

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS
May 1, 2002**

Minutes

Attendance

- Present:** Bud Morris – Chair, Sharon Hamill – Secretary, Peter Amade, Mark Baldwin, Don Barrett, Katrina Baughman, Vivienne Bennett, Bonnie Biggs, Robert Black, Rochelle Boehning, Margret Crowdes, George Diehr, Sharon Elise, Vicki Fabry, Gina Grimshaw, Rocio Guillen, Kara Kornher, Janet McDaniel, Ofer Meilich, Carmen Nava, Kathy Norman, Graham Oberem, Youwen Ouyang, Janet Powell, Patricia Prado-Olmos, Liliana Rossman, Michael Schmidt, Wesley Schultz, Linda Shaw, Laurie Stowell, Susan Thompson, Keith Trujillo, Kathleen Watson, Jill Watts, Shaun-inn Wu, Anibal Yañez-Chavez
- Absent:** Dick Montanari – V. Chair, Roger Arnold, Glen Brodowsky, David Chien, Maria Luiza Dantas, Soheila Jorjani, Michael McDuffie, Brian Norris, Sandy Parsons, Jill Pellettieri, Amber Puha, Laura Wendling
- Ex-Officio:** Candie Halstead – Staff Representative, Steve Lilly – Dean COE, Spencer McWilliams – Dean COAS, Norm Nicolson – Dean IITS, Marion Reid – Dean Library, Robert Sheath – Provost, Pat Worden – Dean Graduate Studies
- Guests:** David Barsky – AVPAP, Bettina Huber – Director Analytic Studies, Eileen Oliver – Assoc. Dean COE, Richard Riehl – Exec. Director Enrollment Services, Peter Zwick – Director University Global Affairs
- Staff:** Marcia Woolf, AS Coordinator

I. Approval of Agenda

- ADD:** **XII. Consent Calendar, NEAC Recommendations**
 Foundation Board of Directors
 Gary Oddou
- XIV. New Business**
 GEC LDGE Area D New Course Proposal Form
- DELETE:** **XII. Consent Calendar, NEAC Recommendations**
 Foundation Board of Directors
 Vicki Fabry
- XIV. New Business**
 APP Course and Program Change Proposals
 NEAC Recommendations
 APP Service Learning Courses
 APP Resolution regarding Originators of Proposals
 IRB IRB Policy Revision
- Motion #1 M/S/P**
 To approve the agenda as amended

II. Approval of Minutes: 4/10/02

- Motion #2 M/S/P**
 To approve the minutes as presented

III. Chair's Report: Bud Morris

A. Announcements: The Executive Committee today initiated 26 amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws of the Faculty. Morris noted that last year's referendum did not pass, due to an insufficient number of returned ballots. A ballot for the new referendum will be issued within the next 20 days, and it is hoped all will vote.

At 3:30 this afternoon, the President is hosting a reception for the Harry E. Brakebill Outstanding Professor Award recipient, Graham Oberem. A round of applause broke out for Oberem.

Next Tuesday, May 7th, a farewell reception will be held for Ed Thompson, former chair of the Political Science department, and currently Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Thompson was selected to serve as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty at Armstrong Atlantic State University in Atlanta, Georgia. The reception will be held from 3:30 to 5 p.m.

IV. Vice-Chair's Report, Dick Montanari: (Attending ASCSU meeting.)

V. Secretary's Report, Sharon Hamill: We have received responses from the administration on the following items:

Returned for revision or research:

FAC Faculty Awards Policy (requires revision)

FAC Range Elevation Policy for Temporary Faculty (research requested)

VI. President's Report, Alexander Gonzalez: Robert Sheath noted that the President is attending an emergency budget meeting. The President encourages all to attend the open forums to be conducted next week entitled "Getting to campus; challenges we'll face." The forums will address transportation and parking issues, and will be held in Commons 206 on May 7th at 1 p.m. and May 8th at 10 a.m.

The Governor has signed the rider to the November bond referendum, which provides immediate funding for the new Business building. Construction could begin soon after the Library is finished in Fall of 2003. In addition, the Humanities & Social Sciences building and Craven renovation will appear on the November bond issue and, if passed, will begin construction 2005/06, as the Business building is being completed.

VII. Provost's Report, Robert Sheath: Mary Elizabeth Stivers has been out ill with a form of hepatitis and will likely not return to work for at least two more weeks. Efforts are being made to keep the flow of work moving in her absence. The campus community wishes her the best. She is well on her way to recovering.

The Academic Blueprint Committee has met three times and is making good progress. They have been reviewing input from the Colleges' curriculum committees; faculty, staff, and student forums; and other data gathering efforts. In relationship to the suggested programs, the committee is now determining how many FTES would be generated, how many FTEF would be required, space and other resources required, accreditation issues, partnerships, etc.

The Budget Task Force will soon be publishing a report on their findings from the Cal State Long Beach visit. It is hoped that some of the processes can be incorporated into CSUSM's 2003/04 budget process. The committee continues to look for other campus models and is concentrating on identifying campuses that are newer and experiencing the kind of growth we are undergoing.

George Diehr asked for information regarding a rumor that the Copy Center is moving off campus. Sheath responded that he had not heard the rumor and knew of no such plan, but that he would look into it.

VIII. ASCSU Statewide Senator's Report: Sandy Parsons: (Attending ASCSU meeting.)

IX. CFA Report: George Diehr: Regarding the CBA, a rumor was circulating that the CSU Board of Trustees might not ratify the tentative agreement at their upcoming meeting. However, Jackie Kegley, ASCSU Chair, recently assured faculty that the Trustees were expected to ratify the agreement.

Implementation discussions between the parties are continuing, and the fact finder is expected to meet with the parties to assist in the process.

ACR 73 states that 75% of CSU faculty will be tenure track. A committee has been meeting to discuss implementation and the parties have tentatively agreed to a timeline of eight years to meet that goal. An increase in the margin funding formula will be requested from the legislature. The committee – which includes representatives of the ASCSU, CFA and CSU – is a very positive, collegial group and is encouraged about the progress being made.

The CFA-supported SB 1450, which would require that 50% of the CSU budget go to instruction, is foundering. Modifications are being sought which would make the bill acceptable to the staff union, which is concerned that the legislation would result in a reduction of staff in other units.

Diehr is running as CFA's candidate for the PERS Board.

CFA is sponsoring a May Day party this afternoon in the Palm Court area beginning at 3:30 p.m.

X. ASI Report: Katrina Baughman: The Student Leadership Awards Night will be held Friday, May 3, at the California Center for the Arts, and Beverly Anderson will be attending.

Tumona Austin, ASI's Post Baccalaureate Representative, suggests the following regarding faculty teaching evaluations: 1) that there be a mechanism for professors to share with their students the result of the evaluation and to address the recommendations or concerns raised by their students; and 2) that funds be provided to either compensate faculty for the extra time necessary to analyze evaluations or to hire graduate assistants for this purpose.

Austin also suggested that a poll be conducted to measure students' interest and participation in the recreational activities sponsored by ASI, and to invite suggestions for additional activities.

XI. Committee Reports:

FAC: The committee's report is attached to the agenda.

LACAC: The committee's report is attached to the agenda.

XII. Consent Calendar: The following items are presented to the Senate for a single vote of approval without discussion. Any item can be removed for particular consideration by request of a senator prior to vote.

APP Course & Program Change Proposals Shaun-inn Wu distributed a document listing 27 proposals, and noted that items 1-6 and 11 should be deleted.

NEAC Recommendations:

Foundation Board of Directors

Peggy Kelly
Gary Oddou
Richard Serpe
Robert Yamashita

Motion #3 M/S/P

To approve the consent calendar as corrected

XIII. Old Business

A. FAC RTP Policy

Morris reported that, in today's EC meeting, the results of the e-mail "straw poll" recently conducted by Janet McDaniel were discussed. As a result of that discussion, FAC and the EC have endorsed three proposed amendments to the RTP policy. McDaniel provided a document describing these amendments, which came moved and seconded by EC.

McDaniel noted that only minor changes have been made to the document since the April 10 meeting: additional references to SSP-ARs and correction of typos and inconsistencies.

The poll revealed that, while the 61 respondents were split on narratives of “up to 10 pages total” and “up to 20 pages total,” all who responded could be satisfied with “up to 15 pages total.” Regarding the number of items of evidence, the majority of respondents preferred “up to 30 items total, distributed as you wish” to “up to 10 items per section.” In accordance with these results, the first proposed amendment (a new #7 under section II.D.) would limit the reflective statements to 15 pages total. The second proposed amendment (changes to II.D.6, and II.E.) would limit the number of items of evidence to 30 total, distributed as the candidate wishes. The third proposed amendment is a change to the flow charts in Appendices A and B. The current flow charts contain steps which are not included in the current policy nor the proposed policy.

Sharon Elise objected to the term “norms.” Diehr proposed striking the phrase, “in light of the norms of the Candidate’s discipline” from Amendment #1. EC accepted this friendly amendment, and a vote was taken on the first amendment.

Motion #4 M/S/P (unanimously)
To accept Amendment #1 as amended

Regarding the second amendment, the term “norms” was once again discussed. It was suggested that the second sentence be struck and replaced with: “The types of items included may vary.” It was also suggested that the last sentence be changed to read: “...each category will be represented by contain evidence.” EC accepted this friendly amendment, and a vote was taken on the second amendment.

Motion #5 M/S/P (unanimously)
To accept Amendment #2 as amended

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the third proposed amendment. While never included in the policy, it has been the practice on campus to provide an opportunity to submit a rebuttal prior to the final decision. McDaniel noted that the campus culture and the CBA do not preclude a candidate from rebutting a recommendation or appealing a decision. Morris indicated that the President and he have discussed this topic, and that the President agrees that candidates may appeal to him regarding decisions made by his designee. It was pointed out that the current language, at IV.A.3., provides for rebuttals, and that the CBA provides a process for appealing status decisions.

Ofer Meilich suggested adding language to section V concerning a candidate’s right to appeal. EC accepted a friendly amendment to add an 11th section to V.A. which would read, “A faculty member’s right to appeal tenure and promotion decisions shall not be abridged,” in addition to correcting the flow chart.

Keith Trujillo suggested voting down the amendment, since the current chart reflects common practice and the President has indicated his intention to continue this practice. After a brief discussion, a vote was taken.

Motion #6 M/S/D (13 noes; 10 ayes)
To accept Amendment #3 as amended

Kara Komer moved to change the word “recommendation” in the current version of the flow chart to “decision.” Trujillo seconded this motion, and the matter was further discussed. Michael Schmidt suggested leaving the original flow chart in place. Morris suggested adding “President’s designee notifies candidate” prior to “candidate has opportunity to submit rebuttal” in the current chart. Peter Zwick argued that the current document does not reflect the policy, and that either the policy or chart should be changed. Graham Oberem suggested that the amendment was more accurate, and to add a box at the end that reads “The candidate has the right to appeal the President’s decision.” EC accepted this proposal.

Grimshaw and Trujillo expressed concern that the appeal process practiced on campus could be confused with the formal process provided for in the CBA. Watson suggested the added box read “The candidate may appeal and/or initiate a meeting with the President (see IV.A.4).” Oberem accepted this change to his motion. An oral vote was taken.

Motion #7 M/S/P

To accept Amendment #3 as re-amended

Carmen Nava expressed concern about possibly conflicting language regarding “standards” at II.D.4. and V.B. Laurie Stowell moved to strike the first sentence of II.D.4., which reads “This procedures document does not address standards.” Norman seconded the motion. Nava opposed the striking of the sentence and Elise agreed. An oral vote was taken.

Motion #8 M/S/D
To strike the first sentence of II.D.4.

Vivienne Bennett moved to change the sentence to read “This procedures document does not *specify* standards.” Schmidt seconded the motion. Elise offered a friendly amendment to change the phrase “what counts” in the following sentence to “criteria.” Bennett and Schmidt accepted the amendment. An oral vote was taken.

Motion #9 M/S/P (unanimously)
To change the first two sentences of II.D.4. to read “This procedures document does not specify standards. Each Department may develop its own standards, including guidance on criteria in that unit.”

Wu expressed concern about requiring secret ballots at IV.G.7. and moved to strike the first sentence of that section. Watson seconded the motion. After a brief discussion, an oral vote was taken and the motion passed.

Motion #10 M/S/P
To strike the first sentence of IV.G.7.

An oral vote was taken on approval of the RTP policy, after which applause broke out.

Motion #11 M/S/P (unanimously)
To approve the RTP policy as amended

B. FAC Market Equity Policy – 2nd Reading

McDaniel reminded the Senate that the document was returned to the Senate by the administration to clarify the process to be followed depending upon whether the academic unit in question has a department structure, and other minor clarifications regarding the process. Schmidt noted that FAC had accepted a friendly amendment he made at an earlier meeting to strike “from another university” from the first sentence under the heading “Justification for Request;” however, that phrase still appears in the document. McDaniel responded that this was merely an oversight and the language should be struck.

Motion #12 M/S/P (unanimously)
To approve the market equity policy as amended previously

XIV. New Business

A. GEC Lower Division General Education (LDGE) Area C Revision – 1st Reading

Hamill introduced the item noting that the committee has been working with the Arts and Humanities faculty since the beginning of the year to develop a proposal for a revision to the Lower Division General Education (LDGE) Area C. The problem to be addressed was the multiple versions of GEH courses which did not always conform to the requirements for such a course. After five months, it was apparent that the Arts and Humanities faculty could not reach a consensus on a resolution. As a result, GEC developed the proposed guidelines based on the discussions which had taken place with an eye toward meeting students’ needs, requirements of Title V and E.O. 595, and faculty concerns. It is anticipated that the proposal, if approved, would take effect in AY 03/04. Faculty teaching GEH courses in the interim will be asked to modify them to fit the new criteria for C1 (Arts), C2 (Humanities) or interdisciplinary courses. Amade noted that the department chairs involved have approved the compromise.

B. GEC LDGE Area C New Course Proposal Form – 1st Reading

Hamill explained that the GEC received 10 or more pages of documentation regarding each course proposal, often responding to every GE guideline as well as every area specific criteria listed. She noted that the GE guidelines are true for all GE courses, and so those have been moved to the back of the form to be used as a reference. It is anticipated that responses to the area specific criteria will necessarily meet the general guidelines as well. In addition, computer competency criteria have been moved under Basic Skills. Finally, Item B on the form asks faculty to identify two or three learning outcomes and how these objectives will be assessed. It is hoped the new form will cut down dramatically on paperwork, but yet still provide meaningful information for the GEC to consider.

C. GEC LDGE Area D New Course Proposal Form – 1st Reading

Hamill explained that the committee also proposes a modification to the LDGE Area D form for the sake of consistency (there were no changes made to Area D content on the form). Hamill distributed copies of the proposed form revision. David Barsky noted that current versions of both forms are on the Academic Programs website. Bennett suggested a brief statement on each of the forms which explicitly states what GEC expects to see. Zwick suggested changing “should” to shall under C1 and C2. Hamill will discuss these suggestion with the committee.

D. GEC Recertification Resolution – 1st Reading

Hamill presented a resolution on recertification of Upper Division General Education (UDGE) courses, a process required by Title V. GEC recently reviewed over 60 courses (a written report for each plus syllabus), which took a significant amount of time, and resulted in the recertification of almost every course. After considering this effort, the GEC determined that the current procedure is too cumbersome and does not provide the type of information that reviewers need. Therefore, the committee has devised a proposal for a process that will be simpler for departments to use and provide more meaningful information for the GE program.

E. APP Certificate Policy – 1st Reading

Wu indicated the need for extending the current interim policy, which stated that the Senate would report on the effect of certificate programs on baccalaureate and master’s degree programs and determine whether to discontinue or continue – indefinitely or for a fixed time period – the interim policy. There has not been adequate time or activity to gauge the effects of certificate programs on other traditional programs. The proposal also includes some housekeeping changes as well as replacement of the term “residential programs” with “college-based programs.”

Diehr made a formatting suggestion. Schmidt suggested replacing “college-based” with “non-Extended Studies.”

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

The next Academic Senate meeting will be held May 15, 2002, from 1:15 – 3:00 p.m. in Commons 206.

Marcia Woolf, Academic Senate Coordinator

APPROVED: _____
Sharon Hamill, Secretary 01/02

Date: _____