CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
February 21, 2006

| 1/AS/06/GC/UEPC--Resolution on Registration Priority, FIRST READING |
| 2/AS/06/SEC--ALS College Reorganization, FIRST READING |
| Workload Timeline, DISCUSSED |
| Next Academic Senate Meeting: |
| Tuesday, March 7, 2006 |
| 2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room |


Absent: Afonso, Brown, DeCaro, Petratos, Senior, Sutherland, Zarling.

Proxies: Demetrulias (for Dauwalder) Garza (Jacobs)

Guests: Bengston, DeCocker, Eudey, Jaasma, Lindsay, Littlewood, Mercier, Stephens, Wendt.

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman/Margaret Ramos

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to order at 2.40pm.

2. Agenda was approved as presented.

3. Minutes of 1/24/06 were approved as presented.

4. Announcements

a. Speaker Petrosky introduced Margaret Ramos as substitute for Diana Bowman, and wished Bowman a speedy recovery. Ramos's duties include assistance in taking minutes of AS and other bodies; all other duties of the Executive Secretary are retained by Bowman.

b. Speaker Petrosky reminded the body that members need to inform Bowman of proxies in writing (email okay) in advance of the meeting. The General Faculty Constitution 4.3 reads, "A proxy shall be a memorandum to the Clerk of the Senate signed by the absent member, and handed by the proxy-holder to the Clerk before participating in the Senate meeting." The Clerk normally delegates receipt of these memoranda to the Executive Secretary.
c. Speaker Petrosky asked that members complete preference forms for governance service and return to Bowman by February 28, 2006.
d. Speaker Petrosky thanked the members of the Faculty Development Committee and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning for another successful Institute Day.
e. Speaker Petrosky wished Betsy Eudey a speedy recovery as well.
f. Speaker Petrosky reported that the recent strategic planning forum was fairly productive, adding that the issue of faculty remuneration and compensation was discussed and taken seriously.
g. Janz reported that ASI would like to name a new Faculty representative; please see him or Minor for more information if interested.
h. Minor announced a shift in ASI leadership: Scott Harvey has resigned as President over Winter, and Minor has succeeded him. Andrew Janz is now VP Internal. She and ASI are looking forward to a successful spring semester.
i. Davis reminded the body that drafts of our WASC Institutional Proposal went out in January. We will need to go to a final draft in mid-March, so any input you have needs to get to us before March 1. The final draft will be posted and distributed electronically.

5. Questions about Reports
None.

6. First Reading Items
a. 1/AS/06/GC/UEPC: Resolution for Registration Priority

It was MS Peterson/Garcia

BE IT RESOLVED: That the current registration priority, as it appears on page 7 of the class schedule, be revised to the following:

Registration appointments are determined by units completed within class level in the following order: seniors, students in master’s and credential programs, freshmen, juniors, sophomores, and unclassified post baccalaureate students.

RATIONALE: Graduate students sometimes have to take undergraduate course work as foundation requirements for their core, graduate level programs. The majority of these courses are junior level classes. Because of the current priority in registration, the graduate students generally face full classes when they try to register. In any one class, there is rarely more than one or two graduate students trying to enroll, but their difficulty is getting into these classes blocks them from further progress in their respective graduate programs. The proposed change to place them ahead of juniors would remedy this situation in most cases and would not unduly impact undergraduates trying to get required courses.

Peterson noted that both UEPC & GC developed and reviewed this policy change, and both judged it helpful for students toward whom it is directed, and non-restrictive for other students.

Petrosky advised that a second reading and vote will occur next meeting.

b. 2/AS/06/SEC: Recommendation on College Restructuring
It was MS Davis/OfBrien

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend to the President the adoption of the college structure recommended in Appendix B of the January 2006 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on College Restructuring, and be it, further,

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus commend the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on College Restructuring for their diligent and timely efforts, and be it further,

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urge the President to continue close consultation with the Academic Senate and all appropriate faculty governance bodies on matters of implementation, especially:

1. Framework and timeline for restructuring.
2. Budgetary considerations, especially allocation or reallocation of resources and the determination and publication of the actual costs of restructuring and the means by which those costs are covered.
3. Definition of the role of the dean(s).
4. Faculty governance.
5. General Education program.
6. Graduate programs.
7. Interdisciplinary programs.

Rationale: On October 25th 2005, President Shirvani proposed a plan for the reorganization of the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences into four separate colleges. The review of the proposal has followed the Policy on Academic Reorganization (11/AS/04). As part of the defined process an Ad Hoc Committee on College Restructuring reviewed and evaluated the President's proposal and other reorganization options in light of input gathered through open forums, direct contact with program and department chairs, a survey distributed to departments, and a web site allowing electronic response. The committee regularly and in detail updated the campus on its work. The committee notes that "When it became clear that both our committee and the campus community definitely agreed that reorganizing ALS would produce benefits in excess of costs, we turned to an evaluation of structural alternatives." Based on their criteria for review and with the clear message that many important concerns requiring ongoing consultation remain, the committee offered a specific recommendation detailed in Appendix B of their report:

Appendix B
The Recommended College Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College A</th>
<th>College B</th>
<th>College C</th>
<th>College D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Agricultural Studies</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Anthropology &amp; Geography</td>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Geology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic &amp; Gender Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Modern Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Politics & Public Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sociology</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTEF=23.6</td>
<td>Total FTEF = 104.3</td>
<td>Total FTEF = 51.2</td>
<td>Total FTEF = 36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTES=371.9</td>
<td>Total FTES = 2250.7</td>
<td>Total FTES = 1056.3</td>
<td>Total FTES = 589.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR= 15.8</td>
<td>SFR = 21.6</td>
<td>SFR = 20.6</td>
<td>SFR = 16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The figures for FTEF and FTES are taken from the 2004 AY data, as provided by Provost Dauwalder. For comparison, in the same year the College of Education had a total FTEF = 53.2 and a total FTES = 676.1, and the College of Business Administration had a total FTES = 550.2 and a total FTEF = 30.3. Figures for HONS (FTES = 2.3, FTEF = 0.5) and MDIS (FTES = 22.9, FTEF = 2.0) are not included in the figures in the table.

Weikart advised that this was a contentious issue for FBAC. They looked at the figures for the President’s original proposal, and found significant gaps. For example, the estimate for personnel included position salaries only, and no benefits. President Shirvani was asked for specifics, and replied to FBAC and SEC that the funding would come out of administrative, not potential faculty lines. Four positions have already been cut, and the President indicated that should be sufficient: EOIR Director, Dean of CSU Stanislaus Stockton, Dean of Graduate Studies, Director of Global Affairs.

Nagel observed that when positions go away, the duties do not, and asked whether these changes were a true savings, or a shifting of costs. Weikart couldn’t say definitively, but noted that the duties formerly handled by the EOIR Director were reassigned to existing positions. Global Affairs was a reduction from two positions to one; Graduate Studies was reduced to interim associate for the current year only.

Schoenly asked what the timeline was for adoption and initiation of searches. Weikart replied that the impression given by administration that searches would likely begin this summer/fall, with interim Deans serving during the process.

Petrosky advised that a second reading and vote will occur next meeting.

#### 7. Information Item

**a. Workload Timeline**

Sarraillé reported that he was hoping to get along with the Workload Agreement, but that an element missing from the Workload Agreement was the lack of any timeline, with deadlines for submission and notification, approvals, denials, and appeals. Our thinking at the time of the agreement was that this was a detail taken care of best by the folks involved in the process, who have familiarity with actual practice, including course offerings, curricular constraints, etc.

FAC developed a draft timeline. The Provost looked at that, and produced another document with "guidelines for planning," which pushes some deadlines back, and makes others fuzzy. Other actions are postponed indefinitely, e.g., "a month after the Governorís budget is passed."

The process has now ground to a halt. Many department chairs reported not having a problem with the FAC timeline. We need a compromise of some sort, and we need chairs, deans, and the provost to come together on it.
The Senate's role in all this is unclear. If we have an opinion, we should publish and send up to President in the form of a resolution. But the hope is that either way the President will direct the campus to implement a plan in Fall 2006. Many departments are ready to roll now: Psychology, Politics and Public Administration, History, some others. They have the resources, but need a reliable schedule.

Schoenly asked if a whole year was needed for the process, and registered a concern about the first few weeks of the term being too busy. Perhaps eliminating a few levels of review could streamline and shorten the process. Weikart replied that the schedule for the following year is due in October; we could put the process earlier, but chairs need people in place to map out the schedule when it is being compiled.

Wendt noted that one of the issues is an implicit commitment in the Workload Agreement to a certain fluidity in scheduling. Put simply, if we sign something, can it be changed? Most folks would feel no, but the reality on the ground is that things do get changed. The message from the President is very clear: let's make this work, even if we can't be rule-bound during this transition. Some departments are more advanced along the process, perhaps, and clearly some discussion about resources is needed. Let's move forward as best we can. Keep in mind that until day one of the term, all of it is a little bit fluid. If we are patient, we can make it work.

Adjourned at 3:10