

**2002/2003 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES**  
**October 28, 2002**

**I.**

Chair Brent also welcomed Dean Meyers from the College of Education, and Dr. Mary Jo Gorney-Moreno.

Chair Brent stated that President Caret will once again host the members of the Academic Senate at his home for a holiday reception. This year's reception will be held on Sunday, December 8, 2002, from 3-6 p.m. A formal invitation will be sent to Senators from the President's office in the near future.

Chair Brent turned the meeting over to Senator Sabalius who is our representative to the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP). Senator Sabalius said the ACIP met Thursday and Friday of last week in Long Beach. They discussed the various campus partner programs. Two of the programs were suspended. The Zimbabwe program was suspended due to costs associated with the exchange rate, rampant inflation, food shortages, and the fact that the University is on strike. The program in Israel was suspended largely due to financial reasons. Although there is hope that Israel will be reinstated in future years, ACIP is looking to replace the Zimbabwe program. The ACIP discussed the International Faculty Partnership Seminar. We currently have a faculty exchange program in which our faculty teach up to a ten day seminar at our partner campuses. This year was the first year this was done, and we had exchanges with our Mexico and Germany partner



**A. University Library Board**

Stephen Branz, Chair of the University Library Board, presented *AS 1188, Policy Resolution:*

---

---

**B. Professional Standards Committee –**

Senator Katz presented *AS 1189, Policy Resolution: Procedures to be Followed when Administering SOTEs (First Reading)*.

Senator Katz said he wanted to be clear that they were separating the administrative procedures from the reconsideration of the SOTE, for the time being. Senator Katz thanked everyone, especially Senator Onkvisit, who provided comments on the evaluation process. Senator Katz also thanked the members of the Professional Standards Committee for their hard work, especially Gilda Pour, Joe Merighi, Shannon

presented some problems with colleagues teaching at different times, etc. Senator Stacks said the issue of students wanting training on what the SOTE was all about came up at a Senate last year as well as the issue of whether there were other methods of evaluating instructors. Senator Stacks asked whether the Professional Standards Committee had addressed these two issues. Senator Katz said the Professional Standards Committee had an extensive discussion about whether or not they should recommend or encourage an orientation process for the proctors. The committee decided to leave that up to the departments. The Professional Standards Committee didn't feel comfortable making this a requirement. Senator Stacks clarified that what she meant was that the students in the classes didn't have a good feeling about what the SOTE meant, not the proctors. Senator Katz said that the Professional Standards Committee had not addressed this issue, nor had they addressed the issue of other methods of evaluation.

Senator Rickford commended the committee. Senator Rickford asked whether we can really control the number of people that will be sitting in the classes. Senator Rickford asked whether we can really control the number of people that will be sitting in the classes.

essed thTBT/TT0490.673hether we can W.96.312.0221 560.1556 1m(Senator 168.)7141490.673hether03 ia9.96 443.3897 548.5751 1m(ber of pe9



**C. Curriculum & Research - None**

**D. Organization & Government -**

Senator Stacks presented *AS 1187, Policy Resolution: Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)*. Senator Stacks said that this resolution is asking for a change in policy F98-2. Senator Stacks said that during the four years since the policy was passed, there have been some questions as to what is actually meant by nomination of the department chair. Senator Stacks said as Senators may know, there are actually two kinds of nominations that actually occur. One is within the department itself whereby a number of people will have nominations for department chair. After this, a vote is usually taken and then that vote is a recommendation or nomination for the President's consideration. Thus, it is not really an election of a chair, but rather a nomination or recommendation that goes through the Dean to the President for approval. Senator Stacks said that this is the current process, with the voting population being only tenured and tenure-track faculty. Senator Stacks stated that the concern that has been raised is that there is no role for the temporary faculty within our departments. The Organization and Government Committee attempted to come up with a way to include temporary faculty in this process. Senator Stacks said that when the Organization and Government Committee first wrote this policy four years ago, they thought that this was strictly a personnel issue. Senator Stacks said that it turns out that there is a specific section in the faculty contract that deals with the selection of department chairs, and it is separate from personnel issues. The Organization and Government Committee is suggesting a process whereby departments hold a meeting at which all temporary, tenured, and tenure-track faculty can discuss those individuals recommended for department chair. Senator Stacks said the next step would be for the tenured and tenure-track faculty to take a secret vote determining which names should be forwarded to the President via the college dean. The President would then make his selection for department chair.

**Questions:**

Senator Goodman stated that he thought the fourth whereas clause needed to be more definitive before we change the policy. Senator Stacks asked Senator Lee for comments. Senator Lee said that we could just refer to the pertinent article instead of talking about the interpretation.

Senator Nellen suggested changing the numbering in item number one.

Senator Hamill said he was really confused. Does this change mean that part-time people can or cannot vote for the department chair? Senator Stacks said that part-time temporary faculty would now be involved in the nominations process, but would not be involved in the vote. Senator Hamill asked what is the difference between this policy and the current policy. Chair Brent said that he was the Chair of the Organization and Government Committee in 1998, and he stated that he has always interpreted the existing policy as saying what the new policy codifies.

Senator Shifflett suggested that there be a whereas clause that states that the current CFA agreement clearly places the selection of departm



Lee stated that the dispute involved the CFA contract, and that the CFA argued that temporary faculty are department mem

issue. AVP Cooper said we will be in better shape in 2005 than we are now simply because the program planning process requires assessment in the major as departments go through it, and that will be further along than we are today. AVP Cooper said the first place we need help from the Senate is in selecting a Chair of the Steering Committee to guide us through WASC. This is a position that will receive .50 assigned time in the spring, and next academic year 1.0 assigned time, or be split between two people each with .50 assigned time each. AVP Cooper said that person who will help organize this whole process will be selected jointly by the Executive Committee and the committee that drafted the proposal. AVP Cooper has asked for nominations, and he has twisted the arms of several talented people on campus. However, he has yet to come up someone willing. AVP Cooper said he would be interested if anyone has a nominee that is someone good at writing, and relatively well connected across campus. AVP Cooper said the handbook of the standards and guidelines is relatively large. However, anybody who would like a copy of the accreditation handbook should contact him in Undergraduate Studies.

### **Questions:**

Senator Bros said that the Assessment Committee discussed having a retreat once a year for each department with a facilitator to assist. AVP Cooper asked if anyone had used the current Director of Assessment in that way. Senator Bros said not yet to her knowledge.

Senator Shifflett asked what kind of feedback have they gotten from other CSUs that have been through this process. AVP Cooper said there was a meeting last spring where several campuses that had been all the way through the process reported on it. AVP Cooper said he suspected they had been carefully selected. They had nothing but praise for the process. In the discussion around the room of those people that weren't on the panel, some alternative positions were presented. AVP Cooper said it seemed to depend primarily on how well the campus was able to get buy-in from the faculty. Those campuses that got large buy-in from the faculty did quite well. AVP Cooper said that the new standards leave you a lot of flexibility as to what you are going to do. What that means is that you can either take that as an opportunity to decide what you really want to work on, or you can see that flexibility as simply lack of structure and sit there spinning your wheels, which is what some campuses have done. However, there are some that are very happy with the results of this new process.

overall description of how the university was ensuring quality within programs, and then they picked two or three departments to see how that played out in specifics. AVP Cooper said the WASC Self-Study that we will deliver to the review committee will be at this extraction level one about what Senator Singh just described.

Senator Donoho said that we might be facing a solvency issue within the next two years. Senator Donoho also said that she really thinks this will a very positive experience for the campus with all the new initiatives.

AVP Cooper said that one of the things he would point out about the proposal is that there are a lot of goals followed by challenges that are in the proposal. There is a paragraph on the first page of the proposal that AVP Cooper tried to write very carefully to indicate that we will not be addressing all of those goals. These are examples of the kinds of issues that the university will be turning its attention to during this review process. AVP Cooper stated that this is going to make the expanded committee really important, because in the next six months we have to decide which of those goals we are going to look into deeply. AVP Cooper said that there will be representatives from the Senate as well as representatives from around campus on the committee, and we need to be sure we have broad enough representation so that each of the constituencies on campus believe they had a shot at getting the issues they are most concerned with on the table.

**Senator Stacks presented AS 1190, Sense of the Senate resolution: Authorizing Senate Sponsorship of a Forum on the Budget and Academic Affairs.** Senator Stacks said that these forums would be offered by the PROMISE 444.18 Tm(s) update the cam

---



