

Minutes: April 15th, 1997

Minutes of the April 15, 1997 Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Mark Phillips at 2:10 p.m.

Senate Members Present: Eunice Aaron, Paul Barnes, Patricia Bartscher, Gerrie Baughman, Janet Buchholz, Rosa Casarez-Levison, Yu-Charn Chen, Michelle Cheng, Robert Cherny, James Collier, Jerry Duke, Gerald Eisman, Ken Fehrman, Newman Fisher, Will Flowers, Helen Gillotte, Helen Goldsmith, Peter Haikalis, Ann Hallum, Jennifer Hammett, Caroline Harnly, Mary Ann Haw, David Hemphill, Marlon Hom, Bonnie Homan, Rick Houlberg, Todd Imahori, Dane Johnson, Herb Kaplan, James Kelley, Thomas La Belle, Wanda Lee, Hollis Matson, Eugene Michaels, Joel Nicholson, Abdiel Oñate, Raymond Pestrong, Mark Phillips, Elisabeth Prinz, Mario Rivas, Roberto Rivera, Don Scoble, Peggy Smith, Lee Sprague, Lana Thomson, Patricia Wade, Mary Ann Warren, Penelope Warren, Nancy Wilkinson, Alfred Wong, Yim Yu Wong, Darlene Yee.

Senate Members Absent: S. Berlowitz(exc.), D. Terrell(exc.), S. Banerjee, K. Walsh, T. Usowicz(exc), M. Verhey(exc.), L. Lyles(exc.), M. Bernstein(exc.), G. Hammerstrom(exc.), R. Corrigan(exc.).

Senate Interns Present: Jaymee Sagisi.

Guests: M. Turitz, G. Whitaker, D. Schafer, M.B. Love, G. West, M. Mallare, J. Gregory, J. Randolph, V. Thompson, M. Potepan.

Announcements and Report

Chair's Report

- **Vice Chancellor Molly Broad** is leaving to become Chancellor of the University of North Carolina.
- Attached to this meeting's agenda is a **draft review of the baccalaureate**. The Educational Policies Council will review the draft at its next meeting; the Senate Executive Committee will review the draft during the summer; findings will be brought to the Senate in the early fall. *Input and responses to the draft are solicited.*
- A **draft copy of the Cornerstones report** has been received, however there are a limited number of copies. Several groups, amongst them--CUSP, the Senate, and the Deans Council--will be formulating a draft response. Chair Phillips stated that of particular interest is the first chapter concerning the Cornerstone principles. The SFSU task force, which attended the Monterey Conference, will meet May 1 to begin discussing a response to the document. CUSP will begin its discussions on April 21. The document will be the primary Executive Committee agenda item on April 22 and the Senate will include the Cornerstones document on its agenda for the meeting of April 29. This is also an agenda item on the Department Chairs meeting on April 24. Phillips felt that the focus should be on key issues particularly as related to the principles and as related to this campus. The identified key issues would be to help facilitate discussions. However, other items may be raised by the groups. The groups should also try to pose alternative ways of looking at the solution of some of these problems.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting of April 15, 1997

M/S/P (Hallum, Gillotte) to delete Item 10 and return that

item to the Senate floor after review by CRAC. As there were no objections, the agenda was **approved as amended**.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting April 1, 1997

M/S (Matson, Gillotte) to approve the minutes as written. As there were no objections, the minutes were **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #3 - Election of Member to the Academic Council of International Programs, CSU

Greta Glugoski/Social Work sought re-election and as there were no additional nominations from the floor, **M/S/P (Matson, Aaron)** to close nominations and elect **Greta Glugoski/Social Work** by acclamation.

Agenda Item #4 - Report from Vice President La Belle

Provost La Belle reported on the changing national and State scene in the funding of higher education, his personal observations on the funding in the CSU and for SFSU, and the budget priorities and requests that Academic Affairs will present to UBC for the next budget.

Since this campus will probably be capped in enrollment in a few years, **funding increases** will most likely have to be from other methods of financing. **La Belle** thought that outcomes will likely become the basis for additional financing, rather than seat time. This will probably lower the emphasis on student/faculty ratios as the basis for funding. **Performance indicators** are being used in some states for financing public colleges to make institutions accountable to the state legislature. He thought that performance factors will become a reality in the CSU. ELM and EPT policy changes are examples of this because it has been threatened that funding will be pulled out if campuses do not comply with the policy. **La Belle** predicted that the CSU will have something similar to institutional PSSIs and institutional merit-based funding. He felt that part of the campus funding will become based on performance indicators. Some possible performance indicators for SFSU include achievement scores, graduation rates, numbers of teachers (K-4) who become certified, the amount of education that is delivered off campus, certain classes of students who graduate, or reduction in remediation levels.

La Belle stated that if incentive funding becomes one element of budgeting, this campus will have to re-allocate funds or become more entrepreneurial and find new ways to create **funding sources**. Faculty retirements are one source for re-allocating funds. Currently the University waits for students to decide what they want to study and then the University reacts and allocates dollars. This necessitates a pool of dollars to cover these needs, so a re-investment pool may need to be created. Off-campus course offerings through the College of Extended Learning, the use of technology-mediated education, partnerships with community colleges in terms of course offerings, and changing the schedule of course offerings could be creative ways of generating funds.

La Belle also identified the budget priorities and requests to the UBC on behalf of Academic Affairs. One request is a **permanent faculty augmentation** of approximately \$500,000 to cover the increase in enrollment next year. A new program has been suggested to **support FERPs, lecturer salary step increases, and the hiring of tenure track faculty** without a resulting decrease in resources for instruction. This proposal would be to bring 78-120 new tenure track faculty to the campus over the next 3-4 years unrelated to any enrollment increases. Academic Affairs would pay 1/3 of the cost of the tenure track faculty and the college would pay 2/3, so that instructional resource base would remain constant. Operating expenditures also need additional funding. The Library needs additional funding. Based on the deans' requests, additional

funding will be requested for clerical and administrative support in the colleges. A request will be made for travel funds to be allocated centrally. Start up costs for new faculty hires will be requested. At least a portion of the funds for a director for the new Marion Wright Edleman Institute will be requested. The new Biomedical Research needs matching funds. Media purchases need to be funded. A mandatory raise for student assistants will also be requested. However, La Belle also reported that Vice President for Business and Finance Don Scoble has indicated that there are no new dollars for next year. La Belle asked senators to observe what is going on nationally and within the State and to follow Cornerstones. He further asked that if senators have reactions to these issues, to let him know.

Houlberg asked about outcomes assessment. He wondered if the CSU becomes like trade schools responding to the needs of the working people in California, will SFSU be training prison guards since that is where the workers will be? La Belle responded that the value system underlying Cornerstones is a market driven approach, however there is no clear consensus on what the performance indicators and outcomes should be.

Smith requested that if there is an increase in money for clerical support, that funding should filter down to the departments rather than staying at the college office level. **La Belle** responded that the deans have requested support on a wide level throughout the college.

Eisman remarked that since technology becomes obsolete quickly, there should be a system to stagger replacements over time and take advantage of new technologies as they arise. He cited all faculty across campus receiving new workstations last year as an example. **La Belle** responded that not all faculty received new workstations, lecturers did not. He agreed that staggering is important, usage patterns are important, and technology needs to be provided for new hires. **Scoble** explained that there is a development team that is working system-wide on internal, long term partnerships with businesses. The partnership would in part focus on building relationships with the private sector. In part it would also be to fund the infrastructure. These businesses would help provide the technology base to keep the CSU technologically current.

Agenda Item #5 - Report from our Statewide Senators

A summary of the meeting was attached to the agenda. **Cherny** stated that he has a copy of the minutes if anyone wanted to read them. He reported that the last session was a question and answer session with **Chancellor Munitz**. The Chancellor was asked how he felt about closing the faculty salary gap and if it was appropriate to raise the entire salary averages, especially if he thought that PSSIs were a way to do this rather than cost of living increases. Munitz responded that he saw PSSIs as "not a major vehicle for closing the gap." He further said that the salary gap should be closed by "a rising tide raises all boats" approach. Munitz also talked about Compact II and whether we want a higher paid faculty and higher student/faculty ratios or a poorer paid faculty and lower student/faculty ratios.

Aaron reported that the Chancellor said that President Corrigan frequently reminds Munitz and his staff that SFSU is not adequately funded for our students. Munitz said that he believes that SFSU is fully funded, but not at the rate SFSU would like.

Julian Randolph/Foreign Languages questioned if the Statewide Senators saw a relationship between Molly Broad leaving and the early demise of Cornerstones. **Cherny** replied that at the time of the meeting, her decision to leave had not been announced so it was not discussed.

Agenda Item #6 - Resolution Regarding Lecturer Inclusion in

the PSSI Process

Houlberg introduced this item indicating a change that had been made by the Executive Committee. In the second Whereas clause, the phrase "not to include a specific group" was changed to "to exclude a specific group."

Houlberg explained that President Corrigan had made at least two public pronouncements that led people to believe that he had a deliberate policy of excluding a large and valuable portion of the faculty from the PSSI process. Corrigan also said that there were other ways for lecturers to get changes in salary. Houlberg stated that there is very little evidence that lecturers are being successful in these other ways of getting changes in their salary. This resolution is a deliberate statement of support of many of the teaching faculty who are incredibly valuable to this campus yet do not receive enough recommendation, recompense, and award for their efforts.

Sprague stated his strong support for the resolution and encouraged its adoption. From his personal experience and observation, lecturers contribute much to the health of this community. He felt that for one segment of the community to be disadvantaged by not being able to participate in an equitable process of compensation demoralized lecturers, students, and all of the community. He felt that a strong, clear message should be made in support of lecturers in the PSSI process.

M/S (Cherny, Aaron) to amend the Resolved clause to read, "strongly objects to, and urges the President to reconsider." The Executive Committee considered this to be a friendly amendment.

Kelley responded to Houlberg's statement by questioning the evidence. He said that in the College of Science and Engineering lecturers move up the salary schedule after completing 12 units with essentially no review. He felt that lecturers can move all the way up the salary schedule without the peer review that tenure/tenure track faculty endure. He questioned how the data was gathered.

Houlberg responded that data didn't have to be gathered. The data came to the Executive Committee through comments in the open faculty meeting with the President, in writing from lecturers and tenured track faculty, and there was an overwhelming response in letter form, oral form, and e-mail form, from lecturers and tenure/tenure track faculty. Kelley urged the Senate not to vote on the resolution, which would censure the President, until the Senate could see the evidence.

Aaron responded to Kelley that the limit for a lecturer to receive a salary step increase is 24 units, not 12. She explained that for some lecturers who teach only 2 classes a semester, it takes a long time to accrue 24 units and become eligible. Additionally, she said that some lecturers have openly been told that their salary increase would result in not funding other sections or some other lecturer would have to be released from employment. These statements have come from department chairs and at least one dean.

Matson stated that regardless of who has what evidence, lecturers are part of Unit 3. All Unit 3 members are eligible for PSSI and the President has said that lecturers are not eligible. All this resolution does is make a statement that lecturers are part of Unit 3 and ought to be eligible for PSSI.

Jan Gregory/English said that the CSU as well as the CFA agreed to the principle that lecturers should be eligible to apply for and to receive performance-based pay. Lecturers should not be removed from the process as a class and no single administrator can re-write the collective bargaining agreement. This senate has appointed an ad hoc committee to work towards amelioration of some of the on-going issues related to lecturers on this campus.

Based on these previous decisions, she felt that it would seem perverse for the Senate not to adopt this resolution. She further stated that the absence of peer review is a sore point for many lecturers. She proposed that the units that do not have peer review in place should not use that as an excuse to not award performance-based pay to lecturers.

Phillips said that the resolution is not a censure of the President. It is an on-going effort to persuade the President that it is extremely important that lecturers not be discriminated against in this process. Lecturers should be considered in terms of the quality of their work. This is an effort to try to persuade the President to provide a just way to respond to lecturers and their PSSI applications. The ad hoc committee to revise the PSSI policy returned language to the policy which asks each college to have a separate list of lecturer recommendations as a clear way of recognition for lecturers. Phillips said he hoped that the President will not strike out that language as he did the last time. He hopes that in his actions, the President will demonstrate a respect for the position of lecturers. The goal of the solution is not to punish the President, but to accomplish something that is important.

Randolph stated that lecturers are highly evaluated and carefully considered every time they are up for re-appointment. He said that in this process lecturers are exposed in ways that he finds appalling.

M/S/P (Fisher, Matson) to move to second reading. **Cherny** responded to Kelley that until recently there have been two methods to increase base salary, the seniority process and across the board cost of living increases. Now there is a third method, merit pay. He felt that lecturers deserve to be covered by all three methods and for the Senate to say so is appropriate. Cherny said that he hopes no one thinks of this as a resolution of censure because it is not, it is an effort to persuade the President to reconsider his position.

P. Warren said that the contractual provisions for the PSSIs suggests that the CSU decision-makers think that rewarding merit among lecturers is provided for in that policy. She voiced her concern that over and above the basic question of fairness, if we operate on different assumptions on this campus, it puts one whole segment of the bargaining unit at a disadvantage. She said she would like to see consistency between the assumptions that are implied in the contract and the assumptions that are operative on this campus. She said that many people on this campus lamented the destructive potential for merit pay systems when this system was first introduced. She hoped that the Senate would not stay silent when they could object to at least one manifestation of this kind of divisiveness.

Casarez-Levison said that lecturers form a core part of the labor force of the University. Tenured faculty rely on this and it is very important to think of lecturers in terms of their quality. Some lecturers need incentives to stay at the University since they could make more money in business. PSSIs are also another way to assess the merit of a lecturer in terms of competence, quality, and performance. She felt that if the University is moving towards performance evaluations and indicators, then maintaining a system that is comparable amongst faculty is a good idea. She stated her support for the resolution.

Homan said that a lot of people feel the PSSI process itself is divisive among the faculty. By excluding any portion of Unit 3 personnel, it becomes more divisive, is inappropriate in this environment, and is demoralizing for a whole group of people. She felt that this policy can bring the faculty together rather than dividing the faculty. **M/S/P (Smith, Gillotte)** to close

debate. The vote was taken and the resolution **passed**.

Agenda Item #7 - Masters of Public Health in Community Health Education

CRAC Chair Ann Hallum introduced this item and introduced **Chair of Health Education Mary Beth Love** as a resource. After being passed by the Graduate Council, CRAC asked for further consultation by Nursing, Education, and Ethnic Studies. Following second review, this new curriculum comes forward as a consent item.

Cherny asked whether this would require additional faculty positions since graduate programs of this sort would ordinarily have a low student/faculty ratio. **Love** responded that the intention is to discontinue the current M.S. if this item is approved, so she sees a steady state. **M/S/P (Kelley, Smith)** to second reading. **M/S/P (Barnes, Fehrman)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed unanimously**.

Agenda Item #8 - Discontinuance of Concentration in Applied Economics

EPC Chair Peggy Smith introduced this item and introduced **Chair of Economics Michael Potepan** as a resource. She stated that this is part of a larger package in which a new degree is proposed. The attached material explains that the degree in Applied Economics is redundant in the Department and would become more redundant if their new degree is approved. The Economics Department has assured EPC that no current students or faculty will be adversely affected by this discontinuance.

M/S/P (Matson, Gillotte) to second reading. As there was no one seeking further debate on this item **M/S/P (Kaplan, Fehrman)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed unanimously**.

Agenda Item #9 - Revision to M.A. in Economics

CRAC Chair Ann Hallum introduced this item and Michael Potepan was once again introduced as a resource. Following the discontinuance of the degree in Applied Economics, this item responds to the professional demands for preparation in the field of Economics. **M.A. Warren** asked whether page 3 should read "proscribed list" as written, or "prescribed." **Potepan** replied that it should be "prescribed." **M/S/P (Aaron, Johnson)** to second reading. **M/S/P (Fehrman, Aaron)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed unanimously**.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Homan
Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, April 15,
1997
