

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

October 11, 2005

PRESENT: Afonso, Bargetto-Andres, Brown, Dauwalder, Davis C., Davis S., Deaner, DeKatzew, Filling, Garcia, Jaasma, Jacobs, Janz, Manrique, Minor, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson, Petrosky, Renau, Riedmann, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Shawkey, Stone, Sutherland, Tan, Tavernier, Thompson, Weikart, Zarling

PROXIES: Peterson (Kim), Filling (Lawson), Akwabi-Ameyaw (Mantz), Olivant (Senior)

ABSENT: Borba, Nelson, Regalado, Werling

GUESTS: Aly, Bengston, Boffman, Brown D., DeCaro, Demetrulias, Gackowski, Moore D., Murray-Ward, Pugh, Ruud, Schulz, Stephens, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

17/AS/05/FAC--Staff Representative on Academic Senate, FIRST READING

18/AS/05/SEC--CSU Stanislaus Seal, FIRST READING

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

DISCUSSION: Classroom Space-exceeds enrollment cap

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, October 25, 2005

2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called at 2.38pm.
2. Agenda approved with addition of 6c, Change in Time Modules for Course Scheduling.
3. Minutes of September 27, 2005 were approved.
4. Announcements

Manrique, representing ERFA, announced former faculty members Max Norton and Dieter Renning were going to Lobby Day to address preserving pension and health benefits, and asked assistance in alerting recent retirees in any department to please contact the association. Meetings are 3 times a year and the next

meeting will be in December.

Sarraillé has cards to pledge NO on Propositions 75/76; please overwhelm him with your interest.

The Speaker thanked Koni Stone for providing refreshments.

5. Questions about reports

Schoenly asked if FAC would still accept input on administrative personnel search procedure policy. Stone said yes. It's a blank slate. Please contribute.

Thompson asked about an item in the President's Cabinet Report concerning facilitating graduation. Dauwalder reported that they have a grid list of 22 items and need to identify sources of input for a 12/22 report to Systemwide; UEPC should have received this. Peterson confirmed they did receive it, but haven't had a chance to discuss it yet. UEPC wants to discuss which items seem right for our campus, and also are waiting for ASI input. Speaker Petrosky shared that he and the Provost reviewed ideas from other campuses as well, and hope to share that information later. Thompson asked what elements were supposed to be in the report, and what kind of impact the report would have on campus. Dauwalder replied that the 12/22 report is supposed to identify directions for further work, and there is a memo on the calstate.edu site that lists the elements they want. Input is due by November 18, 2005.

6. First reading

a. 17/AS/05/FAC—Staff Representative

It was MS Stone/Filling

Be it Resolved: The Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommend to the General Faculty the following amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, Article V, Section 2.0 h):

One voting member of the Academic Senate elected by and from all full-time permanent staff (The term 'staff' shall mean any staff employee who is full-time permanent employee in bargaining units 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.); and be it further

Resolved: That this amendment be sent to the General Faculty for approval; and be it further

Resolved: That this amendment take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The Academic Senate is the primary locus of discussions concerning both academic and non-academic issues on our campus. For some time it has been apparent that faculty desire input on a wide variety of issues from staff. It has also been widely observed that staff are often not made aware of pedagogic ramifications of some proposed actions, and that staff would welcome a more effective information transfer with faculty.

Faculty at CSU Stanislaus believe that they work in partnership with staff, and that all voices need to be heard in discussions concerning our university.

In pursuit of that enhanced information transfer we propose to add a staff representative as a voting member of the Academic Senate. This proposed action would echo practices at the majority of CSU campuses and is

congruent with our goal of becoming a more effective, learning-centered university.

Discussion:

Stone noted the measure was intended to increase communication between faculty and staff. Issues arose during the last round of budget cuts which were exacerbated by the lack of clear lines of communication; this measure is intended to increase the flow between us.

Sarraillé spoke for adoption, arguing it facilitates a formal liaison; we gain a lot from staff perspective, and vice versa. He expressed sorrow we didn't do this sooner.

Olivant questioned why adding a voting member would help communication. Filling replied that it underscores a sense of staff being full members of the community and the group. We don't want to assign them second class status, especially as one vote doesn't effect outcomes that greatly.

Speaker Petrosky advised the body to talk to constituents, get opinions, prepare for a vote next time.

b. 18/AS/05/SEC—CSU Stanislaus Seal

It was MS Sarraillé/Stone

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus hereby recommends the alternate seal as the official seal of the University.

Rationale: The President of California State University, Stanislaus has expressed a desire to revisit the design of the University seal, has directed the staff of University Relations to develop an alternate seal, and has acknowledged the role of faculty governance in the approval for adoption of an alternate seal.

The Office of the Academic Senate has distributed the alternate seal and an illustration of the seal in the context of its use on business cards, has collected faculty responses to said seal alternate, and recognizes those responses as generally positive.

Discussion:

Sarraillé offered that he liked the seal, but was not moved to effusive verbiage on its behalf.

DeCaro asked how the new compares to the old seal. Sarraillé said we don't really have one. Nagel asked if there was a version online for review, and if there's no old seal, to what is this an "alternate"? Petrosky offered it was alternate to current "Book-S" seal/logo. SEC and others reviewed various color and background combination 5-6 weeks ago; received lots of response. Petrosky recollected that this version ran maybe 70/30 for.

Minor asked what the various elements, including the motto, were intended to mean?

Sarraillé explained that the book stands for knowledge, the flame for the light of truth, and the tree is the local agricultural angle, plus growth. Motto is Latin for "voice truth life," and is in Latin because that's fancier. Thompson added that the motto is also the motto on the CSU Systemwide seal. Olivant asked if we teach Latin on campus and offered that if our intention is merely to look pompous, we have succeeded. Sarraillé added that we clearly have to keep up with systemwide.

Zarling offered that it looks like the seal for half the Universities in the world; what's recognizable about it? He added that the symbols look backward rather than forward. He also wondered whether, since this seal is graphically more complex, whether it would render as well in monochrome. Sarraillé offered that it does reduce well. Dauwalder declared that President Shirvani proposed the new seal to emphasize the tie to traditional higher education institutions. He sees the "Book-S" as more of a logo than a seal, but allowed that both can be operable in representing the institution. Sarraillé asked for additional clarification between the "Book-S" as a logo; he was not aware that it was a logo, and not a seal. Ruud declared that there was a seal from 1957 for SSC. Sarraillé withdrew his objection.

Zarling asked for a clarification under what circumstances we can use the old seal. Morgan Foster offered that it's not an old seal, it's a logo, and it can be used on many different things. Reidmann asked if it would go on department stationary, and who would pay for the replacement? Dauwalder replied he expected the new usage would gradually replace the old, and departments can replace as needed.

Minor asked whether one could still see detail in the smaller version. Petrosky said they had put it on a mock business card (his own), and the detail looked dandy.

Sutherland asked for additional clarification: is a logo something that relates to brand, geared toward outside, and a seal is for internal documents? Morgan Foster explained that a seal is representative of the academic face of the university, and goes on diplomas and other official documents. A logo and a seal can both go on a bunch of things. It is quite common to have a number of official marks: an official seal, various athletic brands, institutional brands, etc. Most universities have multiple marks. We do; we just didn't have an academic-looking mark; hence, the seal. Petrosky added that we have a seal we haven't been using, we use a logo for it instead, and we want this.

Thompson was curious about what things we might use the "Book-S" for, where would we see the logo. Morgan Foster replied that it would not be on letterhead. You might put it on a shirt or other merchandise and decorative items. It likely would be replaced over time. We wouldn't officially remove it; people would just naturally want to gravitate toward the new one. The new one would be used on all official documents: diplomas, etc. Petrosky asked which would be on the new web site design. Stephens said the new one. Ruud offered that once a decision has been made, DUR would make a style guide with downloadable .gif and .jpeg files and examples of "do and don't" proper usage. Petrosky asked if the style guide would come to AS. DeCaro declared he would need to see the style guide before voting. Ruud said they had maybe a two-page stub of a guide ready now; but that this is a chicken and egg thing. Tell us what you want the thing to look like, then we'll make the guide to how to use it. DeCaro also challenged the distinction between an academic seal and a marketing logo. Petrosky clarified that both marks are technically brands; only the intended audience is different. DeCaro stressed the need of seeing the entire style guide before granting his imprimatur to the motion. Ruud asked how much detail he wanted. DeCaro said just something that delineates a general idea. Ruud explained that it is easier for DUR if AS sends them what we want, and do the style guide based on it; the other way round is a terrific investment. Petrosky ruled that AS could deal with any style guide separately.

Garcia questioned whether the issue is properly under faculty purview, and wondered whether this really required a resolution, let alone an extensive discussion? Filling asked that the body please recall that the issue of acceptable use is a different issue from what the seal is. The current discussion is about the latter. Sarraillé declared that the current question was a necessary one, that this is something that represents us, is part of our lives as academicians, and it should reflect well on us.

Sarraillé questioned what would happen to the logo on the corner of Geer Road and Monte Vista Avenue. Stephens said she wasn't sure, but suspected that it eventually would be replaced. Peterson exclaimed she was happy to see the lovely new seal, but she was definitely opposed to replacing expensive campus symbols for reasons sheerly of fashion. Further, that it is a part of our history. Olivant wondered whether we could incorporate the old image into the new one, to incorporate history into the academic symbol, possibly replacing the book in the seal with the "Book-S."

Speaker Petrosky advised the body to talk to constituents, get opinions, prepare for a vote next time.

c. 19/AS/05/SEC—Change in Course Scheduling

It was MS Thompson/Filling

Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the attached modifications of current time modules for course scheduling. The Academic Senate further encourages campus administration to recognize the broader impact of these changes and support them through actions such as - but not limited to - the following:

1. Provide resources for alterations of the course delivery for those departments and/or instructors who demonstrate such need.
2. Extend campus support services to complement the extended hours of the new schedule, including access to classroom technology support, cafeteria and bookstore.
3. Ascertain potential student acceptance of the proposed schedule.

Rationale: The attached time modules will provide more efficient use of classroom space and better serve students. It is expected that course scheduling will adhere to the modified time modules as closely as possible, but it is also recognized that reasonable exceptions will be required.

Discussion:

Thompson explained that the handout included a colorful chart of a schedule that would start in Fall 2006. He reminded the body that in 1988 we proposed a change in time modules, providing a precedent for AS purview of the matter. He advised that this proposal comes from administration, has been widely circulated, and has incorporated extensive feedback. SEC supports bringing the motion forward with a recommendation for endorsement. The resolution talks about resources, campus support services and getting information from ASI. If there are other things that need to be in the resolution, we want to hear that. He reminded the body that everyone's got a story about a schedule issue, but would like advice on the resolution itself.

Nagel asked if we can demonstrate the claims of the rationale. Petrosky noted that Lisa Bernardo's people ran it through the current scheduling software, using the current Fall schedule as a base. Dauwalder added history, explaining that the discussion started in the very first President's Cabinet meeting. Concerns were expressed about classroom space. The problem is the wide variation between start/stop times and in credits/hours. The initial suggestion was to go to a four-day schedule with special Friday blocking. We looked at it, mapped it onto the scheduling software, and placed 85% of requests. When we ran the change, had a slightly better fit. We then brought it to SEC, where concerns were raised concerning options. Further

testing also showed the change would be more difficult than we thought. Also, some disciplines wanted three a week classes. Lisa Bernardo and her staff looked at it, and advised applying rules to our current M-F schedule. So, these are the guidelines. Pressure on space maximizes in the evening. We have a portion of campus that runs 4-7, and another that's 6-9, so we put in a break, and worked back from 10pm. It caused a few sections to push out from 9 to 10pm, but it does free up more space. Highlighted features include standard times and timeslots that are known. We maintain MWF classes, and we can keep labs separate. This will encourage common use across the week to increase efficiency. It also allows for 10 minute breaks inside of 3 & 4 hour classes. This will double our evening course room essentially. Works more efficiently, but also leaves some room for exceptions and special cases.

Filling asked if we are anticipating growth to meet more available space. Are we needing it next year? Dauwalder replied that people are complaining now; so we want to use space better, and yes, we are anticipating increasing enrollment. Filling noted that campus space seems half empty after dark already. Weikart admitted he had been skeptical, and looked at the numbers. The real crunch is 6-7pm, and yes, we are close to full at that time. There also are incredibly wild fluctuations in scheduling which need to be regularized.

DeCaro claimed that everybody wants to teach late afternoon and midmorning, and asked how this would help. Dauwalder said from what he understood, the big crunch is 9-1 and 6-7. We'd need to move to early and late if we hope to accommodate more. Have some classes running over each other. DeCaro asked if the change were initiated, would there be a mandate that departments have a responsibility to fill hours. Dauwalder said he would seek advice from schedule people, but otherwise let the deans deal with the chairs on that issue. One possibility would be to identify a certain number of classrooms in each college for exceptions.

Brown said he appreciated all the work. He offered that we can't start that late (7pm); that's why evening classes work so far. We are going to ask a lot of folks to change their routine, have we considered what impact that change would have on evening enrollment generally. Dauwalder thanked Brown for the input, and claimed there was significant evidence that folks do it; it would be nicer earlier, yes, but people do do it. We know we don't want to open another problem while solving this one. Thompson cautioned that we should use data from other campuses with care. If CSULA has 7am courses, that's one thing, but they also don't have the same size service area.

Sarraillé noted that his dept will have to check our majors with classes in other depts, and offered that it's difficult to anticipate all the variations. Everyone will say they're not sure what their new schedule will be, and we won't find out problems until implementation. Further, many of us altered our course scheduling to avoid conflicts; this change may bring those conflicts back into play.

Zarling asked for confirmation on how this would apply to Winter, and if not, should the resolution say it's for Fall and Spring only. Dauwalder confirmed this does not apply to Winter Term.

Kim asked if the discussion about time changes is also going through deans and chairs. She expressed a concern about having to explain such a major and far-reaching concern to her department by herself. Dauwalder confirmed that was the case.

Reidmann asked if the resolution could please also emphasize the availability of late night classroom technical support. Afonso asked who would handle exceptions. Dauwalder said he would assume the chair

talking to the dean, subject to room availability, and expressed confidence that any issues could be worked out.

Schoenly opined that the proof of the pudding would be student reaction, and asked if it were wiser to float a trial balloon first. Dauwalder noted that the computer models seemed to give a strong indication that it works. Peterson pursued that it may work for us, but what about the students. Minor offered to take the issue to ASI Executive Board for discussion, and would bring results back here. She added that the ALS senators were discussing popularity feedback with Dean Boffman.

Zarling asked if increased rigidity was an actual improvement from current time times. Do we need extra rigidity in scheduling? Dauwalder said 75% of the courses are in three hour blocks. The schedule was built around those. Other times blocks had relatively fewer occurrences, so we mapped those into the other. Zarling asked if 25% were so infrequent, why do we need to regulate them? Dauwalder noted that we have accreditation standards to which we must adhere; this helps standardize that.

Kim noted that the 4 unit slots meet only two days. The current schedule lets them take two a week; this one only one. Dauwalder acknowledged they should be there, both TR and MW.

Speaker Petrosky advised the body to talk to constituents, get opinions, prepare for a vote next time.

7. Open Forum

Sarraillé reported an issue with CCC transfer transcripts. Apparently A&R is no longer forwarding them to departments. This is a problem with graduation forms, as well as with general advising. Peterson replied that this seems to be a change in educational policy; UEPC will follow up.

Minor reported a student complaint that up to three out of four courses had students sitting on the floor, and the professor made no effort to find another room, or to find additional seats. Who is responsible for this? Olivant replied that recently the campus has moved to increase enrollments, and instructors have added over the cap for the room. Reidmann added that course caps are set and rooms are assigned based on that cap. We are then encouraged to take more students, we fill it up, we go to chair and say we need a larger room, but there are none. She acknowledged this was a special problem this semester. Filling observed that full classes were also partially an artifact of faculty making sure students get the courses they need to graduate. Dauwalder asked Minor to forward him the information on the class she was referring to.

Minor followed up, asking if there wasn't a regulation? Olivant said it was actually the other way around: instructors are encouraged to overenroll, and students should be aware of this. This is the campus culture now. Schoenly added that faculty are under pressure to bring students in, pressure from the very top on down. Faculty are also pressured by students who need the course to graduate, or need the course as a prerequisite. Sutherland offered that there were pedagogical limits as well, which vary from individual to individual. Weikart observed that faculty have enrolled past the limit thinking they can get another room, but now space is harder to get. Peterson noted that we have been promised rooms in the past for larger classes. Schoenly added that faculty can IW in the first few days after class starts, and it's a precarious exercise to judge attrition against increase. He expressed confidence that the faculty member in question did all that was possible.

Akwabi-Ameyaw recalled that the question concerned the level of instructor responsibility. He acknowledged that he probably didn't have an answer either, but doubted it was his responsibility to find a

chair for the student who doesn't have one. Jantz offered that many students complain that the ones adding are taking their seats. Reidmann agreed with Akwabi-Ameyaw.

Minor countered that faculty let the students in, how is it not your responsibility? Reidmann declared that the President asked her to do it as a favor and she did it. When we went to find a room, we couldn't, because everyone else has granted the same favor to the President. When we steal a chair from another room, we impact the other class. Dauwalder claimed that if department chairs let him know what was going on, he could try to help. Wendt advised that certainly no one in Administration is telling faculty to exceed room capacity, and voiced surprise it was happening. Stephens added that we may find that we need different size classrooms. Thompson magnanimously offered the extra chairs from his TR11.15 class in C131, if that would help.

8. Adjourned at 4:12 p.m.