Academic Senate
08 April 03

================================

1.  Call to Order
1436

2.  Approval of Agenda

mods suggested by mt:
1 - veep stephens can't be here -will reschedule so remove 9a
2- like to switch 6a, 6b as we have visitors for 6b
accepted as amended

3.  Approval of AS minutes of 25 March 03
approved as issued

4.  Announcements

CFA president on the CMS audit hearing

mt - info from campus budget summit [80 people] has been collected and disseminated. next meeting next monday at 11 in msr 130 using, expanding on and prioritizing that information.

ballots are out, votes will be counted friday at 1 pm.

thanks to provost for refreshments.

mt - thanks to president for her approval of 2/as/03/sec regarding campus accountability report consultation.

guests - priscilla peters from ac tec, manoharan, avp it, jim klein,

also like to announce that outstanding professor is david lindsay - applause by all

5.  Questions about Reports
none

6.  Action Items

a.  6/AS/03/FAC - Policy for University Search Committees...

mt - specific changes to language were sent via asnet.
Brown elaborates changes.....
moved PPl part III to introduction [fits better there]

major change - mod part I line 9 to clarify what search committee is sending forward [most suitable candidates rather than a ranked list]. specific reference to relative appraisals and comments on candidates. intent is not to send a ranked list, but will be more than a screening activity.

mt - what is open for action is the resolution not the policy

samo - pointed out the two things I liked last time, you've removed one [the ranked list] which may make it more palatable to h rh. guess I'd rather see them ranked, but can accept this as long as comments may be included. speak in favour of resolution as it is. thanks to brown and FAC for their efforts.

sundar - query as to changes.

stone - last pp - fox can't be head chicken watcher pp. should say original search committee *must* be consulted rather than *should* be consulted.

mt - only thing that is up for amending today is the resolution as extant.

stone - withdraws suggestion.

brown - we wanted the fox to be on teh committee but not the sole watcher of the henhouse.

mt - proceed to vote:
passes unanimously.

---------------------------------------------------------------------
6b b. 7/AS/03/UEPC - Academic Technology Plan

mt - this is a 2nd reading action item. received some language revisions [on p 11 of this week's agenda packet].

mt - directly to vote.

passes

---------------------------------------------------------------------
6c c. 8/AS/03/UEPC - Program Discontinuance: BA in Voc Ed

mt - again, this is an action item today.

nagel - discussion with dept chair re this. seems to abdicate faculty role in pgm evaluation if we vote this down in hopes that protus would whack the pgm.. maybe the senate can amend the resolution to reverse the intent?

nagel moves to align resolution with dean cullinan's memo [put pgm in abeyance].
mt - please provide specific language for amendment.

weikart - point of order - if we vote this down we can move another item which would prompt discontinuance.

stone - that is perfectly fine.

mt - is it allowable to do that? doesn't that force another review committee?

jaasma - uepc discussed this, understanding is that senate can vote this down and propose another motion and pass it. if it comes back to uepc we must redo analysis.

samo - if we vote this down, we are back to square one since we haven't agreed with discon committee recommendation.

mt - this is out of order - refers to nagel

nagel - add:

whereas - ALS which was proposed to house this pgm, has indicated it does not wish to. new resolved clause is the AS place the program on hold.

2nd zarling.

sf - honors program was put into abeyance - can we do the same?

samo - issue seems to be in the resolved clauses. can amendments change the intent.

klein - AS has ultimate authority on curriculum.

mt - ruling of chair may be challenged. ruling is that proposed amendment is unacceptable change to the intent of the resolution. already been accepted by the body. going to rule this out of order.

zarling - will challenge that ruling.

peterson - side with mt - doesn't seem like in this case it matters a lot, but in terms of precedent we don't want to set a 180 degree switch in recommendation.

melissa - agree with peterson's concerns about precedent. would it be cleaner for us to table this and form a new discontinuance committee with a short time frame? Maybe should wait for new dean also?

hagel - incorrect to characterize this as reversing the point of the resolution. amendment asks for putting the pgm on hold.

samo - speak in favor of speaker's decision. all agree that pgm should be trashed, the question is how we do it. suggest we vote down this resolution and ask SEC for a first reading resolution to discontinue the pgm.
zarling - sympathize with precedent setting issue. the situation is not that. basically agree with putting it into abeyance. we are not setting any precedent other than that AS has the power to control curriculum.

avilla - AS doesn't really have much power since you don't set policy. ALS dean is the person who will make the decision.

jmayer - support zarling's challenge.

sundar - we should just go with the amendment.

samo - question to provost - if amendment and resolution passes, can you freeze the pgm?

protus - don't know.

mt - what we're about to vote on is whether to overturn the speaker's ruling. voting yes means you want to address the amendment.

if you vote yes we will move to discussion of amendment.

11 yes 22 no. ruling is upheld.

samo - speak against the resolution. urge senate to reject it.

sf - move to refer this back to uepc. it is fatally flawed.

no second.

nagel - move to table 2nded peterson.

vote to table - 23 no. motion to table fails.

sereno - call the question 2nded - samo

mt - vote to close debate - 29 yes 5 no

carries

vote on the resolution.

resolution fails.

nagel - recorded as abstaining.

samo - point of into - this was a 2nd reading item - can AS express wish to eliminate the pgm as a motion and go back to first reading.

weikart - floor motion -
whereas # of students majoring and graduating in VocEd has been and is small, whereas dean of ALS thinks this sucks, blah blah.

avilla - at what point are pgms too small to be continued. will we dump history if it gets small? because deans don't like it should we kill it? students are still enrolled in this pgm.

stone - no longer have credential pgm for these students so the degree leads nowhere at present.

sundar - not all committee faculty are school of ed. 9 students are not enrolled - in 5 years we had 1,3,2 enrolled. not sure what that means, where the data comes from. have to do something about this.

samo - 1] this is a first reading? is it appropriate to move a resolution to waive first reading? move and seconded [johns]. samo - we all agree except avilla that all students currently in pgm will be allowed to complete it, just no new students. no one wants the pgm, given budget concerns, we should toss it out.

zarling - speaking against waiving 1st reading. convenience is not enough of a reason.

weikart - agreeing with zarling. this is bad precedent.

johns - speak for the waiver as it is clear that intent is to allow discontinuance to happen. don't see any point in prolonging this....

melissa - also speak against moving to 2nd reading. important for students involved to have a voice. students can get credentialed by taking exams

gacko - in favor of waiver

samo - inappropriate to do something new. but we are not doing something new, we are trying to accomplish what we all agree we need to accomplish. weikart's motion expresses the will of the AS.

nagel - regarding parliamentary contradiction - doesn't floor motion do the same?

sereno - agree with samo's comments. there is an overwhelming understanding and agreement on this issue. this is not anything new or anything contentious.

avilla - since this is a recommendaiton where does it go from here?

mt - goes to the president as a sense of the senate.

avilla - she will take action?
mt - yes.

mmayer - most of us have already consulted with depts. why not act now?

zarling - like to clarify that while this is a recommendation, all are - "mere" recommendation is a poor description. still haven't heard any arguments about damage waiting until next AS will cause.

avilla - concur with zarling.

mt - 2/3 vote required.

14 no 18 yes

motion to waive reading fails.

mt - will continue in first reading mode. discussion?

johng - recommend we don't put # of students in resolution.. there is enough in there already.

johns - find myself in the embarrassing situation of......are there students in this pgm currently?

samo - think it is appropriate to have that whereas - can discon either due to quality or quantity. since quality has not been challenged, we need to leave #s in there.

mt - richard will take this under advisement and will return at next AS.

mt thanks to FAC and UEPC for their work on the 3 action items we've had today. it is a lot of long term work that is finally coming to fruition.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------7a

7. First Reading Items

a. 9/AS/03/SEC - Authentic Consultation and Shared Decision Making
mellisa/sf moved and seconded.

sem is an area that really needs faculty input as it really affects us. what we're looking for is to provide a structured means for faculty input.

sf - provides support for our admins against lb nonsense. they need the help.

nagel - how does SEC see the consultation taking place?

mt - mechanism I have in mind is that it goes through the appropriate governance committees and then through the AS.
jaasma - what is current faculty presence on these committees?

mt - we recommended 5 faculty members to committee [pugh's committee] - we thought 5 people were recommended. 2 who had previously been placed on that committee due to special focuses. Not sure how many faculty were appointed. pugh did say it was "proportionally very small" representation.

Youngblom - all the faculty CoC recommended were appointed.

jmayer - agree in principle but think the motion needs more structure. also have problems with authentic. we don't need the negative connotation.

mt - thanks.

avilla - there is only one student on that committee? Why doesn't this go through ASI if it goes through AS?

mt - students probably need to make case to administration who is developing the plan. faculty think this relates to curriculum etc. asi should make its case to administration?

avilla - is this excluding students?

mt - AS is making its case for representation. ASI should do the same. both make them to administration.

avilla - why not do this together?

mt - this is open for amendment.

sundar - request for clarification.

avilla - there is one student on the committee - we're completely outnumbered. why can't asi/as do a joint resolution? thought we are all on the same page working for the same learning environment.

sundar - do see that faculty add value to the discussion, sure that students would as well.

mt - two different issues here - one is membership on committee, the other is approval of policy.

zarling - consultation is a two way street. we are indicating willingness to participate. students should do the same, not as a joint effort.

sundar - don't see anything in here that refers to composition of committee. is that specified anywhere?

mt - this is not about the committee this is about the SEM plan the campus is required to have and the campus enrollment target which been defined.
samo - agree with sundar - the first two resolves are open. there is no preclusion of students here.

mt - would be surprised if asi wanted SEC to refer things to them.

johng - think I'm getting what matt is saying. maybe we should take a proactive stance and foment authentic consultation. not to mandate but to suggest.

johns - basically agree but we need to be very careful of putting words in mouths of students. need to have language that is respectful of students but also not attempt to speak for them.

avilla - all we are asking for is to be included in consultation.

weikart - students do have representation on AS committees. how are they being excluded? doesn't really say anything here about students or faculty.

weikart - consultation implies being consulted. you are being consulted.

jaasma - agree with matt that students should be involved?

avilla - why should AS be involved?

mt - believe that faculty has responsibility for curriculum and sem especially new student admissions is so close to quality of education that we have to be consulted. our claim arises from our governance over curriculum.

avilla - don't understand why this is an issue - we have to accept the top 1/3

mt - impacted pgms.

stacey - faculty have enunciated in this resolution why they should be consulted - this is specific to the plans reported to the CO. don't see this as something that is designed to cut students out. probably ASI should do a similar resolution.

jmayer - agree - avilla should take the issue to ASI and maybe bring it to us for support?

mt - not sure if joint things have been done before.

weikart - avilla is also free to amend the resolves assuming support.

sundar - reason was asked to participate because we need a faculty voice, which is typically also a student voice. this is faculty governance - that's why more faculty than students. just as if at asi, more students than faculty. maybe what you're saying is deeper than more students on SEM?
avilla - if we are claiming that we're really for students - what about that student fee increase resolution?

samo - recommend we move the agenda.

mt - other advice please forward to SEC.

---------------------------------------------------------------------
8a
8. Discussion Items

a. Facilitating Graduation Report

mt - SWAS endorsed this report, trustees have approved it.
will be student representation on this [?]

---------------------------------------------------------------------
8b
b. Methods Used in Academic Affairs at CSUS to Examine Institutional Effectiveness

this is the assessment thing.
protus - last time we talked about what was there. group of faculty and admins who met and established spreadsheets [attached to 11 march agenda packet]. what drove this whole discussion was what appeared to be a lot of disagreement as to what assessment meant.

some bs about faculty comfort. please take a close look at the document....

open to further comments........

nagel - something that I want to point out - when we've dealt in AS with accountability and assessment issues, a lot of faculty don't seem to have a clear conception of the diffs between the various kinds of measures. external accountability seems to rankle these people. they don't know what assessment specifies.

protus - have to have program level assessment in place for accreditation. classroom level assessment needs to stay separate.

mt - correct. a very strong protective element here that comes down to people coming to jsrfdc for workshops with less ambivalence as to what is happening.

nagel - I agree - we need to communicate this.

johns - firewall concept got across, but still feel imposed upon by assessment movement. it is a gloved hand, but a gloved iron fist. commensurate with what they've done to k-12. references to wasc as a bunch of admins in differently coloured hats........
we need to think about how wasc could be assessed....

it is not enough to pass a firewall resolution locally.

mt - we are trying to figure out is where we are going with these docs.

stone - all will recall the asl principles which AS tabled. that doc was an attempt to point out to faculty what asl is what it means and how powerful it is.

johng - something condescending about this. sw is all for asl, but there are no resources available.

brown - process in its entirety was good. committee laid it out well, nobody can argue against it, we want students to do well. still use the metaphor that it is like driving down the highway with the emergency brake on.
references to poorly writing/counting students.

ex post assessment is silly.

avilla - propose that students funding asl and working it like that? asi would run it and publish it.

myers - with regardo to student funded asl - I'd voice some hesitation about that. not at all clear that students are well qualified to assess student learning.

avilla - can we come together on this?
blah blah blah

mt - first year.comp self-assessment.....

peterson - think that students do have insight into whether they are learning or not. that is why we ask them. but some of the issue is what is most important for students to learn.

blah blah blah
STFU

sundar - reason faculty feel students are not the best judge is that most of the time they are assessing instructor rather than program or education.

what assessment needs to do is assess course in relation to program.

protus - johng description of dept commitment to asl and search for resources. is the next step we need to move to.
important for us to have a broadbased understanding of asl.

avilla - what I'm proposing is ... idea form for evaluating a course and a professor in the course they are teaching.
trying to provide an educated way to get students and faculty to do this professionally.

mt - that is something we discussed when protus and I went to asi. we are waiting for asi materials [3 models].

weikart - concerning johng's comments - don't have time to do improvement because of workload ...

mt - BoT did approve grad facilitation report at march 11 meeting. minutes will come out tonight so that we can get a response from hhr on 6/as/,

---

9. Information Item

a. CSU Stanislaus Budget Structure [Stephens, time certain 1600]

---

10. Open Forum

11. Adjourn