

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS**

## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 12, 2005

**Present:** Brown, Davis, DeKatzew, Doraz, Estrella, Feldman, Filling, Garcia, Jaasma, Jacobs, Johnson, Lawson, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Peterson, Petrosky, Regalado, Rodgers, Schoenly, Senior, Shipley, Stessman, Tavernier, Thomas, Weddle, Young.

**Proxies:** Wendt for Dauwalder, Peterson for R. Floyd, Sarraile for Zarling.

**Absent:** Foreman, Jensen, Petratos, Sutherland, Tan, Thompson, Tynan.

**Guests:** Asher, Boffman, Bradley, Burns, Clapper, Schulz, Stephens.

8/AS/05/GC--Proposal for Graduate Certificate in Middle/Junior High School Studies, APPROVED

19/AS/04/USPSC--Vision Statement/University Values, APPROVED

9/AS/05/SEC--Definition of Consultation, FIRST READING

10/AS/05/SEC--Academic Freedom, APPROVED

11/AS/05/GC--Proposal for Graduate Certificate in Child Development, FIRST READING

12/AS/05/SEC--Resolution on Proposed Retirement Plan, FIRST READING

13/AS/05/UEPC--Amendment to Academic Calendar Preparation Policy, FIRST READING

---

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, April 26, 2005  
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

---

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to order at 2.44pm.

2. Agenda was amended to add item 7f: 14/AS/05/LAC/RSCAP--Amendment to Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Grant Policy; approved as amended.

3. Minutes of 3/22/05 amended as follows: Corrected misspelling of Jane Rodgers's name. In first sentence under 8a (Vision), "in Senate" should read "approved by Academic Senate." Minutes approved as amended.

#### **4. Announcements**

Regalado announced that the Department of History is sponsoring the Phi Alpha Theta History Honors Society Conference this Saturday, 9am-2pm in Bizzini Hall. 30-35 papers from undergraduate and graduate students in various Northern California Universities competing. These are dream students: with passion, exceptional research qualities, and they know how to write.

Filling attended the Foundation Board retreat at Carmel Valley, and distributed an 11 year retrospective which may provide insight into how one sector of the community perceives us.

Filling also reported that the Excellence Initiative Committee met, and sent President Hughes their suggestions, and are awaiting reply.

Filling also reported that our colleague Ray Zarling is back in the hospital, and would appreciate contact; send him email: rayz@altair.csustan.edu.

Finally, Filling reported that SEC was requested by the Counseling Faculty to look at some issues; SEC is in touch with VPSA Morgan-Foster, and people are communicating.

Suzanne Burns announced that the Funding Success Handbook is online and locatable through the Research and Sponsored Programs website. The handbook attempts to integrate procedures and policies to guide faculty through the grant development and submission process. It gives information for developing proposals, and a sense of the services available on campus for assisting the process. Contact S. Burns with any questions.

**5. Questions about reports:** none.

#### **6. Action Items**

##### **a. 8/AS/05/GC—Proposal for Graduate Certificate in Middle/Junior High School Studies**

Mimi Bradley presented the resolution and noted the title change to "...Studies" with approval. Bradley pointed out that we have no such program and that significant interest exists. Middle school is a peculiar time of life. Issue has been addressed by systemwide and earmarked as a focus area, and identified by CSU Chancellor as a priority for program development.

Schulz added that last week the Merced Board of Education presented a conference on the topic. It is the biggest area of neglect in SS Credential Programs. This is a special and unique group of students, and represents an interesting challenge for teachers. He is extremely excited about the program, starting a cohort in Fall. Merced Superintendent and Stockton both very interested in regional cohorts. At least 30 people mentioned interest at the conference. It's a focused certificate, but encourages students to do MA Ed work.

Feldman asked if courses for certificate would be applicable for MA. Schulz clarified yes.

Vote on 8/AS/05 passed with one abstention.

## **b. 19/AS/04/USPSC–Vision Statement/University Values**

Filling introduced the resolution as a Second Reading item which had previously been referred to SEC; that since that time, discussions with AD Boffman and others, and further conversations with students, administrators, members of the community, etc. have all contributed to this revised form returning for action.

Boffman provided a draft amended resolution with a new rationale, which tried to make more clear the roles, rather than simply the process. Vision and Values stand as adjusted. Students still wish to add a value statement; Boffman proposes they report it to SPSC when it is ready. The Five-Year Goals were represented in two ways: one in a "clean" version, and also in a version with the editorial changes apparent. Boffman concluded by pointing out various changes in goals in response to suggestions from various constituencies.

It was MS O'Brien/Petrosky to accept Boffman's revised resolution:

**RESOLVED:** that the Academic Senate endorse the campus vision, core values, and strategic goals for 2010 developed from the inclusive processes conducted in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 as presented by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

### **RATIONALE:**

The University's first strategic plan was developed and approved in 1997. The mission and plan, as presented in Pathways to the Future, guided university planning, decision making and budget priorities during the ensuing years. In Fall of 2002, the University began an inclusive and consultative process designed to review progress of the initial plan and to develop a new a strategic plan to lead us into the next decade. With guidance of the strategic planning committees and in consultation with the internal and external campus community, the vision statement, university core values and 5 year goals have been developed. In conjunction with the University's learning-centered mission, the vision statement and university core values provide direction for the future and clarification of essential values. The five year goals will guide campus priorities, budgetary decisions and activities in the coming years.

### **VISION STATEMENT**

CSU Stanislaus strives to become a major center of learning, intellectual pursuit, artistic excellence and cultural engagement for California's greater Central Valley and beyond. We will serve our diverse student body, communities and state by creating programs, partnerships and leaders that respond effectively to an evolving and interconnected world.

### **UNIVERSITY VALUES**

In order to achieve our mission and vision:

\* We inspire all members of the campus community to demand more of self than we do of others to attain new knowledge and challenge assumptions. We challenge one another to be fully engaged, responsible citizens with the ethics, knowledge, skills, and desire to improve self and community.

\* We value learning that encompasses lifelong exploration and discovery through intellectual integrity, personal responsibility, global and self-awareness, grounded in individual student-faculty interactions.

\* We are a student centered community committed to a diverse, caring, learning focused environment that fosters collegial, reflective and open exchange of ideas.

\* We, as students...

\* We, as faculty, elicit, nurture, and enhance the different voices of our selves, students and communities through deliberate engagement, continual discovery and ongoing transformation.

\* We, as staff and administrators, contribute to the learning environment by demonstrating the knowledge, skills and values that serve and support the University's mission.

#### Discussion:

Petrosky suggested that decisions are concrete; hence language of vision should emphasize "interpretations," rather than decisions. Peterson pointed out that it sounds like there's another document somewhere that is the interpretation. These are guides to action.

Vote to amend the resolution, using Boffman's new language, passed with one abstention.

Feldman asked about "respond" in the last sentence of the Vision; should it be changed to "contribute" or "enhance"? Educational institutions should be in the forefront of change, not behind, and our Vision should reflect that.

Nagel, in a point of order asked whether we can change anything but the resolution. Speaker confirmed this, and Boffman pointed out that minor wordsmithing to the language of the documents was possible after any adoption. Nagel then asked if we were voting to approve something that's going to be changing, what is it we're voting for? Will this all change without any advice of the Senate? Boffman responded that the specific objectives can change, especially at a later date, but noted that if significant changes were contemplated, they will come to AS. Nagel noted that this practice seems peculiar. Morgan-Foster pointed out that the student value will be added later.

Jaasma asked if the only change is the addition of the student value; Boffman said yes, and let's go forward with it. We shouldn't need a new resolution every time we change a word. Myers asked Senators to take Nagel's point seriously; if the document is intended to be revised, we shouldn't be voting it up or down. If only ASI will add a student-specific value, fine; if other bodies start to tinker with it, then no. Boffman pointed out that circumstances can change objectives. If, in two or three years our circumstances change, we'll need to tweak the objectives. Peterson suggested that perhaps we were being too paranoid.

Jaasma asked if ASI would be able to get to a value statement in time. Estrella confirmed it was in the final stages. Morgan-Foster suggested we go forward with this as is, if what it lacks is merely the student section, and suggested that Boffman is saying if there's a big change, she's going to bring it back, but it shouldn't really change. Boffman said she would have preferred to have taken this up with the student piece; but would hate to see this unfold again.

O'Brien called the question. Nagel asked for a vote to call.

Vote to close discussion passed by voice.

Vote on 19/AS/04 passed, with several abstentions.

Speaker Filling passed the Turkey Leg to Petrosky.

## **7. First Reading Items**

### **a. 9/AS/05/SEC–Definition of Consultation**

It was MS Filling/Johnson

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus reaffirm 21/AS/01/SEC, Position on Shared Governance:

The Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus embrace the three principles of Executive Vice-Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Spence's initiative on shared governance; viz.,

1. Early inclusion of faculty in identifying issues and in agenda setting,
2. Ongoing consultation, much of it face-to-face, as an iterative process between faculty and administration to reach understanding, and,
3. Substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreement cannot be reached.

And, concerning the exercise of authority over educational functions, the Academic Senate assert that the Faculty generate, define, and sculpt policy for the educational functions of the University while administrative authority is secondary in these areas. Further, the Academic Senate invite the Administration to join us in adopting the principles of the preceding resolved clauses as the campus model.

and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus define consultation as: iterative, deliberative discussion with appropriate governance bodies specified in the Constitution of the General Faculty and be it, further,

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate urge the President to endorse this definition.

**RATIONALE:** The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) articulates the Legislature's understanding that "joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions." Precedent, practice, contractual responsibility, and the CSU Board of Trustee's (BOT) CSU Statement on Collegiality "assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Trustees," adding that "[f]aculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons." The BOT also recognizes the "value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which for which the faculty has primary responsibility."

21/AS/01/SEC accepted, with elaborations, by the provost, and lacking response from the president, describes principles and process for shared governance; however, to ensure appropriate joint decision making, it is necessary that consultation take place with the faculty representatives as set forth in the Constitution of the General Faculty.

This definition foregrounds situations which are not consultation. A partial list includes: distribution of information via facnet or other listservs or mass memoranda; inclusion of faculty members on administrative committees; attendance by faculty at meetings, forums, summits, retreats, etc., even if those faculty members are members of the bodies noted in the definition. Consultation takes place with the representative bodies as opposed to taking place with the discrete members of those bodies.

#### Discussion:

Filling introduced the resolution by noting the history behind the resolution, and wanted to make clear a chain of events: AS passed a resolution as a Sense of Senate enunciating faculty values, sent it to the Provost and President as memo, not for signature. The Provost replied. The President chose not to respond, which does not mean that she did not approve. Filling argued that the best way to appreciate this resolution is to undergo the experience of being Speaker. A situation occurs, not necessarily due to malice, when it is hard to tell when someone is deliberating with Steve and when with Speaker Filling. This resolution would distinguish between individual faculty members and faculty deliberative bodies: when "consulting" with faculty, administration needs to talk to deliberative bodies.

Wendt distributed the original response from the Provost to the Sense of Senate resolution, and also the Provost's recent statement addressing the current resolution. Wendt conveyed apologies from the Provost for his absence. His position discusses further reflections, and a further response to the Sense of Senate. Wendt reported that he wants to underscore that point three of the second resolved clause defines "consultation" too narrowly. The Provost acknowledges that consultation with governing bodies is appropriate, but that this may narrow sense of "consult" way too much. Experience suggests that different examples of consultation wouldn't fit in here. Also, point four gets to the heart of the matter: a determination of what represents "full consultation" demands that we need to work through it, we need to consult on "consultation." The Provost agrees with the mere sentiment that just presence is not consultation, but is asking for further discussion to reach widespread agreement.

Stephens questioned the last paragraph. She values faculty participation, and it concerns her that this participation isn't consultation. She suggested that we need more of a continuum of consultation, and concluded by pointing out that she didn't think AS was asking for us to bring things to committee without their having heard about it.

Filling offered his sense that "consultation" is fraught with official connotations, but it shouldn't get in the way of participation. Consultation needs a formal definition. He is leery that the slope of consultation is wide; we're trying to establish what is formal and what is participation. The Speaker shouldn't be responsible for making all the decisions. Stephens suggested there should be a way that can be worded, by trying to go through COC and other official mechanisms.

Peterson offered a friendly amendment that the beginning of consultation is not sufficient to define consent or consultation. Don't want to say these participations are bad. The word needs to spread that we don't want to discourage or inhibit participation. We need also to be careful with the word "iterative": stuff at AS sometimes gets agreed to. It's rare, but it could happen. Perhaps we say that if AS passes it, it's definitely

consultation.

Nagel suggested that it seems the Provost's objection is to scope, and that the Provost seems to imagine this through differing contexts; that what consultation is depends on context, and asked whether addressing the scope of consultation would be appropriate. Filling noted that appropriate consultation can take place with a CRC of a college, for example. It doesn't mean it has to go to the AS or Speaker, but the determination of what's appropriate rests with faculty. We can find all kinds of semantics for "appropriate," and we want to avoid that. Wendt stated that the Provost's comments include a statement that he would have appreciated seeing this resolution before this point in time. Filling noted that the issue has been on our agenda for the entire year, and was part of the agenda of Speakers Thompson and Russ, as well. This resolution is a result of those conversations.

Wendt offered that the phrase "appropriate governing bodies specified in the constitution" was at the heart of the argument over the limitation of scope. It's a short list, and the scope needs to be broader than that, or the resolution asks that consultation will always and everywhere have to go through all these bodies. If that's not the intent, we need to talk about it.

Rodgers wondered if this was defining shared governance between faculty and administration and not with the whole campus community. Filling confirmed that there was no intent to abrogate position of ASI, Staff Council, or other bodies, and that this was specific to discussions between faculty and administration. Estrella suggested that "...with Faculty" be added to the title for clarity.

Oppenheim said he would vote for it, but claimed this resolution would be rejected by the President. He offered that President Hughes believes herself already to be open to shared governance, and considers it something her administration is excellent at. To ask her to recognize something she already believes herself to be excellent at is a waste of time. We ought to wait until the new administration is installed, and work with the new president towards a meaningful relationship. Stephens offered that the President does take shared governance seriously, and is supportive, and it's not a waste of time.

Sarraille suggested a possible rewording of the 2nd resolved. Some objections center around the idea that we're trying to create a definition of consultation, instead of asserting that consultation must incorporate all due deliberative etc. with recognized bodies. Say that, and we don't have to come up with a final definition of consultation. Myers added that another possibility is changing "governance bodies" to "representative bodies," which would include departments, for example, and not just AS.

Thomas agreed that a short list is sometimes a short process. At the same time, there might be an ad hoc committee on an issue consisting of 80% MPP and two junior faculty members. This might count technically as consultation, but wouldn't be consultative. Wendt replied, why bother? Say we need a committee on X, we go to COC, we say give us two members, and COC gives us two junior members. Why bother if that doesn't constitute shared governance? Thomas pointed out that puts a lot of weight on COC; they then have to be the regulating body saying no, that's inappropriate.

Filling reiterated that there was a difference between information gathering, solution hatching, and consultation regarding those solutions. People on committees bring good ideas, but they don't speak for the entire faculty. We need to segregate "discussion" from consultation. Peterson noted that participation should be the beginning of the discussion. Johnson asked if it would be appropriate to say that we assert that sufficient consultation occurs with appropriate faculty bodies? And repeat the formula in the 1st paragraph,

describing situations that are not sufficient include thus and such. If something is not sufficient for decision making, it might be for developing ideas.

Resolution will return for action next session.

#### **b. 10/AS/05/SEC–Academic Freedom**

It was MS Davis/Doraz

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms the principles of academic freedom, as they apply to students, that are articulated in the CSU Stanislaus, Faculty Handbook, Student Handbook, Faculty Personnel Policies and miscellaneous University Policies; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms the principles of academic freedom, as they apply to students, that are articulated in the American Association of University Professors Policy Documents and Reports, 9th Edition (2001); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That there exists a Student Grievance Process administered through the Office of the Student Advocate for students who believe their rights to academic freedom have been violated; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That while the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus supports academic freedom for students, it is opposed to Senate Bill No. 5 ("Student Bill of Rights") because policies and procedures that protect student rights are already in place at California State University, Stanislaus, and the California State University System; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus further opposes SB5 because the proposed legislation limits rather than encourages open discourse in the educational environment, and respects neither the professionalism of faculty nor the maturity and the intellectual curiosity of our students; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus send this resolution to the Chancellor's Office, the California State Student Association, the CSU Stanislaus Associated Students, Inc., and area legislators, including Assemblypersons Greg Aghazarian, Dave Cogdill, and Barbara Matthews, and State Senators Jeff Denham and Mike Machado.

**RATIONALE:** The Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus appreciates this opportunity to remind all constituents that it endorses the importance of academic freedom for students as well as for faculty members, and that policies and procedures are in place, indeed have been in place for decades, for students who believe their rights have been violated

Discussion:

Davis added to the Rationale by noting that a policy has been in place on this campus for 22 years, that clearly defines the role of academic freedom in the classroom and that endorses that faculty fully and freely recognize and accept the special privileges and responsibilities of the profession in this regard. He continued by saying that as our state legislature contemplates SB5, a meddling and capricious interference in the work of the University, our representatives deserve from us a clear and unambiguous statement, if only as a

professional courtesy.

Schoenly pointed out that the legislation is a stealth attack and is only really of benefit for those who have difficulty distinguishing between belief systems and knowledge. Mantz pointed out that the discipline of anthropology has seen a series of similar stealth attacks.

Rodgers couldn't speak to the policy language, but stated she found SB 5 poorly written, and observed that the legislature has no place dictating this.

Filling offered as a point of information that he had spoken with Student Advocate Alvarez, about trying to rewrite the Student handbook and relevant catalog sections to clarify and accentuate this issue.

It was MS Petrosky/Doraz to waive the rules and proceed to a second reading.

Vote to waive passed unanimously; there was no further discussion.

Vote on 10/AS/05 passed with one abstention.

### **c. 11/AS/05/GC–Proposal for Graduate Certificate in Child Development**

It was MS Garcia/Doraz

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate endorse the Proposal for the Graduate Certificate in Child Development; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That this be effective upon approval by the President.

**RATIONALE:** On March 17, 2005, Graduate Council approved the Proposal for the Graduate Certificate in Child Development. The purpose of this certificate is to offer coursework at the graduate level to prepare professionals who are currently working in the field with advanced study that is directly related to their careers. This certificate program will prepare students with a foundation of graduate-level knowledge and will integrate this foundation with diverse topics that emerge as the most important needs of professionals in the field. The certificate program is designed to take a developmental perspective to address phenomena that pose challenges for professionals, such as facilitating emergent language and literacy, meeting children's challenging behaviors, and child and programmatic assessment.

For this reason, this certificate program is designed to provide the breadth needed by all graduate students and be flexible enough to meet the specific needs of particular career cohorts. It is also anticipated that many certificate students will wish to continue their graduate work toward the completion of a graduate degree. The department has begun the process of creating a comprehensive Master's degree program in Child Development that will prepare students for graduate careers or doctoral study. The faculty anticipates that this proposed certificate program will be one way that potential Master's students will be able to get a taste of the research and theory that would be expanded upon in the Master's program.

Discussion:

Asher introduced the resolution by saying that CDEV has an MA program in the works. This particular certificate program will provide graduate level advanced training for people already in the field. She

reported having a tremendous response to this already. And there are other factors, for example, Universal Preschool will mean that all pre-school administrators will need MA. There is a huge interest and requests for graduate level training. This proposal includes two new pre-approved courses, all other courses are pre-existing. Down the road, we would be using these courses for the MA. This program will have a particular focus for particular cohorts, and the department tried to address specific career needs for potential students. Also, there is a strong application focus here; other ones down the road may have a more theoretical emphasis. It is a 15 unit program. Hope to be very popular. We hope that students can take this to the next stage as well.

Feldman asked why only nine units are applicable to the MA, and whether, after the MA comes into effect, would that change? Asher replied that it was a Grad Division/CSUS rule, not a department or program one.

Item will return for action next session.

#### **d. 12/AS/05/SEC–Resolution on Proposed Retirement Plan (CalPERS/STRS)**

It was MS O'Brien/Doraz

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus strongly oppose the imposition of any defined contribution retirement system-whether for new or existing employees, as well as any mandate to create an optional plan for converting employees from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus urge the Chancellor of the CSU and the Board of Trustees of the CSU to oppose any change in the California Public Employees Pension Plan that would result in lower retirement benefits to its faculty and staff or that would increase the costs of the plan to its employees; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus condemn efforts by the governor and others to unilaterally modify the terms and conditions of employment for CSU employees; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus declare that a well-funded plan with stabilized employer contributions is essential to the CSU in attracting and retaining high quality employees in the CSU; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of California, the Chancellor's Office, CSU Board of Trustees, California legislators, and to all CSU campus academic senates.

**RATIONALE:** The California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) is recognized by professional investment managers as a leader in positive corporate governance and is as a model of a well-managed defined benefit pension plan. Proposals to alter or destroy that system should be made cautiously and only after consideration of all ramifications to both state finances and to the quality of the state's workforce. Retirement plans are an integral part of any employees' compensation package. That is, a strong compensation package includes benefits such as a pension plan, as well as salary. Employer contributions to pension plans, whether defined benefit or defined contribution plans, are a significant portion of payroll for most employers, private and public employees alike. In both cases, employers provide pension contributions

to reduce other payroll costs, as well as to provide an incentive to encourage experienced workers to retain their positions with their employer. Specifically, California's public employees have often been faced with below market salaries partially offset by improvements in their retirement plan. Stock options and company bonuses, which are often used for that purpose with private employers, are not available to public employees. It does not necessarily make sense to assert that plans that are more common with private employers are appropriate for public employees. Further, contrary to popular myth, private employers have not recently shifted to defined contribution plans from defined benefit plans, particularly not after the decline in the stock market in 2000-2002.

Employees must make retirement decisions years before their retirement date. Therefore it is essential that employers provide very substantial notice to employees of changes in retirement plans. Also, stability of retirement plans is essential if they are to meet the goals of either employers or employees. Defined benefit retirement plans are not necessarily more expensive than defined contribution plans. For example, during the years 1989 through 1999 employer contributions to defined benefit plans were often smaller than to defined contribution plans. Had California funded the CalPERS system at a reasonable percentage of payroll during these years, the current large contributions would not have been necessary. The risk of defined contribution plans is in the hands of employees who are often not educated in the investment of these funds and who can ill afford to take the risk of retiring during a stock market downturn. Defined benefit plans, on the other hand, are professionally managed and, for public employers, risk of failure is in the hands of society at large, which is better able to absorb it.

\*A secure retirement plan is known as a Defined Benefit Plan. Monthly retirement amount is fixed and based on individual's salary and years of service.

\*\*Individual risk accounts are known as a Defined Contribution Plan. Monthly retirement amount would depend on how the individual invests and the ups and downs of the stock market.

#### Discussion:

Sarraille agreed with the resolution, and suggested sending it to the Modesto Bee and other local media as well. Thomas pointed out that the Bee had editorialized in support of the Governor's plan.

O'Brien noted that this was a topic near to our hearts. Recent events make it appear that Governor Schwarzenegger is backing down, but he is threatening to bring this back in 2006. Some folks will thus question whether to go through with this or not, but this is important to articulate to the government. We need this program to attract faculty; our benefits package helps us overcome an unattractive salary scale. Chancellor Reed says he sees CALPERS as one of the most important benefit plans we have. So this affects all of us.

It was MS Petrosky/Doraz to waive the rules and proceed to a second reading. Opposition being vocal, the movement was nixed.

Feldman suggested adding a statement to the effect that our plan is now less expensive than the new proposed one will be. The new plan fails to take into account the laws of actuarial science.

O'Brien noted that the state paid little into the plan when stock returns were booming, and got hit later. It's easier to attack the plan, rather than show how it has been good for state.

Sarraille noted that the state only puts in 11 % of the fund over its life; employees contribute 12%; all the

rest is earnings. Feldman repeated that we need to say the current plan is cheaper.

Will return as action next AS.

#### **e. 13/AS/05/UEPC–Amendment to Academic Calendar Preparation Policy**

It was MS Peterson/O'Brien

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus endorse the attached changes to the Academic Calendar Preparation Policy as recommended by the University Educational Policies Committee.

**RATIONALE:** The issue of calendar preparation has been a topic of great debate among faculty and students. The University Educational Policies Committee, in recent discussions, recognized the current Procedures and Principles, items II. 3 and 7 are in conflict with one another. The revised language would allow the UEPC the needed flexibility in scheduling holidays and at least five days off (excluding Saturdays and Sundays) between the last day for reporting Winter Term grades and the first day of Spring classes without increasing the number of instructional and academic workdays.

#### Discussion:

Peterson explained that the main proposed change is the addition of "when Practical" in both the end of Winter and the end of Spring limitations. Prior to being on UEPC, she criticized the academic calendar; she now sees that to get all the credit hours in before a certain day, you have weird days, causing more trouble and confusion for students and faculty. Shouldn't have to constrain us so much. Also, rules currently say there will be five days after Winter term, but we can't do that and end before Memorial Day; so both rules get played around with.

Doraz admitted to once having served on the calendar committee. He respects the dilemma, but pointed out that if we get rid of Winter, we'd always have five days.

Oppenheim agreed with the resolution, noting it was vague, but practical. He observed that we think we can do anything with the calendar and to hell with rest of the world. If it means an extra week to be in sync with the rest of the world, that would be a good thing. To the extent possible, we ought to endorse it.

Feldman hoped the resolution will lead to students having a reading day for both Fall and Spring, as the current situation is grossly unfair to students. Sarraille said that as long as we're airing out pet peeves, he would wonder why in Spring Break someone always puts Easter, but never Good Friday, which seems illogical. Peterson confessed to being not religious, but observed that most area schools do their break at that time, and we want parents to be together on Spring Break. This proposal still leaves the judgment to UEPC, but gives flex room.

Item will return for action next session.

#### **f. 14 AS/05/RSCAPC/LAC–Amendment to RSCAP (14/AS/88/SEC-Ad Hoc)**

Deferred, Speaker asked to please review for next time.

### **8. Discussion Item**

**a. Facilities: Enabling what we value**  
Deferred.

9. Adjourned at 4.30pm.