

<p>Academic Senate September 18, 2012</p> <p>Present: Avwundiogba, Bice, Floyd, , Burroughs, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Johnson, Kane, Littlewood, Manrique, Marcell, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, , Vang, Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Steven Filling for Mark Thompson, Mark Grobner for Marina Gerson, Kurt Baker for AnaMarie Guichard and Salameh for Jackson.</p> <p>Excused: Eric Broadwater and Nhu-Y Stessman.</p> <p>Guest: John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Dennis Shimek, Brian Duggan, Lauren Byerly, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Annie Hor, and Kevin Nemeth.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>.</p> <p>First and Second Reading Item. 5/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of Faculty Control of the Curriculum Sense of the Senate. Passed.</p> <p>First and Second Reading of 6/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of AS-3093-12/FGA (Opposition to Proposition 32 Regarding Political Contributions by Payroll Deductions) — Sense of the Senate. Passed.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: October 2, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Cathlin Davis, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order

2:02pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of August 28, 2012

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Dennis Shimek, Brian Duggan, Lauren Byerly, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Annie Hor, and Kevin Nemeth.

5. Announcements

Colnic announced that the 6th conference for Sustainable Futures will be held on October 18-21. There will be events open in the mornings and evenings with some live talks on campus and workshops with students. There will be 20 or so speakers “beamed in” from international conferences, scientists, business people, social activists and lots of arts as well. This event is free to everyone from campus, and there will be something for everyone. Please encourage your students to take part in this event.

Duggan reminded us that the 9th Annual Technology Fair will be on October 3rd from 10am to 2pm in the lobby of the MSR building. There will be displays of technology for teaching and learning by staff members, faculty, and vendors. There will be giveaways and door prizes, including at least two Nooks. Look for the Postmaster announcements.

Retired faculty member Barbara Manrique announced that the Statewide ERFA has endorsed Proposition 30 and is against Proposition 32. This group of retired faculty are functioning and helping the campus and community as well.

Eudey reminded us that tomorrow is the faculty lecture series and we'll have Stuart Wooley, Biology professor discussing his Fulbright trip to Honduras. The talk is from 3:30-5pm in this room. Stuart will be discussing his mid-career faculty project. On Thursday September 27th, from 1-2:30pm we will have a discussion of capstone courses. Everyone is welcome to come and share your experiences. Applications for Faculty Voices are still being accepted.

We have received a grant opportunity from the Chancellor's office to create learning communities to focus on various issues. FDC will be talking about this on Thursday. Possible topics or speakers for the Instructional Institute Day will also be discussed so please share ideas with Donna Andrews.

ASI VP, Mariam Salameh announced that on September 25th, from 11am-2pm the ASI is holding a National voter registration day. There will be a live band, food, activities and giveaways. Please announce this in your classes.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

No comments or questions.

7. Information items

a. WASC

Speaker Grobner said that a committee is being formed to start the process of gathering information and writing the response to WASC. WASC has offered to delay one report/visit so that the two can happen at the same time. We can combine the EDD special visit with the fall 2013 special visit. The Provost is working on a charge for the WASC special visit committee and will discuss it with SEC, so we're making progress.

b. RPT

Speaker Grobner said that the responses from last year's survey are being looked at by the committee. There will be another survey this year that will cast a wider net (not just chairs and deans as it was last time). We will be using the current responses we have now to formulate the new survey.

8. Discussion Items

a. Upper Division GE

Filling said that everybody should have received the original memo that the Board of Trustees sent by email, stating that the Board was going to look at the possibility of removing the upper division GE as a system requirement. That has been pulled back. The new focus is on students graduating on time.

Filling moved the resolution on the floor regarding faculty control of the curriculum, seconded by McGhee.

5/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of Faculty Control of the Curriculum Sense of the Senate

Be it Resolved that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus reaffirm the faculty's primary responsibility for the curriculum as noted in the AAUP Principles Statements and in the CSU Board of Trustees Statement on Collegiality, and be it further

Resolved that the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus ask that the Board of Trustees defer item 3 on the September 2012 agenda of the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees, "Upper-Division General Education and Degree Completion, Information (Amended) " until such time as the faculty of the CSU have been consulted and have engaged in thoughtful consideration of the matter.

Rationale

The Academic Senate of the California State University was notified of this item on Friday, 31 August. That notification was the first time faculty had been advised of the item, let alone consulted. The ASCSU Executive Committee, which had held multiple meetings with Chancellor's Office executives and staff over the summer to develop better working relationships and to share upcoming items, was taken aback by the precipitate appearance of this item on a BoT committee agenda, and devoted significant time to meeting with various Chancellor's Office executives and seeking to determine the origin of the item and the reason that no faculty consultation was involved.

As a result of ASCSU's work, the agenda item was "amended" from a request to eliminate upper division General Education requirements for bachelors degrees to a mandate for 120/150 unit maximums for degree programs. The ASCSU did not affirm that "amended" item, nor is it clear that either ASCSU or the faculty of the CSU agree that the proposed maximum units is a reasonable or pedagogically wise goal.

This resolution is in support of faculty control of the curriculum. A week before the Board of Trustees memo was sent out Statewide Academic Senate had asked if there was a move to change the upper division GE requirements. The statewide Senate was told that it needs to be less reactive and engage in more active participation in upcoming issues. Then the memo came out with an issue not discussed in that meeting.

Filling spent most of Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday talking to the Chancellor's office trying to explain how violated we felt having our control over the curriculum taken away. There is now an amended item for the Board of Trustees meeting, but it might not be any better. The item includes a statement that Statewide Academic Senate agrees with a maximum of 120 units for undergraduate degrees, which we did not agree to. We need to recognize the difference between providing education and counting hours students spend in classes.

Filling motioned to move the resolution to a second reading, seconded by Nagel.

Discussion: The Board of Trustees meets tomorrow so we can't wait the normal amount of time, and keeping quiet is the same as acquiescing.

Eudey noted that this is similar to other statements we've made, so we have a sense of where faculty and the campus stand on this issue. The rationale and resolution is consistent with prior resolutions so due to the time crunch it's prudent to move to a second reading.

Results of the vote to move to a second reading, 41 for, 1 against, 2 abstained.

Vote results. 39 yes 3 no 2abstained. Motion passes. We're at a second reading.

McGhee noted that this issue is not new. While he was faculty at a Tennessee campus, all programs in state of Tennessee changed to 120 hours. Engineering was 140 units. The idea of 30 units a year, over a period of 4 years is problematic and implies that knowledge is static. Different students have different needs. Business is limited in how many business courses we can offer. It can only be half of the total requirements, by accreditation requirements. We'd lose 1 business course. We're trying to educate our students and prepare them for their careers. We can't do this just because it's convenient if it's not beneficial to our students and society.

Eudey noted that there has been discussion at Statewide over this being an improvement over the prior proposal for GE. Looking at 120 units is better solution than trying to get rid of GE. As Steve Filling stated there are lots of ways to get to the 120. The concern is that this proposal is being discussed this week with intention of being voted on in November, and it would require programs with 125 units to be revamped for fall 2013 catalog. These changes would have to go through the review process by early January to be ready for catalog. That is not necessarily an appropriate amount of time to do the thoughtful engagement that is necessary to change a program. The timeline would force us to work on this before we even know if it's real. We're told that not everyone can meet that deadline, but if they all come in by the print deadline the catalog would be ready on time. Eudey feels it is really inappropriate for the Board of Trustees to make this change without faculty having a say. The Board needs to know we're not happy with it.

Results of the vote, 39 for, and 3 against, the resolution passed.

9. Open Forum

Nagel motioned from the floor to present a Sense of the Senate resolution opposing Proposition 32, seconded by Eudey.

6/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of AS-3093-12/FGA (Opposition to Proposition 32 Regarding Political Contributions by Payroll Deductions) — SENSE OF THE SENATE

Be it Resolved that the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus strongly oppose Proposition 32 regarding political contributions by payroll deduction; and be it further

Resolved that the Academic Senate distribute this resolution to the following:

- *The “No on Proposition 32” campaign
- *The CSU Board of Trustees
- *The University President
- *California Faculty Association
- *Academic Senate of the CSU
- *Associated Students, Inc.
- *State Assembly and Senate members representing the CSU Stanislaus service area
- *The Modesto *Bee*
- *The Turlock *Journal*

RATIONALE:

The Academic Senate of the CSU passed a resolution on this issue in its September 13-14 meeting. Their resolution is attached, and provides a rationale regarding the specific political issue involved.

It should be pointed out that unions that collect political contributions via payroll deduction do so (1) in order to protect and advance the interests of members, and (2) voluntarily from each member.

Further, from time to time, the Academic Senate expresses positions on current issues of broader concern, whether political, social, or educational. It is appropriate in our roles as members of the communities we serve, as well as persons this Proposition would likely affect adversely.

Nagel also shared the following resolution that was passed at the statewide Academic Senate on September 14, 2012.

**Opposition to Proposition 32 Regarding Political Contributions
by Payroll Deductions
AS-3093-12/FGA**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) strongly oppose Proposition 32 regarding political contributions by payroll deduction; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the following:

- The “No on Proposition 32” campaign
- The Board of Trustees
- Campus Presidents and Senate Chairs
- The California Faculty Association
- Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges
- Academic Senate of the University of California
- The Governor of the State of California
- The California legislative leadership

RATIONALE: *Proposition 32 “Political Contributions By Payroll Deduction Contributions to Candidates. Initiative Statute” prohibits unions, corporations, or government contractors from using payroll-deducted funds for political purposes. It also prohibits unions and corporations from contributing directly or indirectly to candidates and candidate controlled committees. Proposition 32 permits other political expenditures to continue unrestricted, including corporate expenditures and expenditures by special interests from resources not limited by the payroll deduction prohibition.*

Finally, the California Legislative Analyst estimates that the approval of Proposition 32 “Political Contributions by Payroll Deduction Contributions to Candidates. Initiative Statute” will require implementation costs to state and local governments potentially exceeding \$1 million annually. Historically, ASCSU has opposed the effective silencing of voices which advocate for higher education in California. Approval of Proposition 32 would effectively reduce the ability of ordinary citizens to participate in the broad expansion of democracy through the exercise of their voices in the public sphere. We join non-partisan political organizations including the League of Women Voters of California and Common Cause and public educational institutions including Los Angeles Community College District, (Com. No. BT3 passed 8/22/12) and several school districts who have opposed Proposition 32. Any attempt to subvert the range of public employee groups from expressing values, opinions, and information regarding public policy via organized unions, corporations, or government contractors, whose necessary expenses are covered by payroll deductions would result in a lessening of discussion and debate central to a democratic society.

Approved - September 14, 2012

This is a political issue, but it affects us directly so it is quite appropriate to speak on this issue.

Eudey said that the discussion at the Statewide Senate was around whether proposition 32 is an appropriate topic to make a statement on for Academic Senates. We lose voice when we lose the ability to have our payroll deductions going to a political voice. She thinks this it is appropriate for us to have this resolution as well.

Strahm thinks it is pretty sad that we have to do this. Corporations can have protection at the level of the Supreme Court, but we have to fight as members of organized labor to do the same.

Nagel moved to waive the first reading, seconded by Strahm.

Filling said that tomorrow is the kickoff of the big campaign to support proposition 32, so we need to speak now.

Speaker Grobner asked for any discussion on moving to second reading. No discussion offered. Results of the vote, 39 for, 4 against, 1 abstained. Moved to a second reading.

McGhee feels that these types of issues, where people are trying to restrict other people's ability to pursue their interests are scary and seem to be happening across the country. Some people seem to think others will be hindered in their support. Why should we give up rights that other people have?

Sarraille is gratified that members of the Senate have put this proposal on the floor. Corporations already outspend labor unions. Some people seem to think that labor unions are a giant force steering everyone else around. Labor unions are democratic institutions and deal with issues that are important to them and deserve a voice. A vote in favor of this resolution is a vote in favor of people's rights to express themselves.

Strahm noted that anyone here who has a family member who is a police officer should know that they bargain for safety vests and the types of ammunition they buy. Our workplace health is bargained for, as is our health care. We should have the right to stand up for ourselves as opposed to having someone who doesn't like us try to shut us all down.

Eudey said that the legislature decided how to define service for faculty. If this proposition happens, our union would not be able to speak to similar issues.

McGhee noted that students may not remember things that have happened before. We're going back to the days of the robber barons. If people don't know what happened once, it can happen again. Maybe this is part of an overall plan to dumb down America so people can do what they want, as they did 120 years ago.

Results of the vote, 40 for, 2 no, 2 abstained. The resolution passed.

The Chancellor will propose an additional \$100 dollars per unit for courses repeated, and a additional \$200 per unit for units in excess of 16, beginning fall 2013. This is may only be for

undergraduate. An example from the Chancellor is that students register for 5 units, then drop 1 unit and that's the problem this is intended to address.

McGhee asked how they define repeating courses.

Eudey noted that this was the example that the Chancellor gave, but there is no clear definition of when the course is allowed to be repeated. Some courses are repeated because the student didn't complete the course or got a D and need to retake it for the units. There are other courses that are repeated because it's allowed by the program. The BoT is voting on this without information on drop dates and courses you're allowed to repeat. We've already passed rules that you can't repeat a course you got a C or better in.

McGhee said that this may just be another example of people going forward without knowing what's going on. The purpose of students building a schedule that works for them doesn't always work. Students are trying to get through as best they can, and now we're going to penalize them for realizing a class won't work. It's going to hit students who have the least resources to respond.

Is there an exclusion for courses that require repeated registrations?

Provost Strong asked if this is coming from a meeting at statewide? Filling clarified that it's coming from Statewide, with corrected information from the Board of Trustees today.

Regalado asked if for an update on the process for hiring a new Chancellor. Filling noted that they had interviews last week at an undisclosed airport with a semifinalist pool. There will be interviews next week for possibly finalist pool.

Colnic asked if there is any discussion to open up the process. Filling said no, there are no indications of that.

Eudey said that there would be a few additional people invited to final interviews, maybe. There is anticipation that a decision would be made in October for a vote in November at the Board of Trustees meeting. Also related is that the Cal State LA President is retiring.

Clerk Cathlin Davis announced that the Library will hold an open house this Friday, September 21st. There will be a reception in the evening to open the Armin Schulz children's book collection. Davis is giving a talk at 10:30am on Louisa May Alcott. Please share with colleagues and students.

Filling reported that at the Board of Trustees is meeting today to take action on the three student fee increases. The issue of super seniors, course repetition, and excess units was postponed until the November Trustees meeting.

10. Adjournment
3:05pm