and found that 2% are very bad, 2% very good, and the rest of us, 96%, in the middle. Students thus are nearly as good at evaluating us as we are of them. Finally, the original purpose of student evaluations were to help faculty, not to be used in RPT decisions. However, they immediately became a central part of the PAF; this is not helpful.

Filling asked for a point of order: Article 15.14 of the MOU states “written student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach. A minimum of two classes annually for each faculty unit employee shall have such written
student evaluations. Student evaluations shall be conducted in classes representative of the faculty unit employee’s teaching assignment. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee’s PAF. Unless consultation with an academic unit has resulted in an agreement by the administration and faculty to evaluate all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated.” Then 9/AS/93/FAC states that “Departments are encouraged to develop and test alternative teaching assessment instruments, using the IDEA long or short form or other theoretically grounded standards for establishing reliability and validity. If specified in department RPT elaborations, and if explicitly approved by the URPTC, results from such instruments may be substituted for or supplement the IDEA short form placed in the employee’s Personnel Action File.” So, this resolution allows faculty to have an alternative evaluation instrument, but they can’t use it because there is no process to do it.

--O’Brien agreed, stating that the resolution does say that forms other than IDEA can be used, but the point is, how to implement it. He suggested getting departments together that already have department forms and discuss this.

--Thompson suggested we could assume the process is in 3/AS/89/FAC and 9/AS/93/FAC so the Department of History should send their department form forward for approval by URPTC. He clarified that the resolution says we either keep IDEA or get rid of IDEA and use SATE, but that is not the issue right now. We still have IDEA, but departments can propose an alternative for their department. Even if a process is developed to use an alternative instrument, departments can still use IDEA. Further, it should not matter if RPT files are harder to read for the URPTC or Provost. That is not a compelling argument to not have alternative department instruments. But he stated when he thinks about the English Department recommending on RPT, he sees the department as first and foremost voice and if we want to use an instrument that helps our department, it just reinforces their voice in the RPT process. However, we still need approval at a higher level, especially to avoid abuse of the process.

--Feldman stated his belief that any evaluation instrument used will end up in the RPT file. But, there is a need to have proper interpretation that goes along with it from the department so the URPTC and the Provost can understand the information. The department recommendation needs to make the case.

--Dauwalder stated his experience in evaluating RPT files that the factors that really ring through clearly is the faculty member’s philosophy, approach, syllabi, examples of teaching materials, evaluation from colleagues. These are the most valuable. The fact that departments could have different evaluation instruments would pose no extra problem since he is dealing with 29 different department elaborations already.

--Doraz advised that when he was on the URPTC, he did not want an argument if an elaboration fit or did not fit. It is really up to the department. So, how do you make an informed decision?
--Provost Dauwalder referred to the policy and the MOU that faculty have to have some form of student evaluation instrument, not necessarily the IDEA form.

--Nagel stressed that the one thing that keeps happening is that these instruments are used to attack people. We need to keep that in mind if talking about alternative instruments.

--Oppenheim stated that his impression is that most of us think IDEA can be helpful, but there is a better way of doing it. He questioned how the language from Article 15.14 of the MOU got there and when? Was it inserted to protect faculty or administration? If faculty doesn’t agree, maybe it can be bargained out the contract.

--Peterson stated that some kind of student evaluation is helpful to her, but not necessarily IDEA. The open-ended portion is the most helpful and she encourages students to complete that.

--Oppenheim replied that he did not say student evaluations are not necessary. The contract mandates that student input is necessary to proceed; is there a more effective way to get that input?

--Regalado suggested to Nagel the potential of student infraction; students go after faculty as well.

--Schoenly added that letters from students can be included in the RPT file. There is also a period of time where students can give input. That is all at the department level.

--Mantz voiced concern that these are representative of the base or foundation of how all things are decided. He spoke to a sense of institutional pride at some campuses, where a symbol of quantitative evaluation gets treated like a GPA score. He wondered if it is or should be used as a barometer.

--Provost Dauwalder stated his sense in reading RPT files is that this institution to varying degree uses student evaluations on a broader base. Some places have an obsession with numbers; his sense is that this campus is not one of them. The IDEA is among lots of elements for evaluation and that is good. Varying degrees of importance are placed on numbers, but IDEA is not treated as a baseline.

--Regalado suggested that in recruiting faculty, that is the question we get from potential applicants, “how are faculty evaluated in the promotion process?”

--Young stated that she finds IDEA appropriate if used in its complete form. She tells students she appreciates their feedback because it helps improve her teaching. She includes these comments in her RPT file.

Filling asked Senators to discuss this with their colleagues so we know what to do at the next Senate meeting.
c. Copy machine situation

Feldman stated he has long thought we paid too much for copies here. And due to the budget situation, our budgets are even tighter. He suggested we need to focus on getting more out of scarce resources. Much of our budgets are for O and E, specifically money goes to making copies. If we can reduce the cost of copies, we will have more money for other things. He proposed forming a Buyers Union where we will go into the market place and get a contract for 30 or so copiers, with full service contract. He suggested we would have sufficient buying power to get the cost down and we should be able to do it for less than 2 cents per copy. Every department on campus could be a part of the Buyers Union. He asked that this issue be referred to the appropriate committee to develop a proposal to make this happen.

Comments:

--Oppenheim suggested this not come from the faculty, but the University. And that we probably have a policy to keep our costs down.

--Stephens agreed with Feldman’s comments, but the trade-off is in individual departments. They would give up the decision-making power on what kind of copy machine they want. Different departments have different requirements. She advised that they have not put constraints on departments, but if we choose to do it differently to have conformity, we would save. She volunteered to research this.

--Myers suggested that if a committee was put together, he would hope they would consider how many employees might be out of work for outsourcing. Stephens advised that the campus does not maintain copiers now.

--Tan reported that in her case, money was not saved due to campus regulations when she ordered her computer. She could have saved money if she ordered over the internet. This could be true for copiers.

--Oppenheim suggested that since Vice President Stephens is aware of the trade-offs, we should ask her to list the plus and minuses and bring the information back here. It could be referred to a committee if necessary.

--O’Brien stated that the issues of copiers and computers are interconnected. In the past, departments saved their rollover money, and then made a large purchase, like a copy machine for their department. Since department rollovers have been taken away, they will no longer be able to do this. Then what? He suggested that since the Administration has taken on the responsibility because they took the rollover money, that they will now have to make these purchases for departments.

--Feldman recommended the Senate ask Stephens to do the research. Stephens agreed.
Regalado added that it might be helpful to ask other campuses if they use this type of model.

Meeting adjourned at 3:48 p.m.