Academic Senate Minutes
February 26, 2002

Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m. The agenda was approved (MSP Filling/Sarraille). Blodgett asked that Graduate Council and her name as Chair be added to the January 29 minutes under Committees. The minutes of January 29, 2002 and December 4, 2001 were then approved (MSP Thompson/Filling).

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Speaker/SEC (Russ)

Speaker Russ attended the President's Executive Retreat that included considerable brainstorming and reported that faculty may provide input March-May concerning a draft strategic plan.

Russ also spoke of the Deans' Council initiative concerning the need to prepare for 10,000 students by 2006 by hiring 212 new faculty members at a cost of $6,000 each for the hiring process. This initiative also makes recommendations for increased travel, development, training, and computer budgets. Therefore, Russ supports this plan because we need to hire and retain quality faculty in order to maintain quality programs.

Russ also spoke of the administration plan to form a very large committee to study assessment and evaluation, but wonders if this committee is necessary. She also spoke about responsibility for academic program review, traditionally in the faculty domain. Russ is concerned because the administration wants to move AVP Hogan to this committee.

b) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)

Floyd said that, since the committee has not met since January 24, he has no new information about assessment. At the meeting on February 28, he will begin an informal discussion about academic program review. He will propose a meeting with Enrique Lopez-Contreras (Chair of APR), Steve Filling (Chair of ASL), Harriet Blodgett (Chair of GC), and Andy Young (Faculty Development) to talk about the vision of the interface between the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA) and the various faculty governance structures related to assessment. Some specific ideas about formalizing the roles and relationships should come from this discussion.

c) Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)

Towell informed the Senate that soon the committee will recommend criteria for administrative position search committees.
d) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)

Filling reported that the committee has been very busy working on BPAC2. Tom Young presented a plan to include eight people, with representation from all areas, who would think about the university as a whole. The plan received favorable reaction. He added that a strategic planning committee like MAP may be needed also. President Hughes asked Young to ask BPAC Review Committee to act as BPAC for this year. Filling solicited faculty comments. FBAC will give a survey to departments concerning the use of accounting reports.

Filling noted that last fall the Senate approved a new program for community college leadership. The contract between the College of Education and UEE it turns out, is in draft form, and FBAC cannot get information about the other details.

e) Graduate Council (Blodgett)

Blodgett said that the GRE general test has been revised. More questions have been added to do a better job testing analytical thinking and writing.

She added that money remains for fellowships and scholarships and that departments should send names of possible recipients. In addition, the committee has looked at the draft of learning goals that the assessment group drew up and has sent it back to committee.

f) Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)

Sarraille spoke of the resolution to revise the campus representation on the SWAS. Proposed changes to the bylaws are that campuses will have a minimum of two senators, campuses with more than average FTEF would have one additional senator (3), and campuses whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF would have twice as many representatives (4). San Diego may soon be eligible. Another change is that the emerita/emeritus member would have voting rights.

An amendment will go to the campuses for approval of this reworking of the bylaws. It will require a majority of votes cast and a majority of votes cast at a majority of campuses. The Board of Trustees must approve any changes.

Christopher requested the average FTEF. Sarraille said about 650 faculty. Farrar asked for the rationale. Sarraille likened the situation to the Congress and the desire that senators represent an equal number of faculty. This is a compromise plan.
Sarraille then spoke of a vote on March 5 that will urge the course review subcommittee to exclude all first-term language courses except English from GE Humanities C.2 credit. The rationale is that these courses lack the required cultural component. Bargetto-Andres reported that many foreign language department faculty members are sending emails declaring their opposition. Her understanding is that foreign language courses taken at community colleges will not be credited. The effects on LIBS will be great. Students take courses to learn about other lands and to learn the language. Language and culture are closely entwined. To learn a language, one must learn to appreciate the culture. She emphasized the great harm that this change would cause.

Christopher agreed by pointing out that she has taught English GE courses and has also taken Spanish 1010, a course with a strong cultural component. She emphasized that the CSU should not discourage language learning. Carroll called the resolution indefensible.

Sarraille explained that the rationale is to align credit in the CSU with the UC system (only second-term language courses get transfer credit). He added that there was a big movement to standardize transfer regulations and more resolutions will come in the future.

Bargetto-Andres said that students who have completed four years of language study at high school would not get credit. They must take an entrance exam now and then are placed in the appropriate credit class. She added that our campus includes many students from community colleges and claimed that their courses should count. Chairs of the CSU foreign language departments have drafted a second proposal that they plan to send back to the SWAS.

Zarling said that he opposed this resolution in principle because the CSU has different goals and students than the UC system.

Thompson explained that the intention was to affect community college courses. The Academic Affairs Committee of the SWAS initiated the resolution and it caused much discussion and debate. One contingent wants to table this item until consultation with the people who should have been consulted before.

Akwabi-Ameyaw said that the CSU makes no efforts to promote non-European languages. Bargetto-Andres replied that our campus offers Cambodian, Hmong, Japanese, and eighteen other languages in the JUMP program.

Farrar asked if the sense of the group was to oppose this resolution and a show of hands confirmed this viewpoint.

\textbf{g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)}

No report.
h) ASI (Johnson/VanRuiten)

VanRuiten stated that the ASI was losing its faculty advisor, Dr. James Payne, so will be searching for a replacement. They are also working on a program to reward professors who score highest on a poll of students concerning GE classes.

Akwabi-Ameyaw asked for a definition of "reward." VanRuiten said that tentative plans were to publish results in a pamphlet and on the web site and perhaps to have a formal reception if funds are available. ASI will work with faculty and Institutional Research to formulate the details. Christopher said that such a poll should not endorse high grades.

i) OTHER - UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN

Randy Harris reported that the United Way campaign was underway and urged colleagues to donate. He invited faculty to attend the reception on Friday, March 1, 2-5 p.m. in the South Dining Room that will feature door prizes and good food.

INFORMATION ITEM

a) CROAC Report (Thompson)

Thompson thanked the members of the committee and explained that Chancellor Reed wanted to convert all campuses to early-semester campuses (two fifteen-week terms, beginning in mid-January and in late August). Speaker Pandell asked the committee to look at various calendars. Thompson said that it tried to look as broadly as possible at the information available. This was not a "save the Winter Term" committee, but it tried to look at what is best. The CSU offered $2 million as an incentive to convert.

The committee decided that the calendar is part of curriculum (teaching and learning), as many documents assert. The Chancellor's monetary offer seems to be a way to exert control over local curriculum. The committee did not find compelling reasons to change nor strong support from faculty and students for any change. No quarter campus in the CSU has decided to convert.

Therefore, the committee recommends that Stanislaus continue the current 4-1-4 calendar with a 10-week Summer Term, remove the requirement that students enroll in Winter Term, pay close attention to the needs of Student Services for advising and orientation, and undertake no calendar reviews or proposals for change unless arising from the Faculty and grounded in compelling reasons regarding improved teaching conditions and enhanced learning outcomes.
Floyd asked if there was a need to address the philosophical reasons for the Winter Term, especially the original idea of including special topics during this term, but Thompson said that original conception changed very early because of student and faculty desires. He added that recent survey information indicates that students think the Winter Term is a unique term.

Christopher asked about the next step. Thompson replied that the report will go to the UEPC and to the SEC. Russ noted that three committees in the past have looked at the question of whether to keep Winter Term, but they did not consider improvements. VP Morgan-Foster expressed appreciation for the concern for the needs of Student Services.

**ACTION ITEM**

*a) 22/AS/01/GC-Fee Waivers for Graduate Students Carrying Teaching Responsibilities*

Blodgett explained that the capital letters indicated clarification and expansion of the original proposal.

Sarraille pointed out that he was in favor of the proposal, but he believes that soon the Graduate School should develop guidelines to prevent exploitation of graduate students or use of graduate students to solve budget problems. He recommended that such guidelines place limits on the number of classes taught without pay and limits on the number of classes students may take while teaching.

Morgan-Foster asked if the Executive Order included any mention of caps on use of graduate students. Blodgett said that it did not.

Filling called for the question. The vote was in favor (one no vote).

Resolution is:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus, pass the Revised Proposal for Fee Waivers for Graduate Students Carrying Specified Teaching and Classroom Responsibilities to become effective upon receiving the President's approval.

**OPEN FORUM**

*a) Sarraille spoke of an email that said campus police will not be in Stockton next term. Russ asked VP Stephens about this change and expressed concerns about safety.*
VP Stephens explained that we now have tenant status in Stockton and are no longer responsible for safety. The university leases three buildings now, but wants to move eventually into one (Acacia). Since we have evening classes, our needs are different from those of other tenants and she and Dean Morgan are ascertaining costs. We must pay for extra services. If private security does not provide a high enough level of security, we will pay to upgrade security. We must work with the Stockton Police Department and the City of Stockton.

Stephens added that all new campus security force hires have been told that the Stockton positions will end. The Unit 8 force has put together a layoff list. Official notices will go to the union and to employees. The Chief is working with the Stockton Police Department, Sheriff Department and Turlock Police Department trying to place officers in other positions to avoid layoffs on June 30. Stephens said that the faculty in Stockton will be consulted.

Filling asked about plant people. Stephens said that they were hired as temporary workers.

Floyd asked if Stockton was now more like an off-campus center. Stephens agreed it was. Floyd also asked about the vision of the developer. Stephens said that an EIR must be approved and that next week a draft master development plan will be out for review.

Russ requested that this plan be brought to the Senate. Stephens agreed to do this and to have Dean Morgan appear also.

Floyd referred to the relationship between Delta and CSU Stanislaus concerning course offerings. He will meet with Dean Morgan tomorrow to discuss the language of policies for working relations between the two campuses.

Russ said that a letter should have gone out to faculty teaching in Stockton to allay fears about pending changes. Stephens said that they had to sort out the situation before telling the faculty.

Zarling stated that his understanding is that we will have a basic level of security but less than we require; therefore, we must pay for more. The security provided by the developer will not be uniformed officers. He asked how we benefit by making this change and said that we are losing control.

Stephens acknowledged the costs of managing this area were great--$500,000 minimum to update the site-but she declared that the focus was on the academic program.

Other concerns expressed about this situation were that only uniformed officers may handle hospitalization (R. Floyd) and that the University could face liability
problems because of lack of safety without uniformed officers (Nagel). Stephens said that the Stockton Police Department will have jurisdiction, but added that the administration is looking at the needs, such as escorts to parking lots.

Filling asked if the faculty will have keys to the buildings and Stephens gave an affirmative reply. Filling explained that two years ago faculty had no keys and had to call Public Safety to open doors. Stephens will check this matter.

Russ stated the need to look at the Stockton program, past and future, and questioned if we are better off now than when we were housed at Delta?

b) Thompson then shared a rumor that some trees were to be replaced by forty-one palm trees at a cost of $1,000 each. Stephens confirmed that the palm trees were to be planted. Almy, a member of the UFPC, retorted that the tree issue could have been brought up with this committee. He said that the plans were made for the trees and a fence without a vote of the committee. Stephens replied that safety concerns would not come to the committee.

Russ commented that issues that require no action should still come to the Academic Senate. She is deeply concerned things are not going through proper protocol. Stephens stated that the Senate cannot demand this level of micro-management. Russ retorted that the UFPC should have discussed these items. They should at least have been information items, not "done deals." Someone had to think of palm trees and funding for them. Russ added that the aesthetic aspect of the campus is a rightful concern of faculty. Faculty seem out of the loop when decisions are made. She asked that her concerns be shared with UFPC.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.