CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
October 25, 2005

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

PROXIES: Andres (Jacobs), Filling (Lawson), Mercier (Sutherland)

ABSENT: Tavernier

GUESTS: Boffman, Demetrulias, Elmallah, Gackowski, Murray-Ward, Ruud, Shirvani, Stephens, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

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

18/AS/05/SEC--CSU Stanislaus Seal, APPROVED

19/AS/05/SEC--Change in Time Modules for Course Scheduling, TABLED to November 8th mtg

20/AS/05/UWC/UEPC--Reaffirmation of GWAR, FIRST READING

DISCUSSION of Proposal Creating Four Colleges From One

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, November 8, 2005
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:
Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to order at 2.34pm.

2. Agenda approved.

3. Minutes of 10/11/05 were approved with the following changes:
   a. Riedmann and Janz were misspelled throughout; apologies to Andrew and Agnes.
   b. Werling present, not absent.
   c. The Speaker thanks the Provost for providing refreshments on October 11, and Stone for doing the toting.
   d. In the ERFA announcement, Ed Albert is also part of the group going not to Lobby Day, but to the regular meeting in Northridge.
e. p. 2, report to Chancellorís Office due 12/2 (not 12/22); two places
f. p. 3, "affect" for "effect"
g. p. 3, "stationery" for "stationary"
h. p. 6 (7 of handout) top, add "One. Thompson cautioned that we should use data from other campuses with care. If CSULA hasÖ"
i. p. 6 (7 of handout) bottom, amend final line to end the sentence at "to bring students in."
j. p. 7 (8 of handout) top, strike entire first line.
The Clerk thanks the Provost for his keen eye.

4. Announcements

* The Speaker thanks the Provost for providing refreshments, and Stone for doing the toting.
* A concert on Thursday 10/27, 7.30pm, in Snyder Hall will feature Chamber Signers and Womenís Chorale, under the baton of Daniel Afonso; see Afonso for faculty tickets.
* The Halloween gala in the Village Sunday is open to the community; please bring the wee ones.
* DeCaro, recently returned from a Communications & Diversity conference in China, advised all present to go to China, where they will take care of you.

5. Questions about reports

FAC: Nagel asked what "Appendix O" is, having had difficulties finding it online. Stone advised that Appendix O describes the procedure for faculty conflict resolution; it is being updated and revised for friendliness. The Provost added he would like to provide input to the workload dates document; he will bring data to meeting.

Action Items

a. 17/AS/05/FACóStaff Representative on the Academic Senate

Without discussion, the motion passed by voice, with one abstention. This will now be sent to the General Faculty for a vote; if approved, it will go to the President for approval.

Speaker Petrosky expressed confidence that the rest of the year would proceed as smoothly.

b. 18/AS/05/SECóCSU Stanislaus Seal

Shirvani addressed the issue with a handout displaying different seals, as well as samples of how the thing would look in different applications. He declared that we had a seal in 1957, but it was neither sufficient nor appropriate. And it wasnít put away when the "Book-S" logo was introduced. We want to represent the institution more academically, to give it a more academic and elegant look. Faculty have long commented they donít like the "Book-S" logo. He asked the graphic designer to look at a wide variety of seals, and the result was this. The elements are recognizable: a circle, four quadrants, an open book, a lamp of knowledge, the systemwide motto, a tree representing agricultural life. We chose this particular tree because it prints well when reduced. He anticipates the change from the current logo will be perhaps a year-long process; we will go through current stock and replace it as needed to avoid waste. He urged getting on to printing our publications.
Thompson asked for what uses the old Book-S logo would continue to be appropriate. Shirvani advised it would quietly be phased out. Zarling asked about the date on the old seal (1957); Shirvani advised it was the date of the charter, not the actual opening of the campus. Zarling added that he understood the impulse for a more academic-looking image, but objected to the idea that "academic-looking" means uniformly backward-looking icons and images. Even the UC seal has something more current than this. The new seal says we're rooted in the past, he observed; we might have something more imaginative. Shirvani returned it was a matter of taste, and added that even old schools that once dropped their "traditional" seals are going back to them. People seem interested in the tie to tradition.

Regalado offered that the seal is fine and dignified. As an historian, he thought it would be nice to have more color. Shirvani returned that he appreciated the note, but that Gold and Red are the school colors.

Thompson asked if student representatives could say what student response was. Minor advised that ASI greatly respected Shirvani for coming to their meeting and explaining it all in the first place. She said he came with same stuff we're seeing here; overall, most were pleased. She acknowledged there was some confusion at first, but the consensus afterwards was that this could well represent our University.

There being no more discussion, the motion was passed by voice, with four abstentions. This will be sent to the President for his action.

c. 19/AS/05/SECóChange in Scheduling

DeCaro had additional issues not raised last time. He asked if the new schedule included Distance Education courses, and advised that there are current struggles getting resources, especially monitors for distance sites, and claimed this change will make matters worse. He asked for written codification guaranteeing that such support will be forthcoming, not merely to cover the current year, but in the future as well. He added a demand for clarification of what those resources would consist of and what their source would be. He added an additional demand for confirmation that every course would get a classroom appropriate for the needs for the course. The Speaker inquired if DeCaro was making an amendment. DeCaro declined, but threatened calling a point of inquiry if his demands weren't addressed.

Schoenly voiced an issue raised by another biology faculty member that two lecture/lab courses, when taught as continuous 4-hr blocks, could reduce preparation time when both are taught in the same room on the same day, but offered a solution by suggesting that one class could be scheduled earlier or later than the other.

Regalado raised concerns over the 7-10pm block, declaring it was more appropriate for an urban setting. Informal surveying revealed that many students travel long distances after working a full-time day, and expressed concerns about late night dangers, especially winter fog. Women in particular are strongly against it. He pointed out that merely scheduling additional courses gives no guarantee of their being filled. He also raised a question about student feedback, suggesting that the current membership of ASI may not be overly familiar with evening classes, and this lack of familiarity might skew results.

Garcia noted that GC had raised concerns similar to Regaladoís. One specific concern was that moving from 6-9pm to 7-10pm would negatively impact graduate student enrollment. Extending the work day to 10pm also raised concerns about the quality of teaching and learning.
Nagel reported that he had received contact from a dozen lecturers, all vehemently and uniformly against the move. He noted that lecturers tend to work a spread-out day. One student informant told him that a vote for this was a vote against motherhood.

Dauwalder spoke to concerns being raised, pointing out that Dean Morgan had requested additional costs coverage for Distance Education facilities. Last year’s gap was filled by one-time funds, and he expressed confidence that this year’s gap would be resolved in the next week. He pointed out that getting appropriate classrooms was indeed the issue, and that regularizing the schedule, even by half as much, would open up additional opportunities. He pointed out that fog is a specifically winter phenomenon, and that 32 courses this term are running until 10pm. Furthermore, starting times for graduate classes are all over the place, from 5-8 to 7-10. Finally, regarding lectureships, he recognized that there were special needs cases, and that the Deans were empowered to handle exceptions. He repeated that exceptions would need to be made, but wanted to regularize the schedule as much as possible.

Shawkey reported that the College of Education faculty has formed a resolution about this issue. Noting the special hardship for education courses, she claimed the 4pm start time is practically impossible. COE supports the regularization of daytime classes, but wants a confirmation of flexibility in evening to support the motion.

DeCaro declared he was uncomfortable with the Provost’s confidence about funding for distance education. Dauwalder noted his discomfort, but assured him it would be taken care of.

Afonso also wanted a clearer assurance from the Provost that chairs would have an open window for discussion of exceptions with the Deans.

Thompson pointed out that overall statistics reveal one perspective, but one needs to look at local situations as well. In English, every grad course is 6-9pm, and the shift would have a major impact on the English MA program. He declared he had not heard anything about flexibility in evening courses, except for language about "rare exceptions."

Tan pointed out that the break in between the two units two days courses was only a minute, and needed to be at least ten.

It was MS Sarraillé/Nagel to table the motion for two weeks to work on these issues.

Weikart asked for clarification about which issues would be worked on.

Filling pointed out that the body has alternatives; the main motion is debatable and amendable and could be stripped down to the uncontroversial stuff, saving the other items for later address. He asked to leave only the evening course material to table, maintaining the main motion as amended. Stone pointed out that she had issues about the daytime scheduling as well.

Shirvani admitted that administration, as originator of the plan, hadn’t sufficiently done its homework, that these were issues that should have been resolved before coming to the body with a resolution. He asked if the body would move on an amended resolution addressing daytime scheduling, then meeting with the Deans and the Provost to discuss the range of evening exceptions. He did not want to leave the issue open ended.
DeCaro asked if discussions would include identification of resources and funding. Shirvani replied that any resource questions on this table were limited to the availability of basic services, like food and safety. The campus is well aware of the lack of resources for evening and distance support, and administration is working to resolve those issues. But a change in schedule would not affect a situation with a course being taught right now anyway. Dauwalder confirmed that.

Thompson spoke for the motion to table, observing that if two weeks were too long to wait for a decision, someone could point out why; otherwise, we know we have a package of things to work on.

Borba reported that Dean Murray Ward worked with the Provost on the schedule for COE, and found him very flexible; their concerns were addressed, and the explanation seemed to satisfy everyone. He agreed with the President that issues could be worked out among the Deans and faculty members, and didn’t see a need to hold the item up any longer.

Janz pointed out that a more accurate student survey could be available given an additional two weeks.

The question was called on the motion to table, and passed.

First Reading Item

a. 20/AS/05/UWC/UEPCóReaffirmation of GWAR

It was MS Peterson/DeCaro

Resolved: The Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms the basic philosophy and requirements of the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement [GWAR] as last modified [4/AS/91/EPC], which are that 1] students must first successfully complete a GWAR screening test [the WPST], and 2] students must then complete a designated, upper-division WP [Writing Proficiency] course with a minimum grade of C-, and be it further

Resolved: That the University Writing Committee recommend modifications to extant policies governing implementation of the GWAR as needed to ensure effective implementation of the GWAR. Said recommendations will be made to the University Educational Policies Committee.

Rationale: The University Writing Committee [UWC] believes that the basic philosophy and requirements of the GWAR should be periodically revisited and reaffirmed given the importance of written communication in higher education. The UWC notes that the following issues suggest the need for said reaffirmation:

The GWAR requirements are that 1] students must first successfully complete a GWAR screening test [the WPST], and 2] students must then complete a designated, upper-division WP [Writing Proficiency] course with a minimum grade of C-. These WP courses will be a part of the regular curriculum in the disciplines in which writing is integrated as an instructional device in a way appropriate to the discipline.

* There has been a gradual but unmistakable increase in the number of students enrolling in WP courses
who have either not taken the WPST or who have taken and failed the WPST.
* When surveyed, WP course instructors report that students who have not achieved passing scores on the
WPST are not prepared to succeed in a discipline-specific writing course.
* Data Analysis conducted by Institutional Research demonstrates that the WPST is not an inordinate
challenge for students. The first attempt pass rate at CSU Stanislaus is approximately 83%, which is in line
with other CSU campuses that use screening examinations. Over 99% of students taking the WPST do so
successfully in no more than three attempts.
* In a few cases, instructors have been pressed to enroll more than the maximum of 25 students for courses
classified as C-4. This is a disservice both to the students and instructors of such courses.
* The Chancellor’s Office requires periodic review of campus GWAR requirements and CSU Stanislaus
needs to fulfill this requirement.

Discussion:

Peterson declared it was a straightforward resolution. There was some discussion about bringing a more far-
reaching resolution to the body, but UWC and UEPC ultimately preferred to secure a reaffirmation from
Senate that student writing is fundamentally important and worth the policies we’ve already created, before
sending it off to UWC for additional work. This approach to the GWAR was important in 1991; is it now?

Regalado observed that the President had spoken about adding to the prestige of the University with the new
seal, yet this requirement allows a C- for passing a writing requirement.

Schoenly noted that with the recent push to expand enrollment and offer larger sections, the assertions about
class limits here would become more important. We may have to move to more scantron assignments and
reduce writing in other courses, which will negatively affect overall student writing.

Mantz, supporting the motion, declared that the resolution was not commensurable with current
administration policy on enrollment. WP courses take up a great deal of time, with one-third the students,
and adversely affects the way WTUs are calculated and valued.

Gackowski declared that it was a disgrace that any student has a C- in writing. He said he received
complaints from employers all the time; not about professional training, but about their writing.

Filling noted that the C- limit came about to respect those disciplines who also use it as a lower limit.

Brown pointed out that the timing of the test matters. If one takes it as a senior in your last semester, it’s not
serving the function of GWAR to do it that way. For students who don’t take the program as designed, we
effectively have to teach writing in every upper division course. He recommended it be required to be taken
before admittance to junior level classes.

Zarling pointed out that one cannot take WP courses until one is a junior, and the procedure recommends
taking it immediately upon attaining that status. Enforcing that recommendation would be up to departments.
The UWC wanted a strong recommendation that students take the WPST immediately after the Critical
Thinking course, indeed wanted to encourage student performance in all ways: low course sizes (15 is
optimum), for one, without administrative pressure to go beyond it.

DeCaro, speaking for the motion, declared that his course is widely reckoned to be the hardest. 25 students
is the absolute maximum, he claimed, a maximum he had also been pressured to raise by an unnamed administrator. Further, he speaks to employers nationwide all the time, and the biggest complaint is a lack of effective writing skills. He said the problem is especially acute given the kind of diverse students we have.

Regalado observed that a C- is below average. If we are talking about quality education, we need rigid standards here.

Demetrulias was not aware of any administrator having any authority to bring pressure to add students over the class cap. She declared that Academic Affairs was also concerned about class size, and they had worked hard with UWC to maintain that limit. The statistic that concerns her is that students take the WP course without having passed the WPST. They then pass the course, but still can't pass the WPST. Admitting students to WP courses without the WPST pass does a disservice both to student and to faculty. There must be a minimum level of competence for writing within the discipline.

DeCaro admitted that the unnamed administrator to which he referred has retired. Communications has been encouraged to take students to fill the course in order to make sections, and thus to take students who have not completed the WPST; but, he insisted, they must pass the WPST before they can pass the course.

Minor declared that part of student confusion comes from not being aware of the process. Most normal students, she said, aren't told by professors that they need to take it. They can't get into the WP course in the major, and so don't take it until they have to before graduation. Also, a poster went up today for registration for the WPST which closes tomorrow, and that seems like too little advance publicity.

DeCaro declared that administration can block anyone from registering if they want to. We say students are adults and they should be responsible, so we don't block them, but then we have to eliminate them. We could just handle this at enrollment services.

Filling asked if someone could actually speak to reaffirming the GWAR, and leave the mechanics of making it work for later, just like the resolution asks.

Petrosky advised the body to consult, discuss, and prepare to vote next week.

Open Forum

a. The Four Schools proposal

President Shirvani thanked the body for the opportunity to present an idea. He said we really have a problem with ALS, that it was too big: a university within a university. It has too many departments for one dean, and has become ungovernable. He therefore wants to split ALS into four separate colleges: Fine and Performing Arts, Health and Human Services, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Science and Mathematics. He would like to discuss the proposal with the body, then take it to the student body as well. Shirvani pointed out several advantages to the plan, including:

* Increased advocacy: one person now represents 75% of the University. There is a more cohesive relationship within COB and COE; ALS is a university to itself. Splitting the College would allow more effective representation both within the University and outside.
* Support: the ALS Dean’s office is already spread thin. We could improve the situation with ten assistant deans, but that solution isn’t practical. Scheduling issues would have been more easily managed. Information flows will improve.
* Expanded expectations of Deans: we need more academic deans, with more local responsibility and more direct charge of the unit. Smaller units mean quicker response to resource needs and more effective distribution. Collaboration and interdisciplinary work will be easier.
* The decentralization will focus our identity, and allow the Deans to represent the University to the community. We do not want to expand the Development staff; Deans need to go outside and present their case. There is not a lot of corporate fund-raising available here, so we need people to articulate a vision face to face, and that demands deans with both academic and community-relations expertise.

Shirvani acknowledged that an estimate of costs revealed a $300K increase, but claimed it was manageable, and worth it for what we will gain. We’re no longer a small liberal arts university, he concluded; we’re a medium-sized Master’s-One University, and we need to behave like one. He promised to deliver on the academic side, recruiting Deans that have been in the classroom, have a good record of research, and come from good institutions. The new Deans would all sit on President’s Cabinet.

Discussion:

DeCaro asked why not go further and split the Humanities from the Social Sciences. Shirvani said he was open to that.

Filling asked if the increase in Deans would be matched by a corresponding decrease in other administration. Shirvani noted that a comparison to other CSUs did not reveal us to be out of line in that regard. He advised that we should not think about hiring five or six administrators, but about hiring five or six senior faculty, who are also deans.

Sarraillé persisted, asking where the compensatory savings would come from, whether we would be narrower at the top. Shirvani said he was trying to narrow the top, but also has cut out a lot of waste: facades, parties, etc. Sarraillé asked whether the calculations had included the physical relocation of people. Shirvani acknowledged they hadn’t presumed to be so bold as to begin remapping campus, but he was aware it was an issue. It would be nice to have colleges together, and if this is supported, he will start thinking about it in architectural terms.

Thompson asked for a reminder about the process for administrative reorganization. Dauwalder declared that the President has provided a proposal, and will meet with different groups to gather input. The policy detail is on the web under "Other Policies." Shirvani added that a proposal can come from any direction, but must come to the Senate. His plan is to distribute the proposal widely, discuss it widely, and then move.

Sankey asked whether we would conduct national searches for each; Shirvani confirmed.

Zarling asked how this would affect the composition of campus governance committees. Dauwalder said that would be up to AS. Zarling replied he hoped the final proposal would speak to the issue. Sarraillé thought either the Faculty Affairs Committee or Committee on Committees could work up that facet of the proposal.

Afonso asked for clarification; does the President merely want an expression of support, or does the faculty
have any real say in shaping the proposal. Shirvani declared that the Senate has a say, but insisted that one person alone cannot manage a college of this size. Local issues demand local response, and this change will help that. UC Merced has 875 students, and deans out their ears, all out there representing the institution; we’re not. But, he acknowledged, the final decision to split ALS had not been made yet.

Mantz hoped for a quick resolution, as we tend to lose good candidates to other places when we delay searches. Shirvani agreed completely. He added that we want a good academic who can also raise money, not someone coming here to retire. The sooner we make a decision, the sooner we can get on to searches for deans and faculty.

Garcia observed that the Academic Reorganization Policy allows anyone to put forward a document for consideration, and he hoped this conversation would stimulate a committee to be formed, with a faculty majority (per the ARP), to be intimately involved in whether and how the plan goes forward.

Bargetto Andres asked if it would be relevant that deans teach in the discipline. Shirvani agreed, adding that deans should be academic deans, and keep fresh and connected to their constituents. He offered that he himself would be teaching a course next semester. He wanted the deans all to either teach, or to be engaged in active research, preferably with students. We would have a whole different set of friends, were that so, he argued, and a more articulate spokesperson. Regalado asked if Shirvani was encouraging the current administration to follow his lead into the classroom; Shirvani confirmed.

### b. Enrollment Growth and Quality of Education

Thompson noted that English added 20 FTE during the enrollment surge in September, and that all the classes that were added were prebaccalaureate and remedial courses, courses at the lowest level, which suggested that the enrollment surge had been composed of an inordinate amount of students requiring prebaccalaureate work to continue at the University. We got to 18 sections of ENGL0100, and hit the wall with the Writing Center. Fall 07 looks even worse. He wanted to bring this issue to general attention. Money is coming in and support is not arriving where it is needed. The Writing Center is not a part of the English Department. The Center needs more space and more tutors. Shirvani appreciated the observation, and acknowledged that there was a challenge to balancing access and quality, and was committed to both. Thompson said he wasn’t complaining, just noting that there was a difference between recruiting students and serving them once they get here. Shirvani agreed.

Thompson then requested business cards with the new seal.

Adjourned at 4.24pm.