**Academic Senate**  
**January 23, 2007**

**PRESENT:** Bender, Brown, Carroll, Clarke, Covino, Davis, DeCaro, DeCocker, Eudey, Filling, Garza, Grobner, Jibby, Johnson, Lawson, Lindsay, Manrique, Mantz, Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O’Brien, Petrats, Robbins, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Sniezek, Shawkey, Silverman, Thompson, Tuedio,

**PROXIES:** Minor (Janz), Carroll (Taniguchi)

**GUESTS:** Carl Brown, Lilia DeKatsu, Diana Demetrulias, April Hejka-Ekins, Marjorie Jaasma, Gary Novak, Gordon Senior, Mary Stephens, Stephen Thomas, Ted Wendt

**3/AS/07/SEC—Commendation for the Naraghi Family, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

**15/AS/06/UEPC—Mandatory Advising within the Major, APPROVED**

**1/AS/07/FAC/COC—Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, FIRST READING**

**2/AS/07/RSCAPC—Amendment to 6/AS/06/RSCAPC—Policy on Human Subjects Research, FIRST READING**

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

Commencement Proposal presented to Senators

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

Tuesday, February 20, 2007  
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Clerk

---

1. Call to order at 2:36 pm.
2. Approval of Agenda. Approved as distributed.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 5, 2006. Minutes approved as distributed.

**4. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

a. Senators congratulated Gary Novak as the new Dean of the College of HHS.

b. Two new Senators were introduced: Mark Bender represents Agricultural Studies and Brittney Jibby replaces Chris Scott as one of the ASI representatives.

c. Strategic Plan—Sarraille advised that an amended Strategic Plan document (line in/line out) incorporating suggestions from AS and committees, and with cost estimates was sent to Provost Covino. Sarraille encouraged Senators to review and forward input to him or Provost Covino. It is expected that Covino will take this to other campus constituencies for further input. It may tie in with the statewide SP process.

b. Evaluations begin Thursday, January 25 and ends Wednesday, January 31. Finals are Thursday, February 1 and Friday,
February 2.

c. Spring semester begins Tuesday, February 13.

d. Commencement change (handout distributed) This will be discussed at the Open Forum.

e. Committee Preference Form will be distributed to all full time faculty at the end of January. Please encourage your colleagues to participate in faculty governance by completing the form and sending to Diana Bowman, JSRFDC 109.

f. Thompson advised there is an ad hoc committee on Intellectual Property Rights that has been reviewing extant policies. The charge indicated the work would be done by December 2006. The committee has one more meeting, so the report suggesting revisions to the current policy should be out shortly.

g. Nagel reported CFA is working on a pledge card campaign regarding a possible strike vote. The fact-finding report will be due within 4 weeks. CFA is looking to gauge faculty commitment. If you have not signed a pledge card but would like to, please see him after the meeting.

h. DeCaro advised that eCollege is wrapped up for spring, but are looking at summer and fall courses. Please ask faculty in your department to let him know by the end of February if they would like to do an eCollege course for those terms.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

Nagel questioned in the FAC report it said they are beginning to discuss the lecturer evaluation policy. He asked when this policy would come to the Senate. Thompson replied the next FAC meeting is February 14. SEC meets February 13; it would probably be a couple more AS meetings until it comes here.

6. CONSENT ITEM

a. 3/AS/07/SEC—Commendation for the Naraghi Family

Sarraille reads the following resolution and asked if there are any objections to passage. The resolution passed unanimously.

Whereas, the Naraghi Family has made a generous donation to the University; and,

Whereas, the Naraghi Family is to be commended for its contribution to the advancement of teaching and scholarship at California State University, Stanislaus and to the research and intellectual life of the region; and

Whereas, the Nora and Hashem Naraghi Hall of Science symbolizes the importance of community support for the education of the citizens of the Central Valley; and

Whereas, the Naraghi Hall of Science will advance the work of students, faculty, and staff; therefore, be it

Resolved: that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus hereby honor and graciously thank the Naraghi Family for their enduring contribution to the education of the present and future students of California State University, Stanislaus, and, be it further,

Resolved: that the Academic Senate encourage the faculty, students, and staff of the University through their work to honor the life's work of Nora and Hashem Naraghi.

7. ACTION ITEM

a. 15/AS/06/UEPC—Mandatory Advising within the Major Resolution
Carroll advised Senators of the minor revisions being the addition of parenthetical (s) in resolved clause to address the concern raised about double majors. The other focus of discussion had to do with the lower limit (75-90 units). UEPC decided to leave it as is, as there is another resolution waiting in the wings for first year advising which has a target of 45 units.

There being no further discussion, vote was called. Passed by voice vote.

8. FIRST READING ITEMS

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

It was MS Thompson/Filling

Be it Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty indicated in the attached document, and be it further,

Resolved: that the Academic Senate recommend the amendments become effective upon approval by the General Faculty and the President, and be it further,

Resolved: that the approved amendments be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale: On March 7th 2006 the Academic Senate approved a resolution (2/AS/06/SEC--Recommendation on College Restructuring) supporting the recommendation of the Report from Ad Hoc Committee on College (ALS) Restructuring to form several new colleges, and the President approved the resolution on March 30th. Shortly thereafter, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) formally referred the issue of amendment of the Constitution of the General Faculty to the Committee on Committees (COC) and the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), committees constitutionally empowered to recommend on committee structure and to propose amendments to the Constitution. In the fall of 2006, the SEC negotiated at length with the Provost over the process for consideration of amendments and agreed to a dual process during which the COC and FAC would continue with the work referred to them by the SEC and, at the same time, an ad hoc Committee on Constitutional Amendments (CoCA) would be jointly formed and would report to the FAC. The COC and FAC continued with their work and invited input through a series of eight forums as well as invitations to all General Faculty Committees, all standing Academic Senate Committees, all deans, the provost, and the president. The CoCA has held two forums for consideration of issues as well for feedback on two proposals for amendment and has provided a recommendation to the FAC to proceed with the proposed amendments in the attached documents. Many issues were considered at length by the committees, and the proposed amendments reflect their considered opinions based on an extensive review and discussion of input and recommendations. The committees feel that the proposed amendments will facilitate elections and appointments to constitutionally-provided committees while balancing representation with workload and preserving the authoritative voice of the Faculty in a constitution that has served and adapted well for many years.

Discussion:

Thompson explained after restructuring of the colleges last year, SEC referred the issues of amendments to the General Faculty Constitution to FAC and COC. They have been working on it for almost a year. The rationale gives a brief history, noting all faculty, committees, deans, the provost, vice provost were asked to give input. All items were sent to the Ad Hoc Committee (CoCA) and received back a request that we send the attached amendments forward. This came with a single objection from one CoCA member. This represents a lot of work and a lot of consensus.

Filling stated that COC has been working on this since last January. They spent lots of time talking with committees, deans, provost, president, students and staff. The clear consensus was this is probably the best way to move forward at this time. Sarraile advised we want to get a vote on this the next time we meet, February 20, so if you want to see anything improved, please let FAC know before the next meeting.

Minor advised the students no longer have a Board of Directors, so anywhere it refers to appointing a student representative, just say appointed by the ASI President. She explained that approval for all student representatives has to be by the ASI President.
Eudey referred to page 23, Article IV, Section 6.6 talks about interdisciplinary Studies Committee having 5 members, no more than one from each college. She noted that not all colleges have graduate programs. She suggested more flexibility in the language.

Eudey questioned the phrase ‘no more than one from each college.’ In balloting, would only one person from each college be able to run or could more people run, but you take the highest vote getter from each college? Sarraile stated he was unsure how this would work, but it thinks it would be more like the latter.

Tuedio asked if FAC looked at the types of programs that are typically approved that would change the approach you make of designating slots. Some areas might not have a program, but would have representation and some areas might be underrepresented due to the number of programs. Lindsay advised that he served as chair for many years, even though this is a subcommittee of GC, members are not from GC. Secondly, some of the members are from disciplines that don’t have graduate programs but interdisciplinary masters may well be hitting that target audience. This committee primarily reviews proposals and recommends if the proposal meets requirements for such a degree program. Thompson asked if it tells us about membership? Lindsay replied that what has happened in the past, people would get on the sub-committee and they would normally be reappointed every three years. But through attrition the committee dwindled, so we would go to the COC and ask for more names. We would always try to keep a certain balance between hard sciences, social sciences, arts. The interdisciplinary programs can combine just about any set of disciplines, although as Tuedio notes, clusters do show up from time to time.

Hejka-Ekins, Chair of CoCA stated the committee met a number of times and carefully considered the recommendation of FAC and COC who spent a lot of time balancing representation and the burden to faculty. She stated in her opinion, this is not patchwork. It was carefully thought out and a balanced solution to the issue. And she stated in her opinion (and others that voted for it) this was deliberated and was carefully developed. There will be feedback from colleges as this progresses, which is a bottom up approach which makes a lot of sense. This proposal can be adjusted depending on input from the colleges and others. Demetrulias stated she attended two meetings of CoCA and when she left the last meeting she was under the impression changes would reflect college representation only. It was depicted in the CoCA minutes that this is a transition document until there is time to have more debate. She noted in particular that in two of the committees that affect her position was changed to non-voting. She understood that CoCA had agreed to leave those out. This document goes beyond what was agreed to as incremental changes.

Tuedio followed up on Novak’s concern about representation from all colleges. For example, COC does not have college representation now so this is not a change. Are there other people representing smaller colleges that say although it would be a tremendous workload, they still want representation? Mayer, Senator from Theatre, agrees they are trying to balance the issue of the need for representation and workload, and are unsure how to face it. There are only 22 faculty in the College of Arts. Thompson responded to Demetrulias regarding the patchwork metaphor stating this is the third of fourth time he has heard this metaphor and he responded to it each time and it has been brought up again. Hearing it repeated over and over, he is starting to take offense. He thinks it is something that helps people visualize the document in a certain way. He stated he hates to hear people make arguments to get the resolution passed saying the committee worked hard. But on the other hand when someone mentions that the General Faculty constitution has been amended 31 times, we need to acknowledge that is 31 times of hard work and careful consideration. Two examples: we added Academic Technology Subcommittee and Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee when he was UEPC Chair. We didn’t think it was patchwork. It was a lot of hard work involved. Those were reasoned responses to systemwide initiatives and we wanted to put a strong faculty voice into place. The idea of patchwork doesn’t represent the efforts or outcome. Thirdly, the third forum falls before the second reading and the FAC response to CoCA made it clear FAC invites responses from the third forum and any pro and con arguments on any recommendations from the Provost proposal CoCA wants to provide.
To follow up on the Vice Provost’s voting rights, Thompson asked Demetrulias what changes she feels were made. Demetrulias stated on page 17, Article IV, Section 2.1, originally there were 10 voting members and it did not include the Speaker. The new version says 12 voting members and 8 additional faculty, but when she counted, it looks like 9 and the Speaker is also a voting member. Sarraille replied there is a certain ambiguity in the current Constitution. Depending on who you are and what interpretation you have, you can come up with different results. It is not clear whether the Speaker, student or Vice Provost are voting members. What we have done in this document is to leave the ambiguity in. It was done in the spirit of fair play and has to be resolved later. Demetrulias stated she thought the revision was to remove ambiguity. Sarraille replied FAC/COC didn’t feel it was a good thing to change voting rights in one direction or another at this time. It would be addressed later. Nagel voiced confusion by the Vice Provost’s comment, on page 18, the second paragraph, line 392 and on page 23, the GC has no Dean of GC so the language had to be changed. He agrees with Sarraille it does not change the voting rights. Johnson tried to clarify that on page 17, the 8 includes representatives from each of the 6 colleges, the library and counseling. The Speaker is in addition to the 8 faculty members. They total 9. It does not address the Speaker, Vice Provost and Student voting rights. We left the ambiguity in because we wanted nothing to hamper the elections to go forth. Tuedio suggested putting the word ‘and’ to read ‘There shall be eight additional faculty members including a library representative, a counseling representative, and one representative from each college, and the Speaker.’ Sarraille stated in Article III, Section 2.4 reads “The Speaker shall be an ex-officio member of all committees of the Academic Senate.” Eudey advised ex-officio is by position, not person and could be voting or not. But, her question is on page 19, reference to OCMDL and AT Subcommittees, will the suggestion to merge be held off till later? Thompson replied he has sent the question of merger to the subcommittee chairs and are awaiting their feedback. They have the rationale and questions to respond to and they have a sample of a charge combining the two subcommittees. He plans on attending their next meeting. Eudey asked if this isn’t a substantive change and Johnson stated this change is not in this proposal at this time. Thompson stated he disagrees with the notion that only changes are representation. FAC is presenting a series of amendments that have been recommended and this is not seen as stop gap or patchwork. This document has served us well and we are proposing amendments at the same time maintaining openness for changes in the future. It is clear the COC and FAC are constitutionally charged to recommend on committee structure and bring amendments forward, and that is what we are doing.

Sarraille would like to point out he has urged AS to go forward with this. We have certain timing problems but he stressed at this point that is not the only consideration. What we are proposing is not a patch or limited to little things to get ready for elections. Grobner, Co-Chair of OCMDL, stated Thompson asked him to take the issue of merging OCMDL and AT to his committee and although the subcommittee has not met, he took a straw poll and everyone is in favor of combing the two.

Brown, a crossover member (FAC/CoCA) stated there is confusion what CoCA’s further charge is. It is still functioning, yet one of the proposal’s is already on the AS agenda. CoCA has some query as to what their charge is, if any. If continuing, then there may well be further amendment at a later date. He agreed with Demetrulias that is one of the reasons for bringing this forward now. This is not meant to cement the document; it may well change in the future.

DeCaro, past member of the AT Subcommittee stated we’ll probably phase out CODEC and TV in the next couple of years. The original charge for OCMDL will likely be obsolete. He supported the idea of folding OCMDL and AT together and in the next few years create another committee to address our future needs.

Demetrulias wondered since OCMDL and AT are subcommittees of UEPC shouldn’t UEPC discuss? Carroll replied there is no harm in UEPC discussing it, but the charge of UEPC is not clear whether they have to approve all changes to subcommittee structure. Sarraille stated since UEPC will meet before the February 20 AS meeting, they will have time to discuss.

Covino thanked those who participated in the open forums and on CoCA. He noticed a great range of perspectives and ideas that have come up that are intellectual, interesting and worth further consideration as we move forward. Hopefully CoCA or some version of CoCA will continue to consider questions. He received a number of suggestions and questions and he has been trying to pay attention to a range of input he received and will make every effort in the next little while to respond with greater specificity so CoCA has that and it may become part of the remaining discussion and future consideration. Thompson stated the constitution is
always open to change and a variety of methods remain.

Novak asked that on page 20, composition of COC, it needs to be made clearer that the speaker and speaker-elect are exempt from the ‘no more than one from each college’ requirement. Tuedio replied as written, it is grammatically correct.

Sarraille reminded Senators we are not voting today. It is a first reading and will be an action item at our next Senate meeting on February 20. The last forum is February 7. As Thompson pointed out, other things under consideration are not mutually exclusive. Some of which may undo what we’re doing now, many will be in addition to.

This will be an action item at the next AS meeting.

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

It was MS DeCaro/Nagel

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached revised Policy on Human Subjects Research.

RATIONALE:
California State University, Stanislaus is committed to supporting the research, scholarship, and creative activities of the faculty, staff, and students. Some research activities involve the use of living human subjects. Such research includes experimentation, surveying, interviewing, and other methods of collecting information from or about individuals. The University has a professional and ethical obligation to assure that humans participating in human subjects research are treated in a manner consistent with the highest possible legal, professional, and ethical standards.

The federal government, the California government, and professional societies concerned with the use of human subjects in research have established standards and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research. Failure to comply with these standards places the University, the faculty, and students at financial and legal risk. The University has an obligation to protect subjects in human research, and to protect faculty, staff, and students from personal and financial risks that may be incurred in the conduct of human subjects research.

Included in that obligation to protect human subjects is clarity on definitions pertaining to “research” and “vulnerable populations.” In an attempt to be responsive to local diversity issues, CSU Stanislaus recently approved a local definition for both terms. After further investigation, the RSCAP Committee believes it is more legally defensible and academically prudent to employ the definitions consistent with the current federal definitions. Additionally, based on the university’s Institutional Review Board’s recommendations, the language surrounding “Classroom Activities” has been clarified as it pertains to oversight and responsibility.

The attached would replace the current Policy on Human Subjects (6/AS/06/RSCAPC).

Discussion:

Senior, Chair of RSCAPC, explains the changes to the Policy on Human Subjects Research. The committee clarified the terms “research,” “vulnerable populations” and “Classroom Activities.”

Silverman questioned what ‘highest possible legal, professional and ethical standards’ mean in the Rationale. Senior replied it is in the proposal itself. If you look at the definitions, it lays it out. Protecting human beings and respecting them. Silverman stated he is not complaining about the committee’s work, but this statement does not seem well defined.

Novak noted that this issue came up at the end of the 2005/2006 academic year in the AS and at that time, the Psychology Senator though the language would be too restricted. The Psychology Department is in favor of consanguinity with federal guidelines. Nagel advised that one reason the IRB Policy needed to be revised was because the Federal Guidelines changed. This language will allow us to amend less often.

There being no further discussion, this item will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting on February 20.
9. OPEN FORUM

a. Sense of the Senate Resolution

It was MS Filling/DeCaro the following sense of the Senate resolution:

That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus express its dismay at the decision of the leadership of the CSU to award itself retroactive salary increases.

It was MS DeCaro/Filling to waive the rules and go to a second reading. Motion passed.

Discussion:

Garza asked if the vote by the Board of Trustees has taken place on the raises and Sarraille replied they are meeting today and tomorrow. Minor added the vote will take place tomorrow. Davis offered a friendly amendment to add ‘considering.’ Snizek suggested this addition weakens the resolution. A rationale needs to be added. She suggested waiting until after their vote takes place to vote on our motion. Davis added that our vote today could possibly influence their vote tomorrow. Snizek voiced doubt.

Thompson spoke against the resolution, stating we need to come back with this in a more refined form with other things we are dismayed about. Tuedio agreed adding he would like to link the issue about student fee increases and the way in which the administration has successfully created the impression that we call into question. Possibly adding a Whereas statement that speaks to the concern we have about the general impact of the divisive move claiming student fee increases are required for faculty raises. We need to slow down and make a stronger point.

Eudey asked if there is a sense of the group that waiting would be a better choice, we should vote to postpone to the next meeting. Sarraille suggested we table to a time certain. Carroll agreed with Thompson and Tuedio particularly with what the CSU East Bay ASI did yesterday. Their resolution clearly supported the CFA and its faculty in arriving at a fair contract.

Johnson voice support for waiting to get further input. Or she stated she would vote for something urging the Board of Trustees to not give themselves raises or wait until it happens and express dismay.

Filling stated the purpose of this resolution was to raise consciousness and to send a statement to Long Beach and hopefully acquaint our students with the reality that student fees and faculty raises have no more correlation than administrative salaries and student fees. Minor added that administrative salaries would be less than $100,000 and faculty salaries would be several million $. We are not uneducated on this issue. Information we have supports that. Filling stated he did not intend to offend, but disagreed with her information. He stated his point is that dollars are fungible and that the budget represents choices made by administration, not hard dollar mandates. Carroll suggested that the distinction between the smaller figure for administrative raises and the larger one for faculty raises leaves unclear where ASI draws the line between acceptably low amounts and unacceptably high ones, and suggests that ASI is making dollar amounts rather than the principle of raising of student fees the key issue. He would hope their approach would be based on principle, not money.

It was MS Johnson/Carroll to table until the next AS meeting. Approved by voice vote.

b. Commencement Proposal

Sarraille asked for questions or concerns about the Commencement Proposal. Morgan-Foster explains the handout. It looks like the College of Arts and College of Humanities and Social Sciences will graduate on Friday morning, June 1 and the rest of the Colleges will graduate on Saturday morning, June 2. She stated they will continue to go back each year and look at the data, but we need to get going on this for this year. Nagel pointed out the handout does not have this allocation. Morgan-Foster explained they added the College of Arts to June 1 because they didn’t want one College holding their own commencement, so it was changed.

Tuedio asked if there was any thought given to having both events Saturday, one in the morning and one in the afternoon and Morgan-Foster replied having them too close together would be difficult for maintenance and cleanup. They would be working 18-20
hours in one day.

Mayer stated the handout indicates no high price speakers. He asked if there would be special speakers and Morgan-Foster replied yes.

Thompson questioned the numbering system. What does it mean faculty 011, 012. Morgan-Foster stated she gave everything a value. The higher the number, the better the value. It helps to work through things. The more efficient the cost, the cheaper the event, the higher the value. So for faculty, it means faculty involvement is not as high as it could be now. If it’s split up, maybe faculty will have more time to focus on their students. Individual college events would get a higher rating than one event. But they are all up for debate. But she wanted to confirm if they move to two events, it should have a positive influence. If it’s the same, there is no reason to change.

c. ASI Resolution

Minor asked to comment about the below ASI resolution from Stanislaus that has been briefly discussed.

Whereas, Associated Students, Incorporated is the representative body, and the official voice of the Students at California State University, Stanislaus; and

Whereas, The ASI of California State University, Stanislaus is a member of the California State Student Association; and

Whereas, The CSSA is recognized by the CSU as the official representative body for CSU students; and

Whereas, The primary of role of these student government bodies are to first and foremost advocate on behalf of students; and

Whereas, The CSSA and ASI Stanislaus recognizes the importance of having a well paid faculty and a quality education; and

Whereas, The CSU have agreed to make no assumptions of student fee increases until after the State of California decides upon CSU appropriations for the 2007/2008 year; and

Whereas, The two main sources of funding for the CSU system are student fees and the state general fund; and

Whereas, The State California will potentially fund only a partial amount of the CSU budget request of approximately $3 billion dollars; and

Whereas, The demands of the California Faculty Association will likely increase the size of the CSU budget and as a result student fees will potentially be used to subsidize this budget increase; therefore be it

Resolved: That the ASI of CSU Stanislaus encourages CSSA to continue its fight for low student fees, and be it further

Resolved: That the ASI of CSU Stanislaus strongly urges the California State Student Association to continue its stance of non-involvement in the collective bargaining process, and be it further

Resolved: That a similar resolution be passed on all CSSA member campuses, and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be widely distributed to all affected parties, including the California State Student Association, the California Faculty Association, the Statewide Academic Senate, the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus, and the student governing boards of all 23 campuses of the California State University.

Minor advised at the last Board of Trustees meeting, Andrew Janz (ASI Vice President) and Andrew LaFlamme (CSU Stanislaus student and ASI Student representative on the Board of Trustees) attended. It came to their attention that CFA student interns that came to the CSSA meeting in December were very unprofessional and put us on the spot. This resolution came about as a result of that. The biggest thing for us is that we don’t want to be involved. She stated she realizes CSU East Bay published a powerful
resolution in support of CFA and faculty. The Stanislaus resolution says we will stay neutral. One thing disputed yesterday here was the possible linkage of faculty raises with student fees. There are no guarantees student fees would or would not be affected by faculty raises. With our knowledge it could be. She distributed a letter from Janz answering questions.

DeCaro asked for a point of clarification. He asked if Minor said the statewide ASI does not support faculty. Minor replied they have not taken a stance. Three other campuses have reviewed similar resolutions as the one passed by ASI at CSU Stanislaus, but, as stated above, CSU East Bay ASI passed a resolution supporting faculty and CFA.

10. ADJOURNMENT 4:30