

<p>Academic Senate December 5, 2006</p> <p>PRESENT: Afonso, Carroll, Clarke, Covino, Davis, Deaner, DeCaro, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garza, Grobner, Helzer, Johnson, Keswick, Kim, Lawson, Lindsay, Manrique, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nelligan, Nelson, O'Brien, Petratos, Riedmann, Robbins, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Scott, Shawkey, Silverman, Stessman, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling</p> <p>GUESTS: Mark Bender, Jane Bruner, Marjorie Jaasma, Ted Wendt</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</p>	<p>14/AS/06/FAC—Procedure for Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees, APPROVED</p> <p>15/AS/06/UEPC—Mandatory Advising within the Major, FIRST READING</p> <p>DISCUSSION: President's email of November 28, 2006 re: University Budget</p> <p>DISCUSSION: General Faculty Constitutional Amendments (input from COC, FAC and CoCA)</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, January 23, 2007 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Steve Filling, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order at 2:37 pm.
2. Approval of Agenda-Approved as distributed.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of November 21, 2006-Approved as distributed.

**4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. UBAC is being reconstituted. Membership will be: Provost, VP Business and Finance, 2 faculty at large (Paul O'Brien and David Lindsay), Chair-elect of FBAC (Schoenly), CFA rep., 1 dean, 1 student, 1 staff. This is the same structure it had previously.
2. Last day to evaluate your classes is this Friday, December 8<sup>th</sup>.
3. Reading Day is Tuesday, December 12 and the first day of finals is Wednesday, December 13. Monday, December 11<sup>th</sup> class will meet on a Friday schedule.
4. CFA-Filling

The CFA bargaining team met with the mediator and the CSU contingent recently. There is no significant progress to report. There is another mediated session scheduled for December 15. It is likely to be the last session with a mediator and it is expected the CSU will file with PERB thereafter. The next step in the process is impartial, non-binding fact-finding, which will probably start in

January. Fact-finding is done by a panel of 3, 1 CFA selection, 1 CSU selection and 1 impartial person. Their report, which is nonbinding, will probably come out some time in February, and there will be a 10 day 'blackout' period to allow for further negotiation. At this point in time, CFA is anticipating that the CSU will impose terms and conditions in early March.

Filling distributed information from CSU Humboldt showing they also have a structural deficit. The difference at Humboldt is that the President demanded massive cuts in the Academic Affairs budget. Our colleagues at Humboldt are asking individual faculty, other CSU Academic Senates, and staff/students at other CSU campuses express their disapproval of such actions by communicating with the legislature, our campus President, the Chancellor's Office and the President/Provost at Humboldt. Details on how to reach these people and sample emails/letters will be available on the web, URL will be forthcoming to Facnet.

Filling advised the next CFA bargaining update breakfast is scheduled for December 14, 8-10 in FDC Reference Room. Faculty and staff are cordially invited to stop by, have some breakfast and catch up on our contract status.

DeCaro questioned at what point does it go to binding arbitration. Filling replied it does not go to binding, because of HEERA. Taniguchi commented that Sacramento State suffers from a similar structural deficit, and they don't know what it means either. Eudey stated she was very glad to see that the last bargaining breakfast included strong staff participation. We have a strong relationship with staff and that should be highlighted. It is not seen elsewhere. Solidarity is much needed and we should all make every effort to attend the breakfast on the 14<sup>th</sup>. Thompson questioned what "retrenchment" means with respect to the bargaining process. Filling stated that the CFA bargaining team mentioned that in the most recent discussions the CSU offer appears to have become less attractive and that the CSU bargaining team is clearly positioning for imposition.

Thompson questioned the new Associate Vice President position and Sarraille replied it is the Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs. COC is considering three faculty that will be part of the search committee. Other members will be 1 dean, 1 person from Business and Finance (Paulsen), 1 person from Academic Affairs (Demetrulias). This position will replace the current director. Nagel asked what the difference is between a director and an AVP and Provost Covino replied it is a difference in articulation of that position with other AVPs and the aim is to elevate the status of our research enterprises and provide support at a sufficient level so we can give it priority relative to resources and its status in the system. Filling asked what it will cost in addition to what we are paying now and Covino replied the existing line will fund it, along with an increase in sponsored research funding. Riedmann asked if there is a salary window for this position and Covino replied there is a salary range in the CSU benchmarks report. We expect this position to pay for him/her through the kind of results we will see in terms of grants and contracts etc. Filling asked if it would not be paid the same as the director and Covino replied he did not know. Filling asked how long we will front the additional wages until we get results and Covino replied he can't be specific because it is hypothetical. Filling noted this is an example of why we have a structural deficit – we apparently don't forecast costs. Garcia stated as a faculty member that has done work for this office, he wanted to point out the current leadership is excellent, but support has been a question, so he wondered if changing the title and bringing in a new individual will address issues raised by faculty around supporting the office.

5. Vice President Morgan-Foster updated Senators on the status of Commencement. The suggestion is to divide the graduates into two groups of about 800 students. The College of Humanities and Social Sciences would have one graduation and the other five Colleges would be grouped together and have one. One would be Friday morning and one would be Saturday morning. She noted that Friday, June 1 (the proposed graduation) is not an academic workday, so faculty would not be expected to attend both graduations. The cost is not significant. In the future, we'll need to deal with this further and we still have not resolved what to do about credential students and Master's Degree students. She stated she would like to hear further from faculty regarding this issue.

6. DeCaro stated since e-Learning is going to be extended one year, department chairs need to ask their faculty to identify courses they'd like to do in the summer for e-Learning and send to DeCaro.

7. Carroll stated he has been asked by ASI to remind faculty to be clear in the syllabus about +/- grading. If faculty are using +/- grading, they must so state in their syllabus.

8. Afonso advised that this Sunday is the holiday concert. The Music Department is giving away 50 tickets to faculty. Call Ex 3959 and the first 50 who call will receive tickets.

## 5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None

## 6. ACTION ITEM

### a. 14/AS/06/FAC—Procedure for Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees

Sarraille reminded Senators this is a Sense of the Senate resolution, so if it is approved, it does not go to the President for approval, but it will be transmitted to him.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on 14/AS/06/FAC passed unanimously. Resolution reads:

**Resolved:** that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus affirm the *Procedure for Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees*, approved by the Senate Executive Committee March 16, 2004 and by the Dean's Council March 24, 2004.

## 7. FIRST READING ITEM

### a. 15/AS/06/UEPC—Mandatory Advising within the Major Resolution

It was MS Carroll/Nagel

**RESOLVED:** That a third paragraph, reading as follows, be added to the 'First-Year Programs and Advising' section of the University Catalog\*:

That undergraduate students receive mandatory, personal advising from their major/concentration/program advisor at a point determined by their major department which lies between the completion of 75 and 90 units.

**RESOLVED:** That a statement be included by each department/program in the academic policy section of the catalog and other advising documents indicating at what particular point that department/program requires mandatory advising.

**RESOLVED:** That the Faculty Handbook be amended as appropriate to reflect the above changes.

**RESOLVED:** That the above changes be effective beginning in the academic year following final approval of this resolution.

**RATIONALE:** The University Educational Policies Committee has been discussing Facilitating Graduation at CSU Stanislaus. It was found that students may not be receiving effective advising when approaching degree completion. The UEPC agreed that mandatory, personal advising by a major advisor when the student has completed between 75 and 90 units is in the best interest of the student and will assure timely degree completion and decrease unnecessary costs to students. Electronic degree audit technology will be available fall 2007 that will provide automatic generation of degree information. This technology will allow timely and efficient access to degree completion information by both faculty and students.

\*Note: The 'First-Year Programs and Advising' section appears on page 66 of the 2006-2007 University Catalog.

Discussion:

Carroll advised the idea for this resolution came out of last year's UEPC regarding facilitating graduation. UEPC discussed various points when advising would be good. This resolution is a result of that. UEPC suggested that when students apply for graduation, sometimes they find out they have not met all the criteria, so they have to reapply and pay another fee. This resolution states the department will determine how many units are required for mandatory advising. This could save the student time, money and frustration.

Riedmann ask how UEPC came up with 75 minimum and Carroll replied UEPC discussed this and the point at which we do this has to take into account transfer students. But, they didn't want to do it too close to 60 units which would make it not of much use. Davis added that students can transfer with 70 units in Liberal Studies. DeCaro stated the problem with 75-90, some courses are only

offered every other year, and if we don't get students earlier, they may not graduate. He wondered if it could be made more flexible and lower the number of units. Carroll questioned if 75 units was too late and DeCaro replied yes. Sankey thought it a great idea but how do you enforce it? Carroll replied students would know this when they read the Catalog. Also, departments will be informing them. As far as enforcement, that is another question. UEPC is not responsible to put this in place, but presume it can be done. Tuedio suggested 75-90 sounds right but it is probably a semester removed when advising occurs. In other words, there is a lag between unit taking and advising. Maybe the transfers are driving this beyond where it should be for the rest of our students. Eudey stated the more advising the better. It sounds like the policy is trying to say all programs should have mandatory advising before 90 units, which may be cleaner than 75-90 range. We are then saying everyone has to do it once before 90 units and leaving it to programs to pick when. She questioned the second Resolved clause. What is in the Academic Policy section of the Catalog? Maybe this should go in the section about the Major rather than in the Policy section. Carroll replied what the second Resolved is doing is requiring that each program put something in its section of the Catalog. But if we make Eudey's first change, we may not need the second Resolved change.

DeCaro asked if there was a mechanism for double majors to have advising in both majors and Carroll replied he would think it is implied. Stessman stated her agreement with advising before 90 units. In Chemistry, the earlier the better.

Thompson mentioned you can do a registration hold, but the problem is you would then have to release it. Further last Saturday he looked at a large data sample called the WPST. The prompt asked about increasing retention at the CSU and the vast majority of responses said to increase advising and maintain smaller classes. Riedmann noted the purpose is to facilitate graduation so the 90 units may be waiting too long. She proposed 80 units.

Robbins stated from a staff perspective, is the problem majors that don't require advising, since most departments require advising prior to registration. Carroll replied yes, there are only a few majors this will impact. Robbins suggested looking at the double major, when one department requires advising and the other does not. Carroll stated they would have to be advised in both departments. O'Brien added it could also be that students intend to declare a major but forget to complete the form. Even with a hold, they wouldn't be captured. Tuedio suggested we push closer to 70 units, and wondered why we are dancing around transfer students. We should try to catch them early. Filling stated the department is more than welcome to make restrictive statements, but this resolution just says no later than 90 units. Riedmann stated to advise late in the game defeats the whole purpose of the policy of facilitating graduation.

Tuedio asked about students that are undeclared. We need to force them to set down with someone and discuss what they want to do. Sarraille asked Tuedio if he is suggesting a blanket requirement that could be enforced by an advising hold. Robbins advised that this last spring, we pulled in undeclared students with 45 units and above and in one year we had more than 350 declare majors as a result. DeCaro suggested we even bring it down to 60 as a benchmark mechanism. Students have three semesters left when they hit that. O'Brien questioned if we don't do that now? Incoming transfer students are advised, right? Robbins replied if the students attend orientation, they are advised. But not all students attend orientation. Sarraille asked if orientation is required and Robbins replied it is required for registration prior to the first day of classes. It also means their transfer evaluation is done after the fact because their paperwork gets caught in the start of semester glut. Taniguchi questioned if there is a university requirement for a major to be declared and Carroll replied no. UEPC discussed it last year to see if they wanted to have such a date, but it is fruitless if a student is not ready to decide. Taniguchi suggested it would be good for a student to have to declare a major, depending on the number of units, say 80 or 90 units. It could push them to declare. She questioned how can they graduate in a timely fashion if they don't declare. Carroll wondered if floundering students don't perhaps have other issues and it might not be wise to force them to declare a major. DeCaro advised there are lots of students that change major and already have 30-40 units of core classes in a particular major, but they need to be structured at some point even if they change majors. Stessman asked if we can do by semester rather than units. Davis stated if you count by semester, it assumes students are full-time.

Tan questioned in the Rationale the electronic degree audit is mentioned. Sarraille explained the basic idea is that the software would determine what category the student is in and what the requirements are and how many the student had completed, thus printing out a list of what courses/requirements remain. It is an online statement or report on how much progress the person has made in the program. Tan asked if the software would be implemented in 2007 and Sarraille replied yes. Tan advised she heard that some students in Stockton get different advising than they get on the main campus. Is there an issue with regard to the Stockton campus?

Taniguchi stated she supports advising by semester. There are a number of students that are not full time, but they in particular tend

to be focused and want to be sure they are taking the right courses. Afonso agreed stating the Music Department advises every semester because their curriculum is structured in sequence. Even so, nothing can make students take the classes they need to when they need to. Ultimately, it is the decision of the students to stick to a plan.

Carroll reminded Senators the purpose is to allow maximum freedom to majors to do what they see fit. The History Department ceased the every semester advising because it didn't seem to be worthwhile. Others may find it valuable. The point of this resolution is to stay as wide as possible and let departments do more structures if they want. It is not our responsibility to impose structure on students. It is their responsibility. DeCaro agreed it is the student's responsibility, but we should provide some type of guidance. That is the purpose of advising. Carroll agreed stating that is what this resolution is all about.

Sarraille advised this will be action item January 23.

## 8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

### a. President Shirvani's email of November 28, 2006 re: University Budget

Sarraille explained the attached is from an email President Shirvani sent to the faculty. Tuedio stated he was struck by a comment near the end, "let me also take this opportunity to clarify salary saving." The context is that we have to hang on to salary savings to deal with the structural deficit. In that paragraph, Shirvani says that even if we didn't have a structural deficit, salary savings would still have been held to address a variety of urgent, priority needs facing the campus. Tuedio asked at what point is there impact on academic programs as well as other areas when salary savings are used and earmarked for administrative choices. O'Brien pointed out the need to look at the Strategic Plan very closely. Further, that this letter was in response to something he sent out calling for a faculty led budget summit. Also, the paragraph "now that we have a reasonable handle on the University budget, we are going to resume our UBAC meetings and regular reporting." He goes on to say "Because we have an established consultative structure that includes UBAC and FBAC, I believe it is best to make full use of that process, rather than to work outside of it." O'Brien stated he is quite happy to hear the President will work within the established structure. Sarraille suggested another question might be should we have more since we have more students?

Thompson referred to the paragraph Tuedio mentioned about salary savings closing the budget gap comes from administrative savings. It seems like the golden handshake drove the structural deficit when 3 deans and the president retired. And, on page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, last sentence, the President says "Please be assured that everyone will be kept fully informed and everyone's input will be welcome." He also said at the last SEC meeting that we would have assessable budget information on the web, much like the Chancellor's Office website. Further, on page 1, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, "2) improve prudent use of resources and cost effectiveness of campus operations while fully funding academic instruction." That comes after increased enrollment item. We're fully funding the staffing of classes, but in the English Department, we have had a structural deficit for several years. We are gradually reducing it, but now we're hearing that even though we've increased FTES, we're not getting the increase in money we have to work with. He wondered what the deficit decrease has to do with our plan. We take more students and we don't get any more money. Sarraille stated in that same paragraph it states "I am pleased to report that, through the combination of these two approaches, we have been able to reduce the \$6 million structural deficit of last year to less than \$3 million this year." He stated he would like to see some quantitative analysis of that. Also, how much did enrollment go up and how did we manage to raise \$3 million with a relatively small increase in enrollment at the same time use that money for its primary purpose. Eudey stated this is a crisis budget. With the increase in revenue, what we are doing now will be seen as the status quo and we are overworking our faculty and staff. She stated her fear as we grow we will set what we do now as a benchmark. And, we can't accommodate the workload agreement. She added, we need more money, not necessarily use the money smarter.

Bruner stated that at every deans meeting, there has been conversation along with what Eudey just said. At least from the dean's perspective, we are working on that with the Provost and the President. It is important for people to know that. Covino agreed stating our task is to be open and to work on the problem areas. We are obviously recovering from a difficult period. But, we are better off than other places, he stated. He gave credit to those in this room for that. Further, we must keep focused on the day when we will be in a better position. We have a couple of years of work to do to get ourselves to a good place. He stated we need to get to a place the new colleges are working to increase their revenue and we as an institution are making every effort to intensify that work, enrollment growth, research growth, fundraising and new initiatives. He stated his hope that everyone collectively feels encouraged that we are moving in the right direction. Filling pointed out to the Provost we have degraded what we do in the name of coping, and we are not

doing fine.

**b. General Faculty Constitutional Amendments (input from COC, FAC, CoCA)**

Sarraille advised he emailed the Chairs of FAC, COC and a representative from CoCA and asked that they give a brief report on the status of their work regarding amending the General Faculty Constitution. He pointed out that after today's meeting, the next meeting is January 23, then February 20. Approval is needed by the Academic Senate meeting of February 20, so we can have a General Faculty vote between February 26 and March 2. The President has 30 days in which to approve/reject, but the COC will use the month of March to recruit faculty for committees. But, we need specific information by that time in order to recruit and hold elections in April. We could move this back by a single AS meeting, but that would be a very tight timeline. We do need structural changes in committees to reflect changes taken place in the organization of the colleges.

Thompson, Chair of FAC stated he sent his report to Asnet and Facnet. FAC has consulted with COC and sent a version of the General Faculty Constitution with line in/line out and comments to the Ad Hoc Committee on Constitutional Amendments (CoCA) asking for their response. There is a list of 9 items of changes. Thompson stated he agrees with Sarraille about the timeline. He also noted FAC is concerned about the tension between/among college vs. universitywide representation. We do have some very big committees with lots of ex officio members that are able work. We are talking about how to continue to make that work. The other thing we need to keep in mind is that one set of changes is to facilitate elections that are in accord with the General Faculty Constitution. Thus, we might get to the point where we have a minimum set to facilitate elections and also time to ruminate on other changes.

Filling, Chair of COC advised COC has gone through FAC's version of the General Faculty Constitution and made minimal changes. It is clear from the preliminary report from CoCA, they are taking a rather philosophical look at the Constitution. We will ask them to look at minimal changes as they continue to review it.

Nagel, member of CoCA asked that the following language be added to his report. "CoCA is taking a philosophical bent, looking at what the General Faculty Constitution means." This is part of our charge. Also we will be sensitive to current practice. It is clear to the committee to place greater responsibility for policy making in the hands of the faculty. The timeline gives us worry. We are charged with providing pro/con arguments side by side and it is hard to imagine what level of work will be involved and how long it will take. Eudey added one of the challenges here is keeping faculty involved in policymaking and balancing that with workload. She stated if she were in a small college, she'd be worried about workload. Representation is important, but workload may trump that. If every college is represented on every committee, that will be a large net increase. Nagel stated one way that played itself out is on the second and third points under number 2. Does increased size mean increased representation? Or is it just the usual suspects? How do we encourage junior/lecturer faculty to get involved? Thompson stated one of the things we did was to go through each committee and see where college representation makes sense. One of the places we ended up is that UEPC is a good test case for that. If you're limiting people involved, which committees would they pick to be on? Sarraille stated hopefully Senators have looked at this carefully. If you have reservations, please let someone know ASAP. This is a fairly big deal and we will have to operate under it for at least one year. We have reasons to try to optimize it. Please ask your constituents for their wisdom. O'Brien asked if we are looking at other institutions to see what they do and Nagel replied yes. All three committees looked at it.

Tan wondered if Senators will be able to see the before and after and Thompson replied FAC will do a side by side comparison. A format was developed that will just list out the membership, much like a stacked list. Eudey suggested it might be helpful when doing structure, to look at college structure so we have a sense of the total picture.

Taniguchi added one more issue and that is the Sustainability Task Force. It is still meeting but needs a home. It can't belong to one the colleges because it crosses over two colleges. But it does deserve continued attention. That way it could be included in the rpt file. Eudey suggested that our deadlines meet up with ASI student elections. Sarraille stated the ASI appoints students to committees rather than electing them.

**9. OPEN FORUM**

Scott asked if a student is graduating this year, are they still required to have 3 Winter Terms. Carroll replied yes. The new policy takes effect next academic year. Scott asked when the Repeated Course resolution would be coming forth and Carroll replied

hopefully within the next 3 or so Senate meetings.

Carroll asked for a point of information. He was one of a small group of faculty invited to lunch with the President last week and during lunch he learned that the faculty research funding from the Naraghi family is restricted to the sciences. When this was presented to SEC, that was not mentioned. Helzer asked if only science students would get scholarships and Carroll stated he did not know. O'Brien asked if this stipulation was by the Naraghi family and Carroll again stated he did not know. Sarraille stated it seems like it is not always possible to get a copy of the agreement and see what terms of the gift are because of privacy considerations. But, if people are curious and it is reasonable to be at this point, we have to ask the appropriate administrators to tell us what the details are. It is a little troubling that losing public funding means that when private gifts come in, you do have a change in configuration of the funds and uses of funds. Tuedio wondered if there is a place in that discussion for the LAC. If a large amount of money is directed to the sciences faculty, we need to think about how we might catch up to where other campuses in the CSU are. That could have some ramifications for the rest of us as well. In the meantime, we have a small amount of money committed to faculty research. He wondered if it would be possible to limit those funds going to science faculty and earmark it for the rest of the faculty. We need to keep these things in mind to keep morale up. Sarraille questioned if Shirvani didn't say that the deans would have control over the award of those funds. So that does leave the question, what should be the role of LAC. Where is faculty input here?

Thompson stated he heard that the President is forming an advisory group that would include faculty. Sarraille stated he did get some inkling that was happening. But he doesn't know who is on it. But he did hear faculty were being recruited. Thompson asked that the Speaker follow up on that.

10. ADJOURNMENT 4:20.