CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
November 8, 2005

Present: Afonso, Bargetto-Andres, Brown, Dauwalder, Davis C., Davis S., Deaner, DeCaro, DeKatzew, Filling, Garcia, Jacobs, Janz, Jensen, Kim, Lawson, Manrique, Mantz, Minor, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson, Petrosky, Regalado, Riedmann, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Senior, Stone, Tan, Thompson, Weikart, Werling, Zarling

Proxies: Neufeld (Shawkey), Mercier (Sutherland)

Absent: Nelson, Petratos, Tavernier

Guests: Akwabi-Ameyaw, Bernardo, Boffman, Demetrulias, Gackowski, Pugh, Schulz, Stephens, Wendt.

ACIP REPORT

19/AS/05/SEC--Change in Time Modules for Course Scheduling, APPROVED

Definition and Process for Approval of MOU with Academic Affairs, INFORMATION

20/AS/05/UWC/UEPC--Reaffirmation of GWAR, APPROVED

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, November 22, 2005
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:
Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Meeting was called to order at 2.37 pm.

2. Agenda modified to hear 7a before 6; minutes "of 10/11/05" should be "of 10/25/05"; agenda approved as amended.

3. Minutes of 10/25/05 amended as follows: the final paragraph, penultimate sentence should read, "Thompson said he wasn't complaining about the number of remedial students, just noting that there was a difference between recruiting students and serving them once they get here." Ed Aubert, not Albert, serves on ERFA. Approved as amended.

4. Announcements

   a. Akwabi-Ameyaw announced International Programs positions open for Resident Directors in China,
Mexico, Spain, Japan, and elsewhere. Stanislaus has a history of support for this program. Applications for the 2006-07 year are due December 1.

b. Akwabi-Ameyaw also announced the availability of the Wang Family Stipends, for faculty with competence in Chinese language interested in teaching in China or Taiwan. Four faculty from the CSU will be awarded a stipend of $10K, and a semester abroad.

c. Akwabi-Ameyaw also announced new International Programs starting next year in Africa, including University of Ghana, University of Durban and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. These programs need support and outreach for students.

d. Speaker Petrosky announced he had attended the unit review for Public Safety, and conveyed many concerns raised by faculty. Most of these were not performance related, but they were shared and noted.

e. Speaker Petrosky also announced that the Speaker and the Provost, after consultation with COC, SEC, and others, have named the Four College Ad Hoc Committee: Amin Elmallah, Betsy Eudey, Steve Filling, Ian Littlewood, Chelsea Minor, Gary Novak, Stephen Thomas, and Ted Wendt. The Senate wishes them luck.

5. There were no questions about reports

6. Information Item
a. Definition and Process for Approval of MOU with Academic Affairs

Demetruilias informed the body that for several years many requests had been received for a set of guidelines for development of MOU. She acknowledged the term "MOU" itself is ambiguous, and has different meanings for different agencies. Nevertheless, new programs are developing, among other needs, and her office has prepared this statement as a way to assist faculty who may need it. The document was developed over time, shared widely with academic administration and previous faculty Speakers, until it appeared to make sense and be helpful. The statement distinguishes MOUs from contracts with outside fiscal obligations. The split is not totally clean, but there is a need to distinguish those outside obligations from budgetary obligations within Academic Affairs. Other things have gone through where folks have approved language committing time, money, and other obligations, but never routed it through to the people who were affected. The document is designed to give structure and guidance, with flexibility. This will not affect departments placing interns or field work; it is more on the college or university level with external agencies, outside the normal delivery of academic programs.

Filling commented that a simple statement that faculty as employees cannot bind the University seemed sufficient, that if we start to qualify it, we can raise problems. Demetrulias returned that people do bind the University, which is why we wanted to give some guidelines.

The statement will be placed in the Faculty Handbook to provide guidance.

7. Action Items
a. 19/AS/05/SECñChange in Time Modules
Speaker Petrosky reminded the body this item was tabled from last week due to concerns over late night scheduling and exceptions to the modules.

The Provost recapped discussions held over the past two weeks with faculty in CALS and COE, as well as two special sessions for faculty run by Roger Pugh and Lisa Bernardo. A new attachment details the new proposed parameters based on those discussions. The attachment was eventually accepted as a friendly amendment.

Pugh added that he was surprised that many faculty didnít know that we did not currently have official "common start times" on campus, but that after discussion and listening to faculty concerns, he and Bernardo concluded that the principal concern was with evening courses in the proposal split into two blocks, 4-7 and 7-10pm, which may adversely affect students, especially those in COE, and graduate students across the campus. The new proposal keeps those new blocks, but maintains room currently for about 2/3 of evening courses running at 6-9pm. He was pleased that we could find solutions to space problems. The new proposal offers better flexibility, and meets various needs and concerns. They are aware about problems with facilities, tech support, lighting, coffee, etc., and are trying to address those as best they can. They are also aware of the situation with the labs, and are confident they can work it all out.

Sarraillé observed that lab flexibility in start times is good and workable among the labs themselves, but when staggered against other classes, may prove difficult for students to schedule. Dauwalder agreed, but added it was better than what we have now. The choice is between rigid structure and allowing flexibility with everything. With the latter, we know there will be problems, and weíve tried to respond to a wide variety of desires in departments; the flexibility allows us to do that.

Regalado observed that Enrollment Services was a difficult job, and congratulated the team on doing it, and asked about Pughís statement that "We would build new classrooms to fulfill our growth requirements, but that is not a reality until greater growth occurs." Pugh responded that we have a formula with the Chancellorís Office that plots growth pattern v. efficiency, and it matters to our funding. So we have to grow, but we also have to do it efficiently. Itíd be easy to add five more buildings, but we canít. Regalado asked if "growth" would include classes after 10pm, or on Saturdays. Pugh said yes, actually, we already have them. If the demand is there, we can offer it.

Regalado asked what the criteria was for 6-9pm slots. Bernardo responded that the deans will deal with the 2/3 ratio. EMS didnít want to displace everybody, and the change needs to be spread across the colleges. Dauwalder added that the 2/3 number is the current level of assignment. We keep consistency in the daytime, and maintain the same level of 6-9 we have now. If we have an established pattern, we can keep it as much as possible. The departments wonít have to prove a pattern, scheduling can do that automatically; but we donít want to open up any new 6-9pm courses. Filling asked if that practice would be only for courses, or would it include a program, if all current courses in a program were traditionally at 6pm. Dauwalder said the latter showed a pattern, and they would look at usage within the college.

Jensen asked if the formula included off-campus facilities, and wondered how those students counted, if not. Pugh said they were not, and should be recognized. Stephens added that those classes were not part of the mix, and if they were to be offered on campus, it would complicate the situation. Dauwalder thanked Jensen for the reminder.

Regalado asked about the methodology of the ASI survey. Janz replied that ASI discovered that a student
survey was impractical given the timeline, and simply went directly to students for feedback, through the senators to their constituents. Students reported several concerns, including lack of attentiveness in students late night, available resources, length of the work/class day, and fog. ASI concluded these concerns were legitimate, but not sufficient to reject the plan. He observed that students will benefit, and that traditional students supported it overwhelmingly.

Brown asked why ten minutes were built into the evening courses when deleting it could shave 15 minutes off the work day. Pugh responded that they were added by faculty request for transition time and set up time. Dauwalder observed that perhaps the class could arrange to forego break and simply leave a bit early. Brown said that was fine for the 4pm, but not for the 7pm course, and asked who it was that requested the transition time. Dauwalder didn’t know off the top of his head, but suggested it may have been people looking for something to eat.

Regalado commented that he had requested History students to be contacted for their input, and they were not, nor was he. Minor replied that no formal survey was done, but student senators representing all areas were asked to consult with their constituencies, were polled, and were ultimately in favor of the plan. The Student Senate works much like this Academic Senate, she pointed out. Further, she advised that messages were left for Regalado via both phone and email.

Kim observed an error on the 4 unit 2 days, TR 4.30; it should be 1910-2104. Mercier added that the 3 unit 1 day, 8am module should start at 8am, not 7.50.

A secret ballot was requested and granted. Ballots were 32 for, 9 against, with 1 recorded abstention. The motion carried, the resolution passed, and will be sent to the President.

b. 20/AS/05/UWC/UEPCnReaffirmation of GWAR

Speaker Petrosky reminded the body that the motion was due for action in this session.

Bargetto-Andres said while she recognized the need for standards, she asked if an option could be designed where a department or program could administer a screening test at the start of a WP course to enroll students, who would then still have the obligation to pass the WPST prior to receiving credit for the course. This way, enrollments can increase, and we can open up access to WP courses now open only once a year. Stone said the reason for a uniform screening test outweighs any kind of program sanctioned screening, and the extra workload for the instructor was contrary to the design of the program. Filling added that the GWAR is a University-wide requirement, not a department one. Thompson observed it was a great idea, and should be sent over to UWC for later consideration, assuming the motion passes.

Minor observed that many students were not kicked out of WP courses for not taking the test, and only found out later that they needed to have passed the exam in order to gain credit for the course. Peterson noted that was exactly why the resolution was being brought forward. The GWAR passed 14 years ago, and gradually people seem not to know about it or not care to enforce it. The resolution asks if the GWAR is still something on which we fundamentally agree. Bargetto-Andres’s idea is an interesting one, she added, but would not be considered a friendly amendment; this resolution was deliberately stripped to be merely a reaffirmation of the program. Finally, she said she agreed with Minorís point; students are getting a raw deal, and this is a way to draw attention to the problem.

http://web.csustan.edu/FacultyHandbook/asminutes/0506/110805min.htm
Mantz asked whether one needed to pass the WPST before taking the WP course; whether it could be done concurrently, or whether students could take the course simply as an elective. Peterson said you can't just take the course to take it; we need to teach advanced writing within the discipline, and either the WP or the non-WP students would get shortchanged. Stone added that the course is either a WP course or it is not; the course is taken only for the GWAR, and the prerequisite for the course is the WPST. She asked if the language of the motion needed changing.

Mantz and K. Davis offered a friendly amendment to the first Resolved clause, to read (in part): "1] students must first successfully complete a GWAR screening test [the WPST] prior to attending a WP course." It was observed that a block on enrollment prohibits students from enrolling in a course and taking the WPST before the course meets; the curb should be on attendance, not enrollment. Peterson accepted the amendment as friendly.

Sarraillé asked if there was a procedure for students who attempt and fail the WPST more than once. Stone said that as far as she knew, there was a new plan in the Writing Center, but that there is also a Portfolio option that includes intensive study, weekly work with a tutor, extensive coaching, and has dramatically improved pass rates. Only a very small percentage of students fail repeatedly.

There being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously by voice, and will be sent to the President.

8. Open Forum Cancelled.

Adjourned at 3.48pm to promote the performance of civic duty.