ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
MARCH 12, 2002

Speaker Russ called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.. The agenda was approved (MSP Filling/Peterson). The minutes of February 26, 2002 were approved (MSP Thompson/Farrar) with this correction of the last sentence in paragraph 6 on page 3: "and thirteen other languages in the HILT program."

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Speaker/SEC (Russ)

Speaker Russ announced with pleasure that the Assessment of Student Learning position will be housed in the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning with the oversight of Director, Andy Young. She also referred to her facetious suggestion at the last Senate meeting that faculty stand beside the holes to prevent the costly planting of palm trees near the Gateway building or to plant inexpensive shrubs in these spots instead. In addition, Russ thanked VP Mary Stephens for attending Senate meetings and providing helpful information that helps to avoid misunderstandings. Stephens responded that she enjoys the dialogue.

b) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)

Floyd said that the committee is still working on the problems associated with security and monitoring of exams in Stockton. At the April meeting, he will talk about the guidelines or policies/procedures related to arrangements with Delta.

c) Faculty Affairs Committee (Towell)

No report.

d) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Filling)

Arthur Buell reported for Filling that the committee finalized the survey about accounting systems. It will go to department chairs and staff for their responses. The committee also met with AVP Demetrulias and AVP Bowers to discuss YRO. Thompson asked about information concerning YRO. Buell responded that many issues were raised and that the committee will continue the discussion. Russ added that Filling will report the details to the SEC.

e) Graduate Council (Blodgett)

No report.

f) Statewide Academic Senate (Sarraille/Thompson)
Thompson referred senators to the report that he sent by e-mail. He highlighted Chancellor Reed's interest in raising fees for non-resident students and VP Spence's apparent backing off on faculty accountability in areas 10-13. Interim Provost Rhodes clarified that items 11-13 will not be required, but item 10 will be brought back. Thompson also noted that faculty workload is now a little more than in 1990.

g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)

No report.

h) Associated Students (Johnson/VanRuiten)

No report.

INFORMATION ITEM

a) CSU Academic Senate Constitutional Amendment

Thompson enumerated the important details: 1) a minimum of 2 senators for each campus, 3 if the FTEF exceeds the average systemwide FTEF, 2) 4 senators if a campus FTEF exceeds twice the average systemwide FTEF, 3) inclusion of the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member, and 4) addition of an emerita/emeritus representative as a voting member. He referred senators to the pro and con arguments attached to the minutes.

Christopher asked Thompson whether he approved of these changes. Thompson said that he did not because the changes will decrease the voice of the smaller campuses. He said that the essential question is whether all campuses have an equal stake in the system.

Zarling added that the increased number of senators would reduce support for travel to meetings. Thompson responded by saying that he was put on a standing committee immediately, but recently new senators have not been assigned to these committees because of the lack of funds. Russ added that having to work within the present budget, as VP Spence expected, would be impossible.

Farrar endorsed the change to allow the emerita/emeritus member to vote. He noted that, as a representative to the state emerita/emeritus organization, he has noticed that often people from the big campuses don't know as much about what is going on in the various programs.
Russ ended the discussion by repeating her opposition to the changes. They do not benefit us. She said that smaller campuses such as the Maritime Academy will grow and then will add another senator.

FIRST READING ITEM

a) 1/AS/02/SEC-Guidelines for Disclosure of Publication Costs

This proposed resolution from the SEC was moved and seconded (Thompson/Blodgett) to allow discussion.

Resolved: that the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus urge President Hughes to implement the following as University policy:

Every document produced or purchased for public off-campus distribution by CSU Stanislaus [or its auxiliaries and related entities] shall include a statement of total production and printing cost [including internal and external printing, layout, design, photography, editing, etc.], number of copies printed, and source[s] of funds. Valuation of contributions in kind will be established by agreement with the vendor.

Rationale:

As has been evident of late [see attached front page article from the Turlock Journal of 14 February, 2002], there is increasing interest, both on and off campus, in how CSU Stanislaus expends the funds it receives from the state and various donors. Some states [e.g., Louisiana] have made disclosure statements similar to the above mandatory for state-funded entities, and our campus should take the lead in California by adopting a policy that greatly increases information available to the public.

Thompson explained the perceived need because of unknown costs of many campus publications. He noted that the rationale sets forth the reasons.

Peterson said that the costs could be high and pointed out the difficulty in determining the time and costs related to organizing a brochure. Keeping track of costs would add administrative burdens.

Rhodes spoke for President Hughes concerning the rationale, citing the Turlock Journal article. He explained that the funds to publish the President’s seven-year retrospective came out of her budget and that he had originally hoped to publish an annual document. The costs for such publications are usually $20,000-$50,000 and are used by colleges as a marketing tool.

Afonso said that the Music Department presents 40/50 concerts per year, all good for public relations, and distributes many fliers, postcards, and thousands of
posters. The department is understaffed and keeping track of costs would be difficult.

Oppenheim responded that he had not seen the article, but noted that the President's budget comes from taxpayer dollars that should not be wasted. He said that supporting academic programs such as those offered by the Music Department is different. He objected to the many administration reports. He contrasted the two-page report supplied by the president of the Purchase, New York campus that efficiently presented important details and expressed his agreement with the SEC's concern.

Nagel added that the public has an interest in how money is spent. He is amazed not to see the costs printed and asked if there is no state law. He also differentiated between university and department documents. Blodgett suggested clarifying the purpose of the resolution by limiting it to printed documents by the CSU Stanislaus administration.

Thompson said that the SEC was particularly concerned with documents that go off campus and wanted to obtain input from the Senate. He acknowledged the difficulty in covering every angle, but stated that it is important to make information about costs available to the public.

ALS Associate Dean Klein, as Director of the Fine/Performing Arts School, suggested requiring reports of costs over a certain amount, perhaps $5,000. Farrar asked whether recording expenses helps to determine waste or not. Almy replied that waste is "in the eye of the beholder."

VP Stephens asserted that the real issue is not money but the appropriateness of the publication and mentioned internal and external perspectives such as a granting agency or potential partner. Publications are marketing devices, but they help to present the campus to the public.

O'Donnell agreed with Klein. The Drama Department has found it impossible to get materials printed on time, often because Reprographics has to deal with administration requests and often is swamped with work. Department needs usually rank lower, but they have deadlines for promotional items.

Carroll observed that reporting costs may not stop excess spending, but this resolution might cause some self-checking and more focus on qualitative rather than quantitative factors.

Afonso expressed his concern that the President's report had to be reprinted. The Music Department could have used some of the money. He noted that Vicki Eden, is always helpful, but now his department goes to outside and more expensive graphic artists because she is often too busy to handle their needs.
Peterson agreed that reducing waste is good and suggested that FBAC could work out arrangements with the President to have costs of publications discussed before they are printed. Other comments were that costs of public documents may be requested (Morgan-Foster), that indicating costs on documents will not cost more (Nagel), and that publication of costs has public relations benefits (Carroll).

MacDonald noted that if the costs are printed on documents each person will decide if they are reasonable and wondered whether the real concern is the lack of enough internal discussion about the use of money. She suggested that discussing costs of publications should be part of the budget review process and shared on the Internet.

Thompson reminded senators that faculty were not involved in formulating the visibility guidelines that were more work intensive. They are no longer in force because of criticism.

Finally, Russ advised that wording of the resolution needs some revision before the second reading. She said that the Senate could table the resolution, have FPAC look at policies and procedures, and then bring it back to the Senate. VP Stephens pointed out the greater the number of copies, the lower the costs per copy. Discussion ended with a motion to refer this issue to FBAC (MSP Farrar/Zarling).

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

**a) Grading Option A, B, C, NC**

Floyd said that UEPC had mixed opinions about this grading option and decided to bring it to the Senate to obtain more input. He asked senators to enrich the UEPC discussion by writing comments on the sheets he distributed.

Clarke explained that the Mathematics Department wants this option only for remedial classes. Many students now do minimal work because these courses do not affect the GPA, but requiring a C grade will insure at least a satisfactory level of competence and more effort.

Klein answered Christopher’s question about faculty choice of grading options by clarifying that all grading options are chosen by departments and they would have to go through the process to change options on a course-by-course basis. He added that D grades would still count for GE credit.

Kohlhaas supported this option for remedial classes but not for required classes because she is concerned about grade inflation. Students should be able to fail. Requiring a C grade for some credit courses needed for graduation seems logical also.
Van Ruiten disagreed that getting graduation credit for D grades was acceptable (one idea on the "con" list). Zarling noted that the D grade does not count for WP courses and suggested that perhaps this rule should be the same for GE courses. He endorsed the resolution, but O'Donnell said that he looked at the D grade as representative of some students' achievement. This grade will not help application for graduate study. Peterson agreed that some students work hard for a D and pointed out that even a D counts for financial aid considerations since they must acquire a certain number of units. Also a D grade allows them to try again.

Other comments were that requiring a C might prevent some students from moving on because of their fear of mathematics (Farrar), some students want a D instead of NC because sometimes NC equates with an F (Kohlhaas), Enrollment Services does not always enforce the grade option stated on the roster (Christopher), and perhaps we should use this option for remedial courses during a trial period (Almy).

Floyd asked that faculty members write comments to provide information for UEPC to consider.

**OPEN FORUM**

Russ spoke of the future Faculty Development Building and asked if senators approved of having a scholar series with specified themes. The faculty could study together during a semester. She mentioned the Andrew Mellon Scholar Series that will start in spring 2003 and highlight research and teaching related to a broad range of cross-disciplinary issues. Carroll said that the Faculty Development Committee discussed it this morning and they hope the faculty will attend these sessions. Russ added that they were looking for sponsors and would like faculty to suggest universal themes by sending ideas to Andy Young.

Kohlhaas mentioned a problem that a colleague experienced when a class was full and some students had been turned away, but one more student was enrolled in Open University through Extended Education even though the class had no more room. Russ noted that Open University uses a different form. It might have been an oversight.

Nagel asked about the bonus award money. VP Stephens explained that the money is kept apart from other funds. Any remaining money is not divided.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.