### Academic Senate

**February 20, 2007**

**PRESENT:** Afonso, Bender, Brown, Carroll, Clarke, Covino, Davis, DeCaro, DeCocker, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garza, Grobner, Hall, Janz, Jibby, Kim, Lawson, Lindsay, Manrique, Manzt, Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nelligan, O’Brien, Petratos, Riedmann, Robbins, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Sniezek, Silverman, Stessman, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling

**GUESTS:** Carl Bengston, Carl Brown, Suzanne Burns, Diana Demetrulias, April Hejka-Ekins, Marjorie Jaasma, Chelsea Minor, Gary Novak

**Recording Secretary:** Diana Bowman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Resolution Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/AS/07/FAC/COC</td>
<td>Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/AS/07/RSCAPC</td>
<td>Amendment to 6/AS/06/RSCAPC—Policy on Human Subjects Research, APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/AS/07/AS</td>
<td>Resolution Concerning Actions of the Board of Trustees, APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/AS/07/SEC</td>
<td>Amendment to Standing Rules of the AS, APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/AS/07/SEC</td>
<td>Resolution in Support of CFA in bargaining with the Administration of the CSU, APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/AS/07/UEPC</td>
<td>Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Implementation Policies, FIRST READING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

Tuesday, March 6, 2007  
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

Meeting called to order at 2:36 pm.

Approval of agenda—Approved as submitted.

Approval of Minutes of January 23, 2007—Jibby asked that page 9, second to last paragraph, state that Andrew LaFlamme is the student trustee on the Board of Trustees. Also, the second sentence page 9 should read “the student representative saw…” Minutes approved as amended.

### Announcements

1. Preference forms for committee work are due in the Academic Senate Office on February 28. Sarraille encouraged Senators and their colleagues to complete the form and participate in faculty governance.

2. Next week a letter will be going out asking for spring update of courses to be evaluated. If you want to change your
course(s), please contact your department chair.

3. SEC is gathering information about the processes of recent faculty searches. If you have any concerns, please relay them to any member of SEC. Names will not be shared.

4. Mayer advised he was at the Utah Regional Kennedy Center ACT Festival. 30 students from the Music and Theatre Departments performed Little Shop of Horrors. They did very well.

5. Thompson advised the Ad Hoc Committee on Intellectual Property Rights completed its charge and sent their report with suggested revisions to the IPR Policy to FAC, ASI, CFA, GC, OCMDL, RSCAPC, S. Burns, SEC and UEPC.

6. Filling advised there will be a general membership meeting of CFA tomorrow 11-1 in JSRFDC Reference Room. Food and drink will be provided.

7. Janz reported on February 28 the ASI in association with housing will put on a campus dialogue on connections between higher education and pop culture.

Questions about reports

None

CONSENT ITEM

a. 5/AS/07/SEC—Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

Sarraille announced the membership of the Academic Senate changed from 46 to 47 when we added Agricultural Studies. The quorum changed from 28 to 29. Unless there is an objection, he stated he would assume it is all right to amend the Standing Rules. There was no objection.

Action Items

a. 1/AS/07/FAC—Amendment to General Faculty Constitution

Thompson, Chair of the FAC, thanked the Academic Senate for the input provided at the first reading of this resolution.

In the spring of 2006, the Senate Executive Committee referred the issue of amendment of the Constitution of the General Faculty to the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Affairs Committee. Since that time, both committees have consulted with each other and more broadly through a series of forums and through direct invitations for consultation to specific campus constituencies such as all standing General Faculty and Academic Senate committees, all departments, deans, the provost, the president, and the Academic Senate.

The committees believe they have attended to their constitutional duties and have arrived at a series of proposed amendments that reflect the review of input gathered broadly and reflect the considered opinions of faculty elected by the General Faculty to make just such considerations. We also believe these amendments will facilitate elections that are in accordance with the Constitution.

Since the last Academic Senate meeting, the committees have reviewed the discussion and suggestions offered at the first reading, I reported the changes made in response to that and other discussions in my report to the Senate, and I will review the changes again shortly.

As well there was a question whether the UEPC must have a first and second reading of a proposal to make a change to the standing subcommittees. I think it is important to explain to the senate the reasoning of the FAC in reviewing this question. The power that the
UEPC has in the constitution is to create in consultation with the COC, ad hoc committees. Since the standing committees are enumerated in the constitution, they certainly can’t be removed except by amendment approved by a vote of the General Faculty and by the president. For example, the former subcommittee, Academic Program Review was removed in the only way it could be, by amending the constitution; the same process of amendment is necessary to create a standing subcommittee. Creation of standing subcommittees of the UEPC does not belong to the UEPC or even to the Academic Senate; creation belongs to the General Faculty and the President. That said, we are of course not interested in limiting consultation to that specifically required. The discussion of combining the two subcommittees arose at more than one of the FAC forums last fall, and was discussed in COC, FAC and in the SEC. The FAC has consulted with the SEC, the UEPC, the Academic Technology subcommittee, the Off-Campus/Mediated and Distance Learning subcommittee, and CIO Whitman, and we thank them all for their timely response which supported and informed the proposed merging of AT and OCMDL into a Technology and Learning Subcommittee of the UEPC.

As was reflected in my written report to the Senate, the FAC incorporated these changes to the attached document:

384: VI.2.1 Inserted and as recommended to clarify language

466-468 VI.2.3 Changed number and listing of UEPC subcommittees.

Changed to specify “appointed by the President of Associated Students” where appropriate, but note for example V.2.e on student membership in the Academic Senate is left to read as “selected by the Associated Students, according to their procedures.”

Deleted language on the OCMDL and AT subcommittees of the UEPC.

519-526: Inserted language creating a Technology and Learning subcommittee of the UEPC.

727-729 Altered language regarding appointment of ad hoc subcommittees of Graduate council, viz.: “normally with no more than one from any program.”

Those are the changes.

We did not disambiguate a much-discussed ambiguity or alleged ambiguity we inadvertently highlighted in attempting to account for the voting privileges on the University Educational Policies Committee; however, we believe that the Constitution and governance can continue to function, as it has for the past many years, whether or not an ambiguity exists and that the question should not be a bar to recommending the proposed amendments to a vote of the General Faculty.

The resolution up for action today recommends the proposed amendments to a vote of the General Faculty. Recommendation by the General Faculty will require 2/3 approval of those voting. If the General Faculty does recommend the amendments, then the proposed amendments will move to the president for his endorsement.

Finally, for those who are susceptible to the argument that “we worked hard,” I say “we worked hard.”

We believe we have consulted broadly, we have proposed thoughtfully, and we have kept the Faculty’s interest at heart. The committees urge you to support the resolution.

Discussion:

Sarraille voiced a point of personal privilege about lines 466-468. If the GF approve the amendments, there will not be 5 subcommittees but 4 deleting OCMDL and AT Subcommittees. They will be replaced with the Technology and Learning Subcommittee. Thompson explained that the change was reported in his report over Asnet.

Taniguchi thanked the committees that worked so hard. She noted on line 507 it reads ‘four no more than one from any College…’
should read ‘four faculty with no more…’ This was accepted as editorial.

Janz made a motion to amend line 608 that reads ‘an ASI Senate member designated by the President of Associated Students shall act as a student voting member for a one year term,’ to read ‘a student designated by the President of the ASI.’ Thompson stated the Constitution is not open for amendment. What is on the floor is the resolution and it can be amended. Further, the change was in response to a request by the ASI President at the last meeting, and in his opinion, that is a substantive change to the document and that is not in order. Sarraillie agreed stating only if the amendment would be editorial or minor in nature could the document be amended. Sarraillie asked if this is the wish of the ASI and Minor explained that recently she needed to appoint a student to the Search Committee for Dean of Arts. The ASI had no student representative on the ASI from the Arts, so she had to appoint from outside. Sarraillie reminded Minor this section addresses a student representative on FBAC. Janz asked if this language was intended to restrict this to only ASI members and Sarraillie replied this is the same wording as when FBAC was first formed. The only words changed by FAC were deleting ‘Speaker of the ASI Senate’ and adding ‘ASI President’ at the request of Minor at the last meeting. Taniguchi questioned whether it would be important to have a student elected by other students to represent students on faculty committees and Janz replied the ASI President has the authority to appoint student representatives. Taniguchi added, the ASI President’s pool would be from students that have run for office and have been elected by students. Sarraillie stated his ruling is that this rises beyond editorial or minor so the motion is not in order. We can entertain motions to amend the resolution but not the text of the constitution. He suggested contacting FAC if the ASI would like to recommend changes to the constitution at a later date. Hejka-Ekins also suggested the ASI contact CoCA, since they are compiling a list of constitutional issues that will be given to FAC.

O’Brien spoke in favor of the resolution. He stated it is incredibly important and the timing is right to hold elections in a couple of months. COC, FAC and CoCA did a very good job.

The question was called and vote on the resolution passed with a vote of 36 For and 4 Against.

b. 2/AS/07/RSCAPC—Amendment to 6/AS/06/RSCAPC—Policy on Human Subjects Research

Sarraillie advised RSCAPC made no changes to the document. Senior recapped the circumstances why this document came back to the AS, specifically that the campus decided to use the federal definition pertaining to research and vulnerable populations. Also, the language surrounding Classroom Activities has been clarified.

There being no discussion, vote on the resolution unanimously passed by voice vote.

c. 4/AS/07/AS—Resolution Concerning Actions of the Board of Trustees

Sarraillie explained that this resolution was tabled at the last meeting.

Sniezek questioned why it reads ‘expresses dismay’ rather than ‘oppose.’ Filling explained it is largely because if we say ‘we oppose’ it presumes we have a voice in the process and we don’t. We have a voice in the wider discussion.

Janz read the following statement: A few weeks ago a student representative met in good faith with the leadership of the Stanislaus Academic Senate to move beyond the apparent disagreement seen here at the previous Academic Senate meeting. I was under the impression that we agreed that the students and faculty would work together to garner support from the state legislature to increase funding to the CSU. I walked away from that meeting with a new sense of cooperation between faculty and students. But what the students really got was this resolution "The Resolution Concerning Actions of the Board of Trustees", clearly designed to one-up the student resolution. The student resolution supported a faculty raise, administrative raise, and Low Student Fees.

This Academic Senate resolution asserts that the executive leadership has stated that student fees are the only source of funds for faculty salary increases. I would like to ask who has said this and when? Never in my experience as a statewide student representative have I heard this out of any administrator’s mouth.

Further, this resolution disingenuously claims that faculty are told there is no funding for increased salaries. How can this possibly be when there is still a twenty-four percent increase in faculty pay on the bargaining table and the CSU Budget.

http://web.csustan.edu/facultyhandbook/asminutes/0607/022007min.htm
Next, the resolution also mentions the difficulty the CSU is having with trying to acquire additional funds for higher education. I really wonder how this can be so. Maybe it has something to do with the fact that the statewide-CFA has followed the Chancellor to many of his public events to create a public image of CSU mis-management. Or perhaps it’s the Flunk Arnold Campaign obviously designed to increase support from the governor’s office.

Regardless, I cannot with good conscience cast a vote against the administration pay increase when I have already voted in favor of a faculty pay increase.

I strongly urge this board to move beyond this tactic of targeting the CSU and join the students in our lobbying efforts in Sacramento to get more state funding for higher education.

Sarraille thanked Janz for his statement.

It was MS Thompson/O’Brien to add a Resolved clause stating ‘this resolution be communicated to Chancellor Reed.’ Thompson explained faculty are expressing our dismay and we have to express it to someone. The most likely audience is the Chancellor. Carroll pointed out a typo in the second resolved ‘disingenuous.’ Vote on amendment passed by voice vote, with 2 objections and 1 abstention. Thompson, as parliamentarian advised abstentions are not recorded under Robert’s Rules. It says people have the right to abstain, but not the right to publicize.

Filling noted that the resolution speaks to actions taken by the Chancellor’s Office, not to the state budget or to the CFA. The resolution communicates the thoughts of the faculty on recent actions by the Board of Trustees, not to the ASI resolution. Faculty cannot and should not remain silent while the executives of the CSU mislead students and the public as to the state of affairs.

Mayer asked if what Janz is expressing is symptomatic across the system. If so, that will be a problem and it makes our job that much more difficult. It is not good for negotiations. Janz clarified that his statement wasn’t about supporting or not supporting faculty, but it is the tactics being used they do not support. Taniguchi stated one of the perceptions is that some of the information in the resolution comes from the Chancellor’s Office but has been analyzed much differently by CFA than from the CSU. That is a major source of the differences. Perhaps students should acknowledge that all information sources have perspectives that color the information provided.

Carroll suggested since Janz is opposed to the wording, might it be possible to tweak it without diluting its power, so we get ASI support.

Sniezek asked why abstentions are not counted. Her reason is that if the wording of a resolution is a problem, and she is uncertain how to vote, she would abstain. Sarraille advised you can abstain, and can also ask that the vote be counted and announced.

DeCaro voiced confusion about the student’s position. At the last meeting, ASI President Minor stated they are neutral. But Janz says they support faculty, although not the resolution. Minor replied CSA and ASI discussed the difference between CFA and our faculty. She stated she supports our faculty, not CFA. Further, she understands the difficulties and understands faculty are underpaid. But she doesn’t support the types of behavior attacking Chancellor Reed or acting inappropriately. She stated ASI has nothing against faculty getting raises. DeCaro stated at the last meeting Minor stated they support administrative increases because they were a small amount of money compared to faculty raises. Minor stated these are two separate issues. DeCaro again asked if they support faculty.

It was MS Carroll/Riedmann to amend the second Resolved to read “That the Academic Senate, CSUS believe that this decision, made at a time when the CSU is resisting CFA proposals for faculty salary increases, when students are being threatened with significant fee increases, and when many campuses are canceling classes because of a lack of funding to pay instructors, sends an impolitic message to the public and to the CSU community.”

Carroll stated he is unsure if the students are against the resolution or the spirit of the resolution. Janz stated he does not think this is a good resolution. It continues to divide our situation. Thompson voiced support of the amendment. It carries the same idea in slightly more nuanced language. It also carries well what we are looking at as a statement of the Academic Senate. He added that the ASI made their statement and although he disagreed with it, he still supports our students. We can support each other even though we
disagree.

Sniezek voiced support of the amendment. It says what we want to say.

There being no further discussion, vote on the amendment passed.

It was MS Carroll/Thompson to modify the Rationale by deleting the last sentence.

Mayer stated if the sentence is struck, there will need to be additional wording to end it.

Vote to drop the last sentence passed by voice vote.

It was MS Carroll/Filling to add in place of the deleted sentence “This move strikes the Academic Senate of CSUS as inappropriate at this time.”

Tuendio questioned what happened to the language that states “when the balance of the university community is struggling to communicate to the California legislature the dire need for additional funding for the CSU?”

There was no objection to add the above language, so now the amendment reads: “This move strikes the AS of CSUS as inappropriate at this time, when the balance of the university community is struggling to communicate to the California Legislature the dire need for additional funding for the CSU.”

Vote on the amendment passed.

Back to main motion. Vote on the resolution as amended passed by voice vote.

Resolution reads:

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus express its dismay at the decision of the executive leadership of the California State University System to award themselves retroactive salary increases, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus believe that this decision, made at a time when the CSU is resisting CFA proposals for faculty salary increases, when students are being threatened with significant fee increases, and when many campuses are canceling classes because of a lack of funding to pay instructors, sends an impolitic message to the public and to the CSU community, and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be communicated to Chancellor Charles Reed.

Rationale: At the Board of Trustees meeting on 24 January, the compensation committee issued final approval of a plan to retroactively increase the salaries of 28 members of the executive management by 4%. This results in an additional cost to the CSU of over $300,000 per year. This move strikes the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus as inappropriate at this time when the balance of the university community is struggling to communicate to the California legislature the dire need for additional funding for the CSU.

First Reading Items

a. 6/AS/07/SEC—Resolution in Support of CFA in bargaining with the Administration of the CSU

It was MS Filling/Carroll

6/AS/07/SEC--Resolution in support of California Faculty Association (CFA) in bargaining with the Administration of the California State University (CSU)
RESOLVED: recognizing the Faculty's responsibility for the educational functions of the University and the Senate's role as the official representative body of the Faculty, the Academic Senate of California State University Stanislaus fully support the California Faculty Association and urge Chancellor Charles B. Reed to return to the bargaining table and to bargain in good faith, without establishing positions that cannot be negotiated, and, be it further

RESOLVED: that this resolution be distributed to the Trustees of the CSU, CSU Chancellor Charles B. Reed, CSU Stanislaus President Hamid Shirvani, CSU Provost William Covino, all CSU Academic Senates, the CSU Stanislaus chapter of the CFA, all other CSU chapters of the CFA, and local media.

Rationale: The Faculty of CSU Stanislaus has primary responsibility for the educational functions of the University, and the quality of the academic programs hinges on the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers and scholars.

Although, both the Consumer Price Index and campus Presidential salary increases have raced ahead of faculty salary increases over the last decade, on December 15, 2006 the statutory step of mediation ended without progress on the critical issue of faculty compensation.

The CFA and the CSU have reached the final statutory stage of bargaining known as fact-finding. We believe that the California Faculty Association has bargained in good faith with the California State University administration for over a year and a half; however, the administration bargaining team has attempted during mediation to renege on tentative agreements already reached in order to degrade benefits to be included in their "last best offer." Now, we must prepare for the likely outcome that one side or the other will not support the fact finding report, at which point Chancellor Reed may for the third time take the extreme step of imposing terms and conditions of employment consistent with their "last best offer." It is crucial that the Chancellor, rather than taking the destructive step of a second Imposition, demonstrate that he values the Faculty of the CSU by returning to the bargaining table and bargaining in good faith.

Saraille stated there is some consideration and thought to voting on this today so he may ask for a waiver to go to a second reading.

Filling stated that the resolution is self explanatory. To date 16 other campuses have passed similar resolutions. The ethos of higher education resides in the faculty, and a large part of what the CFA advocates for directly affects quality of education in the CSU. It is not just about more money. He urged the Senate’s support on this motion.

Wendt stated he’d like to try to make a distinction between the AS supporting CFA in its bargaining with CSU. If we stop right there, that would be an easy vote to take, but Senators are asked to vote on a resolution that characterizes things in bargaining that people in this room are not privy to. Faculty have representatives at the bargaining table as does the CSU. Bargaining needs to happen at the bargaining table. Filling asked what mischaracterizations Wendt is referring to. Wendt replied the assumption the CSU is not bargaining in good faith. Filling asked if Wendt has been present at the bargaining table and he replied no. O’Brien stated what Wendt is saying needs to be thought about carefully. But he supports this resolution. SWAS has been receiving resolutions like this, 16 to date. This does send the right message. It shows solidarity that we hope for a successful outcome of our contract. Garcia asked Wendt for more specific language he is referring to that we are not privy to. Wendt replied the First Resolved, last sentence ‘urge Chancellor Charles B. Reed to return to the bargaining table and to bargain in good faith, without establishing positions that cannot be negotiated.’

Wendt stated also in the Rationale “the administration bargaining team has attempted during mediation to renege on tentative agreements already reached in order to degrade benefits to be included in their “last best offer.” Do you know that the CSU has reneged on previous agreements? Saraille responded that Sam Strafaci of the CSU did make a statement about changing their bargaining proposal to bring back some older stuff. That was reported in various media.

Saraille advised if people want to suggest changes, or if they feel the language is inaccurate or unproven, they can make a motion to amend during the second reading. Covino advised he knows of several campus that have adopted a statement passed by the SWAS in January and he wondered whether this body wishes to consider this statement as a model or alternative. Manrique, speaking as a member of two bargaining teams in the past, shared that details in this resolution fit with her experiences in bargaining. She thinks degradation of the offer has been a deliberate tactic and she agrees with the sense and words of this resolution.
Thompson asked the Speaker to ask some of our CFA representatives for help in validating the particular statement in the Rationale.

Filling stated as an informed CFA person, CFA has been bargaining in good faith. Last October the CFA bargaining team met with the CFA Board and Chapter Presidents and were told the CSU were changing previously bargained items. From a CFA perspective, this is happening. Taniguchi asked the Speaker to get evidence to back this up before a second reading. We would have a much stronger resolution. Filing explained that bargaining is confidential and there are a lot of things the bargaining team is restricted from telling us publicly. Taniguchi stated she has been reading emails, so much has already been made public. We just need to gather that information.

Carroll stated his support for Taniguchi, but wondered if the timing of the resolution is more important than getting the kind of evidence to strengthen the resolution. We lose something even if we gain something. Sarraille reminded people amendments can be proposed when in a second reading.

It was MS Thompson/Mantz to move to waive the rules and move to a second reading.

Thompson stated he has no strong feelings either way but this gives Senators an opportunity to say if they want to vote or not. Eudey questioned the timing of the ongoing bargaining process. Is something going to happen before our next Senate meeting? If not, this should be carried over. Sarraille stated if we wait for two weeks, that will take us very close for completion of fact finding, which would be after the final steps of the resolution process. Nelligan suggested the Rationale seems to be the issue so he suggested putting a period after ‘half’ and strike the rest of the sentence. Then go to ‘now we must prepare.’ Sarraille ruled this out of order.

Mantz stated the urgency makes it timely because of a possible strike action. Further, the issue around disagreement won’t be resolved by producing a series of emails. If people disagree, then they disagree. Eudey replied that you have demonstrated a need to suspend so she supports moving to second reading.

Vote to suspend the rules and move to a second reading passed by voice vote.

It was MS O’Brien/Carroll to amend the First Resolved by taking out the language on the fifth line after ‘faith’.

Eudey asked if we could also change the Rationale under the same amendment and Sarraille ruled no. It should be a separate amendment.

Vote on the above amendment passed by voice vote.

It was MS Nelligan/Carroll to amend the Rationale deleting at the end of the third line, starting with “however” and ending with “offer.”

Wendt asked if it is correct the Rationale does not go anywhere? Sarraille replied when resolutions are sent to the President, the form only has the Resolveds listed. If it is a Sense of the Senate, the entire resolution goes forth. Wendt noted there is a pretty substantial difference between sending Chancellor Reed a message that says to bargain in good faith and telling him to bargain in good faith because we don’t think he has been acting in good faith.

Vote on amendment passed.

Back to main resolution.

Thompson pointed out under the Rationale, on the fifth line up from the bottom, change to “second time,” (not third time).

Janz suggested Senators take a better look at the SWAS resolution since students would be in favor of that.

Vote on the resolution passed by voice vote.

Resolution reads:
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RESOLVED: recognizing the Faculty's responsibility for the educational functions of the University and the Senate's role as the official representative body of the Faculty, the Academic Senate of California State University Stanislaus fully support the California Faculty Association and urge Chancellor Charles B. Reed to return to the bargaining table and to bargain in good faith, and, be it further

RESOLVED: that this resolution be distributed to the Trustees of the CSU, CSU Chancellor Charles B. Reed, CSU Stanislaus President Hamid Shirvani, CSU Provost William Covino, all CSU Academic Senates, the CSU Stanislaus chapter of the CFA, all other CSU chapters of the CFA, and local media.

Rationale: The Faculty of CSU Stanislaus has primary responsibility for the educational functions of the University, and the quality of the academic programs hinges on the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers and scholars.

Although, both the Consumer Price Index and campus Presidential salary increases have raced ahead of faculty salary increases over the last decade, on December 15, 2006 the statutory step of mediation ended without progress on the critical issue of faculty compensation.

The CFA and the CSU have reached the final statutory stage of bargaining known as fact-finding. We believe that the California Faculty Association has bargained in good faith with the California State University administration for over a year and a half. Now, we must prepare for the likely outcome that one side or the other will not support the fact finding report, at which point Chancellor Reed may for the second time take the extreme step of imposing terms and conditions of employment consistent with their "last best offer." It is crucial that the Chancellor, rather than taking the destructive step of a second Imposition, demonstrate that he values the Faculty of the CSU by returning to the bargaining table and bargaining in good faith.

b. 7/AS/07/UEPC—Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement Implementation Policies

MS Carroll/Filling

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus accepts the attached GWAR Implementation Policies; and be it further

RESOLVED: The attached GWAR Implementation Policies will become effective at the start of the 2007-2008 Academic Year; and be it further

RESOLVED: That said policies should be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook and that the appropriate changes required to reflect these policies be made to Writing Proficiency Screening Test (WPST) brochures and the University Catalog, and further that copies of the GWAR Implementation Policies and the attached FAQ be sent to all WP course instructors, department chairs, and Academic Advising.

RATIONALE: In 20/AS/05/UWC/UEPC the Academic Senate asked the University Writing Committee (UWC) to recommend changes in the policies for oversight of the GWAR program. The attached policies are the outcome of that endeavor.

The GWAR requirements at California State University, Stanislaus are that:

1. students must first successfully complete the Writing Proficiency Screening Test (WPST);
2. students must then complete a designated, upper-division Writing Proficiency (WP) 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.

While the UWC and UEPC can find no pre-existing statement of GWAR Implementation Policies, the policies attached hereto are congruent with long-established practice on our campus. With respect to the proposed change to extant practice, UWC and UEPC note that plagiarism is an increasingly significant concern that was not adequately addressed by established practice. Plagiarism is becoming easier to do and more common in all of its forms from extensive "assistance" with writing papers to directly copying from the web or elsewhere. While guarding against plagiarism has always been the responsibility of the instructor, we think in the face of its increasing prominence it is advisable that the UWC make this explicit in the WP course guidelines. Therefore the underlined text [10.d] has been added.
Discussion:

Carroll explained that basically what this does is to codify what is accepted practice here which is the GWAR. Mantz questioned on page 31, number 10 an additional criteria was added so it should be changed from 4 criteria to 3 criteria. Also, it is unclear whether a WP course can be taken as a non-WP course. Further, he stated this is the first time he has seen this document, so he suggested it be shared. This could pertain to workload. Davis shared, with regard to enrollment, timing issues allow for enrollment but not attendance. For example, if a student takes the WPST late, the documentation might not be in the system in time for it to show on the enrollment sheet. But the student would have the written documentation at the time of the first class. Also once this is approved here, it will go to the writing blackboard page.

Eudey replied to the Mantz question about admitting non-WP students. The answer is on page 33, under Frequently asked Questions about the GWAR, number 5 “As with any course prerequisite, the instructor has the authority to allow a student to take the course without having taken the WPST…” But, Eudey questioned where the term GWAR (Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement) comes from? Is it system language? If not, it should be changed because the term ‘graduate’ implies graduate level and this is for undergraduates. Davis replied it is a system word. Taniguchi asked for clarification referring to number 5; does the instructor have the authority to allow students to enroll, attend and get a grade without passing the WPST? Davis replied faculty have the authority to make exceptions, but we recommend you don’t do that.

Mantz stated it was his understanding faculty can’t let non-WP students in. The FAQ answers that query. Thompson states the implementation policy states it is the instructor’s responsibility to withdraw students. Does the responsibility extend to students that state they are not taking the class for GWAR but to fulfill the multicultural requirement? It would be helpful for UEPC to consider the non-WP purpose issue. As it reads, number 3 and 5 seem to have a conflict.

DeCaro voiced support for 4 units for WP courses. He explained there is twice-three times the amount of work. Also, he suggested developing language at some point to differentiate what students are allowed into these courses. It creates a lot of problems in class. There is also the possibility of legal problems.

Tuedio stated he was under the impression that the catalog states if a student did not pass the WPST prior to the end of the semester, that course would not satisfy the WPST requirement. Robbins clarified that the WPST requirement is distinct from the WP course requirement, and that both must be satisfied to complete the GWAR requirement.

O’Brien noted under number 5 is the first time GWAR is mentioned so he suggests it be spelled out. Eudey added that under FAQ, number 8, it clarifies that every student must do all the writing assignments. The bigger issue is how we identify whether students pass the WPST can enroll in the course. This document says they can at the instructors discretion. She suggested students received information/advising the first day of class that tells them they need to pass the WPST and a WP course. Either we don’t let them enroll or we monitor this very well. Our goal is to find ways to help them become good writers.

Brown questioned if the screening test and prerequisite is the same thing. Davis replied the Writing Committee says the WPST is the prerequisite and it is in the Catalog. The Writing Committee does keep track on how many students are allowed in a class without a prerequisite. Brown questioned since we don’t waive other prerequisites, we should not waive this one.

O’Brien suggested UEPC look at the issue of having it required while preserving academic freedom. He shared in his department, they voted to not allow them in. DeCaro stated he would like to see some mechanism that prevent students getting to 120 units for graduation and still can’t pass the WPST.

Thompson advised the English Department just approved English 3000, an upper division intermediate comp course with a strong component of writing under pressure. The student can use the final exam as submission for the WPST. It is a 10 week course that also may be offered the second semester of summer semester. This course might help students that continuing fail the WPST.

Robbin stated she deals constantly with students who take the course but can’t pass the WPST. Number 5 gives a lot of leeway for interpretation. But the WPST is a requirement for graduation. We oftentimes end up with the students in our face. Her concern is that students are getting mixed messages and they keep going to people until they get the answer they want.
Carroll questioned if the UEPC and UWC review this policy before the next AS meeting, will it be a first or second reading. Sarraile replied it will be a second reading.

Tan suggested there should be a computer system that checks on prerequisites and block students from enrolling in classes they don’t meet the requirements. It is really an administrative task. Filling replied on the roster for WP courses, it lists if the student passed the WPST. There is no real burden on the instructor. Davis explained if a student takes it in January, your roster for Spring says it has not been taken but the student has the paper that says they have. Robbin added if you block the student from enrolling because the paperwork has not been processed to show they are eligible, that will create another problem.

Carroll advised UEPC meets this Thursday so if Senators have any suggestions, please send them to him before 1:00 Thursday.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45.