1. Called to order at 2.35pm.

2. Agenda approved.

3. Minutes 5/10/05 approved.

4. Announcements
   a. Speaker Petrosky thanked Armin Schulz, Betsy Eudey and the Faculty Development Committee, and especially the Stryker family for hosting the new faculty dinner.
   b. Speaker Petrosky announced that the FCETL, the FDC, and the CFA are hosting a reception for newly tenured and promoted faculty, Thursday, 10/6, 3-5pm. Please RSVP x3216.
   c. Speaker Petrosky announced the filling of the new Lecturer Representative to Academic Senate, and welcomed Chris Nagel in that role.
   d. R. Floyd introduced the new Director of Counseling, Dr. Daniel Berkow, who comes to us from UNC Wilmington. Counselors are encouraged by his understanding of shared governance. Floyd also thanked the faculty for their support during the hiring process.
   e. Nagel announced that CFA is doing information tabling on Propositions 75 and 76, and have a need for staff, especially MWF. Please contact Nagel.
f. Peterson announced the joint Staff and Faculty Family Picnic this Saturday, 10/1, 2-7pm. Please RSVP to Peterson.

g. Morgan Foster took pleasure in announcing the publication of the AASCU report from their study last year. CSU Stanislaus is one of 12 benchmark campuses; the work of faculty is highlighted in the report as encouraging and a commendatory practice for other campuses to follow. She will forward electronically as requested.

5. Questions on Committee Reports

Petrosky reminded the body that reports are distributed on AS-Net.

Nagel asked UEPC about the proposal to consider Saturday as an Academic workday. Saturday classes are taught; how are they not a workday? Peterson replied that UEPC had just received it. The concern is that Saturday instruction involves a voluntary arrangement with the individual instructor, rather than an assumption that Saturday can be assigned. Creating an academic workday might change that relationship. Furthermore, if Saturday is an academic workday, would students and faculty assume all normal services are available? If so, how would we deliver them? UEPC also wants to ensure that work credit is given where appropriate. If anyone has thoughts, please forward them to Peterson/UEPC.

6. Consent Item

a. 16/AS/05/SEC: 2005/2006 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

Petrosky underscored two differences from previous practice. First is the addition of a representative from lecturer faculty. The second is that the Speaker is given the prerogative to appoint a parliamentarian. On the advice of SEC, Thompson was asked to fill this role, and has accepted

With no objections, the 2005/2006 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate were accepted.

7. Discussion Items

a. Review of 2004/2005 Resolutions

Speaker Petrosky directed Senate attention to pp 42-43 of the agenda, which lists all resolutions from the last academic year and their fortunes in the Office of the President. Petrosky highlighted the following:

13/AS/04/UEPC: CVHEC Transfer Associate Degree. Note two stipulations were added.
14/AS/FBAC: Resource Allocation Priorities, resolving to urge the restoration of base funding to prioritize the educational mission and not new initiatives, combined with 15/AS/04/FBAC: University Excellence Incentive Awards, just saying no, were both rejected by then-President Hughes.
1/AS/05/FAC: Amendment to the GF Constitution, created new the position of lecturer representative; we may see similar measures for a staff representative this year
5/AS/05/UEPC: Faculty Computer Replacement Policy, addresses priorities in the Academic Technology Plan guaranteeing a three year replacement cycle; then-President Hughes approved this after the last AS meeting of 04/05.
10/AS/05/SEC: Academic Freedom. We approved this unanimously, and then-President Hughes returned it unsigned.
15/AS/05/SEC: Support of the Mascot, supports student choice of mascot only. This support is a precursor to several branding/aesthetic choices coming up. This resolution speaks to the Mascot only; we made no comment on any sports mark.
Filling requested that AS reconsider 10/AS/05: Academic Freedom. A new bill has been forwarded to the State Legislature, and the issue remains open. Petrosky will keep on the agenda for possible action in the Spring.

b. Senator Orientation
1. Presentation
Parliamentarian Thompson gave a brief presentation, with handout, describing the responsibilities and rights of the Academic Senate. Academic Senate is the official body of the General Faculty. He underscored the spirited sense of self-governance buoying the work of the senate, noted a potential ambiguity in the two terms "Joint Decision Making" and "Shared Decision Making," in State Codes, but also pointed out that the code shields AS from the Legislature, and assigns primary responsibility for educational functions of the university to the faculty, an authority based on disciplinary expertise. The Senate is particularly charged with curricular recommendations, to have a major voice in academic policy decisions about curriculum, quality of the curriculum, and access to the curriculum. Senate is also the primary voice in academic employee personnel decisions re: Keep this in mind as Statewide considers changes to GE and the AY calendar.

2. Committee Charges
Brief overviews were made by:
URPTC member Schulz for Chair Johnson
FDC Chair Eudey
FAC Chair Stone
COC Chair C. Floyd
FBAC Chair Weikart
RSCAPC Chair Schoenly
UEPC Peterson
GC Chair Garcia
SWAS Representatives Thompson and Filling

No overview was made by the Leaves and Awards Committee.

S Thompson pointed out that Statewide Academic Senate’s job was mainly to consider issues with implications for the system (LDTP, e.g.), and to protect the prerogatives and autonomy of the local campuses.
S Petrosky pointed out the acronym list, AS charge, and other handouts in the agenda designed to make us all better citizens.
S Stone reminded the body that the door of FAC is always open, a condition Filling expanded to include all the committee chairs.
S C. Floyd reminded the body that interest forms will be out in February for committee assignments.
S Schoenly, in the absence of LAC members, advised that the deadline for RSCA grant proposals is 9/28.
S Schulz added that the CFP for Faculty Voices will be forthcoming shortly.
S Bowman advised that in case of absence, proxy notice must be given to her in writing (email okay); please contact her as soon as is practicable.

3. Q&A
Regalado, following up a rumor, asked if there were changes in Graduate Council or to the Graduate School itself? Garcia advised viewing the GC post on ASNET for official information, and hastened to add that no change to GC was contemplated. He reported that there has been a restructuring of the Graduate School,
including the elimination of Dean/Director, and some reorganization with Enrollment Management taking on a larger role. GC met with Vice Provost Demetrulias to discuss their concerns, especially that restructuring happened without any faculty consultation. GC then met with President Shirvani, which was quite productive. Shirvani acknowledged that mistakes were made, that restructuring happened too quickly, and agreed to step back. As much as possible, we have returned to the original configuration. Administration will come forward in partnership with GC to discuss concerns, including duplication of services and functions, enrollment and other items.

Regalado asked if the proposal will then be brought to AS? Garcia indicated he would assume so. Dauwalder added he is looking forward to being a part of the discussion on GS; they are working though the issue.

8. Open Forum with President Shirvani

President Shirvani expressed delight at being invited to attend, and eagerness to hear faculty concerns.

Regalado asked if the President would address issue of expanding enrollments, especially the point at which enhanced enrollments undermine academic integrity, and further, how expanding enrollments could advance the academic integrity of the University. Weikart added that in the Department of History, FTES is up 50% over the past 10 years, but full-time faculty has actually decreased.

Shirvani advised that we are about 3.8 % above our yearly target; but that is barely above our target. In a month, this can disappear. AVP Pugh reportedly predicts that the maximum figure we can expect would be about 2% above target. We struggle to make our target; then we don’t have to cut resources so much. All campuses got a 2.5% increase this year; but we probably won’t next year. Big schools go way up in enrollment, and they get priority. Even if we do make our target, our target is still too small to make a big difference in an increase in resources. We put out money for every new class, and we will hire to cover as we grow. Shirvani added that just this little bit, this 3.8%, earned us visibility and respect. We received a one-time General Fund allocation of $1 million from the Chancellor's Office. Out of this amount, approximately $650,000 was spent on the demolition of the Yosemite Residence Hall and removal of associated hazardous material. This leaves an extra $350,000 in one-time General Fund money. If we did not receive the $1 million allocation, we would have had to cover the cost of the demolition out of our budget.

Shirvani argued that we need more resources to hire more tenure track faculty, which we get from increasing enrollment targets. Furthermore, the more resources we have, the easier they are to spread around where they are best needed. This works in the other direction as well. But we decide what we do with the enrollment money. We are under target in our teacher education program, by 30%. Without that, we’d be up 10% overall, and next year, we might have gained another $3M. There are factors all around; the new D. Ed. for instance. We’re not here to expand just to expand; the trick is to use that expansion to add full-time tenure track faculty.

Shirvani acknowledged he is new here, and does not have a complete picture; hopefully he will know more in Spring. Then we can prioritize, but we need detailed statistics about what’s going on right now. But he assured faculty it shouldn’t take long to see who needs what.

C. Floyd asked about the workload agreement, and how that ties into these issues of academic integrity.
Sarraille advised that the new workload agreement has been signed, and we have a plan for individual faculty to apply for assigned time for research. SEC has started the ball rolling on the details of implementation: but we need an outline for events, and a timeline. The other piece of the puzzle is this resource issue: how we afford it. It appears that some juggling is possible in some departments. Hopefully, that’s where the incremental change comes in; we need to develop for more slack. Shirvani added a promise that by Spring, we’ll see some assigned time. We can’t leave this on the table; we need to move on it.

Mantz said it was easy to sympathize with the complexity of the issue and the unfamiliarity of a new campus, but questioned the level of faculty morale regarding equity in the workplace. What message are we giving about our priorities? Are we only concerned about high enrollment numbers?

Shirvani expounded his philosophy that pedagogy drives other considerations, but that the balance is made at the department level. His plan is to decentralize targets to the department level, where overall department enrollment will affect management. The broader question is about academic work, not just teaching. If the place of scholarship is at the bottom, and has been for several years, we need to try a way to pull it up. We need to energize that part of the campus, move around resources. Part of this will involve the salary equity adjustment he promised at the Fall GF meeting. He can’t do it the way he wanted to, but we are going to do it still. Briefly, we have to do it case by case, individual by individual, but it is getting done. We also have a plan for Yosemite Hall property to be used for faculty housing, with first floor shops and upper story condos. Trying to get this going, but it does take some time. In addition, we are going to pay the competitive market rate for new faculty in the future. We are committed to research, but we do need to accept incremental changes as we move forward. He is going to the deans to figure it out, and then let faculty talk to the deans. One current problem is overbureaucracy. For example, we have state lottery money locked in a committee, and we only spent $100K on new books last year. Get rid of committee, put the money where it’s needed, say half to the library for materials, half to information technology for equipment.

Brown congratulated the President on his visibility, noting that his students reported seeing him at the mandatory Defensive Driving class, and asked how he would weigh the benefit of administrative posts against that of new faculty.

Shirvani believes in a lean and clean administration. We should load up administration at the college level, creating strong deans, and narrow it up at the top. We have a high rate of administrators, especially Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents. We’re not as high as some other comparable campuses, but still. We do want to try to eliminate and merge functions. There are certain areas in which we need administrators, but those may not need to be at the Assistant and Associate VP level. We’ve already eliminated one position in the Global Affairs office. We tried others, and got into some trouble for it, but we are looking at similar measures elsewhere. He promised to report to SEC about the process.

Shirvani concluded by asking the Senate to work with him, to create an environment where we can work together.

Adjourned 4.02pm.