1. Call to order at 2:35 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda

Accepted as distributed.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 24

Johnson explained on Page 6, second line, “Johnson stated her concern that students are retaking classes for a better grade……” was not her concern. Her concern was that they are taking classes multiple times and failing multiple times. She asked that this sentence be deleted. The minutes were approved as amended above.

**Announcements**

a. Senator Scott distributed a flyer on “a day of hope. The goal is to deliver 1509 baskets of thanksgiving food to needy and hungry families across the Central Valley. He stated he is trying to get as many students involved as possible, and would also ask for the faculty’s participation as well.

b. Senator DeCocker announced the Alexander Couwenberg exhibition at the University Art Gallery for November 7-December 19.

c. Speaker Sarraille thanked the Provost for the refreshments.

**Questions about reports**
Action Item

a. 12/AS/06/UEPC—Declaration or change of Education Objectives Resolution

Manrique suggested a friendly editorial amendment to the third Resolved clause to read “That the above changes take effect beginning in the academic year following final approval of this resolution.” This was accepted.

Tuedio wondered when advising is required to take place? What is the intent? Is it prior to registration or prior to submission of the form? Carroll replied the intent of UEPC was that advising be received when the change of major is official. UEPC discussions never broached registration so it is independent of that. Tuedio suggested an advising flag be required the moment the change takes place. Carroll reiterated that the student would then not be caught unadvised until advising rolls around next semester. Sarraille suggested it needs to be clarified what happens when a student changes their major. Would the filing of the form trigger advising? Clarke suggested the student bring the form to the new department and the department signs off. A line could be added to the form indicating the student must receive advising. Robbins indicated currently the form goes to the department secretary. Sarraille suggested this can be implemented by making a change to the form. Eudey stated the change of major form already has a signature line, so we just need a change in practice. Tuedio stated the problem with that is that it doesn’t always mean the file is in the advisor’s hands. Thompson stated if advising takes place when the form is signed, what kind of advising does a student need at that time? It might not be necessary to have their file to give that kind of advising.

Sarraille advised we have to decide whether to approve this or not and it seems we have come up against implementation issues that are distracting us from the central issue, the policy itself. Riedmann questioned how we are going to define advising? Is it what classes the student should take or telling them about their new major? Carroll hesitated to impose an agenda for the department, but what UEPC intended is to keep students on track for a timely graduation. It seems as though that could be accomplished by telling the student a little bit about the major.

Johnson suggested a friendly amendment to delete ‘mandatory’ in the first Resolved clause, underlined section of the Catalog language “the student is required to receive advising from an advisor…” This was accepted.

Watkins asked when it says ‘To change and/or declare a degree objective officially…’ what does ‘officially’ mean. Sarraille explained that is not part of the language that was amended, but it seems it is yet to be determined. It depends on how we implement it. Carroll stated his suggested approach would be that a student seeking to have the form signed be talked to at that time. Johnson suggested another friendly amendment to delete the word ‘officially.’ C. Davis explained that students can change unofficially. They take the classes without completing the form until later. The official part is when you complete the form. Sarraille stated since there is an objection to the friendly amendment, a motion would have to be made. Johnson withdrew her amendment. Carroll stated the word ‘officially’ is important.

Thompson suggested a friendly amendment to the first Resolved clause to read “That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus recommend that…” It was accepted as friendly.

Tuedio suggested we actually consider stating that the advising should be required or expected prior to official change. The reason is there are questions in his mind why students have chosen to shift into his major so he would like to discuss this with them before a change is made. Sarraille suggested putting this in the form of a motion. Carroll stated although Tuedio raised a good point, the existing language implies that. Tuedio stated his agreement, but wondered if the students would pick up on that. Either there should be a flag requiring advising or before it is official we need to inform students about this. Carroll suggested changing the language to say “a student seeking a change of degree would be expected to …” or “a student seeking to change a degree objective is required to receive advising from … and signatures must be obtained.”

DeCaro questioned the purpose for advising. Carroll replied in the broadest sense, it is to facilitate graduation. In the narrow sense, to make sure students have a full sense of how their major works so they can make appropriate choices. Eudey stated regardless of the language, one of the key points on the form should say “I have met with the student.” Sarraille asked if wanted to have something on the form to that effect? Tuedio suggested adding a separate Resolved clause. C. Davis suggested adding to the third Resolved clause
language to the effect that advising has taken place. This was accepted as friendly.

Filling advised we are violating the intent of the resolution by talking about implementation. He urged the body to reject the friendly amendment and pay attention to the policy. Tuđio noted we have a policy that is hard to enforce. If we can clarify it, all the better. Nagel asked for a point of information, if it was accepted as friendly and Carroll replied yes. [In response to a query from the Speaker,] Thompson stated in the past, once a resolution comes to the floor of the Senate, it belongs to the body. Friendly amendments are accepted or rejected and if anyone objects, it goes to a motion. Since there was an objection, the suggestion is no longer friendly.

It was MS Tuđio/Carroll to add a fourth Resolved clause to the effect that the “Declaration or Change of Degree Objective form be revised to show that advising has taken place. Vote on the amendment passed.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the motion as amended passed with two abstentions.

Carroll thanked the Senators for taking resolutions from UEPC seriously.

First Reading Item

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

It was Thompson/Filling

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.

Rationale: The Faculty Affairs Committee interprets the language of the Constitution of the General Faculty, VI.1.2.b, where a specific duty of the Senate Executive Committee is to "Advise the President of the University on the appointment of faculty members to institutional and advisory committees," to include that the President and administrators who serve at the pleasure of the President must consult the Senate Executive Committee for its recommendation before the appointment of faculty members to institutional or advisory committees. The Procedure for appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees flows from the constitutional language, is a statement to support and facilitate the long-accepted past-practice based on the Constitution, and has been accepted by current and past Presidents.

Thompson explained the Faculty Affairs Committee has been scrutinizing the General Faculty Constitution this fall and one of the documents we looked at was Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees and FAC noticed it was approved by the SEC and Deans Council but not by the Academic Senate. It was suggested that we bring it to the AS and ask that you affirm it. He apologized for not attaching the document. It will be posted to ASNET as soon as the meeting is over. Bowman was asked to copy the document and bring back to the meeting.

Thompson explained that basically the document says that SEC will be consulted and provide recommendations for appointments to administrative committees. The memo has step by step directions. Sarraillé stated on a personal note, he is hoping there will be some discussion and thoughtful consideration of the policy as it merits it. There should be some thought given to how faculty get chosen to be on universitywide committees and make universitywide decisions. Thought should also be given to whether faculty are representatives or sui generis. Document was distributed.

It was MS Johnson/O’Brien table until the next AS meeting. Motion passed.

Discussion Item

a. Strategic Plan

Sarraillé stated a copy of the Strategic Plan has been distributed to Senators. He is hopeful all have had a chance to read it. Eventually the plan is that it will go before the faculty for a vote. The SEC reviewed it and questioned if it is ready for a vote right
Academic Senate

Taniguchi commended the faculty that worked on the SP. But she noticed the lack of an emphasis on cross disciplines/interdisciplinary connections between colleges. The document seems to downplay this. For example, on page 12, second paragraph, it talks about giving greater autonomy for decisionmaking at the department and college level. But at the same time, there is no mention of support. So, she would like the last line of that paragraph to read “At the same time, some issues—general education and interdisciplinary programs, for example—demand careful University-wide deliberation support.” Therefore, on page 15, 1.8 Strategic actions: Strengthen the general education program to prepare students for academic challenges, the likelihood of multiple careers, and lifelong learning, she stated in this section it might be appropriate to add “coordinate interdisciplinary/intercollege programs both sustaining existing ones and creating new ones as necessary.” Page 16, under Effectiveness Indicators, insert “Evidence of student participation in interdisciplinary programs or activities.” Page 11, middle of page, third sentence to read “This is a difficult task, but one which can be achieved by funding additional goals focusing on the combined goals of excellence in teaching, intellectual and academic pursuits.” Also, page 11, second paragraph, first sentence after ‘mission’ to read “the labor joy of teaching and learning.”

O’Brien voiced concern on page 12, 1.2 Strategic Action. It is troubling if you look under Activities, ‘Determine quality indicators based on cost/benefit analyses and academic program reviews.’ At what point does cost/benefit mandate program termination? By number of majors, ftes? We need to think about that carefully especially for smaller programs. Do we want a quality liberal arts program here? He stated we do need all small and large programs.

Garcia advised that faculty in the Social Work Department commend those that worked on the SP. Good progress has been made in the Narrative. But they are worried about the third theme. It has not been fully defined or thought out. The Narrative speaks to partnership, which is a good idea, but page 20 focuses on the University rather than as a partnership with the community. Maybe we should define what it means to be partner in the community. Johnson stated her confusion about quality indicators. Does this determine what quality indicators you will use? What is the intent of the cost/benefit analysis? Davis replied that line means quality indicators could be a wide variety of things. While we would want more than one (especially for program term), we would want to have a manageable number of quality indicators with which we could make decisions. Those need to be determined by the campus based on cost benefit analysis and other factors Johnson stated, then the cost/benefit is what is used to find indicators not to judge the program and Davis replied yes. DeCaro voiced support for O’Brien’s concern. Some programs are very costly, especially if you have labs.

Nagel pointed out under Strategic Action 3.1, Grow at a median rate of 3% full-time equivalent students per year. He stated he didn’t find anything in this document that mentions maintaining or lowering student/faculty ratio as a goal or does it say we should increase the number of faculty at 3.1% per year to go along with the increase in students. Taniguchi stated that concern touches on another one regarding decision on hiring what positions will be funded and what won’t. How effective is the analysis given we don’t really know where final responsibility for decisions sits. We often don’t have funding authority to implement decisions we want to make. We spend lots of time on assessing and planning and not on implementing. Novak explained that is the intent that there be a determination that does not exist right now. Taniguchi stated she hopes that is the intent because we are going through lots of assessment for no reason. O’Brien asked where do we go from here? Does it get circulated to departments, go to committees or what? Sarraile stated his understanding that it is yet to be determined. SEC discussed this and the outcome was to bring it here to the AS. There was some sentiment to send to UEPC, FBAC, and FAC.

Tuedio called attention to page 15, 1.8 Strategic Action-Strengthen the general education program to prepare students for academic challenges, the likelihood of multiple careers and lifelong learning. He suggested we consider adding as one of the points “to fostering strengths in the liberal arts and prepare students for academic challenges.” He pointed out that we should insure that the breakup into colleges does not impair our ability to provide a strong liberal arts education. Clearly it has no home but we speak of it as an emphasis. We don’t want to tilt toward skill development only. Johnson stated in some of these cases, we have activities, but she would like to see them worded not, for example, ‘increase number of credentials and executive programs’ rather say ‘consider appropriateness of increasing the number of credentials….’ These decisions have not been made. Another one deals with simplifying the governance structure on page 19, 2.8. We need to have a discussion about what decisions should be made at the college and university level. It sounds like the outcome has already been predetermined. We should say ‘consider’ rather than ‘do.’ Novak stated his take on this is this is a Strategic Plan and it lists things we are planning on doing. The discussion should be done beforehand. The discussion will determine the actions. Johnson stated that the Administration might say if we approve this
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document, we agree to all that’s in it. Novak replied the document will be changed after input by faculty. This guides us right now and our discussions should determine what is in the document.

Johnson stated another bullet under 3.4 on page 21, ‘promote the availability of and reduce obstacles to use of campus facilities by students, faculty, staff and the community.’ The FDC has always been an issue on the types of activities that are allowed. We need a discussion on the appropriate use, rather than just say figure out how to make it more accessible. Also on page 11, third paragraph that states ‘We envision CSUS as a world-class institution that can fulfill its primary mission of teaching excellence augmented by a professoriate whose scholarly and creative activities are internationally recognized within their disciplines.’ She stated when she thinks of world-class, she thinks of a University like Stanford or other universities we know by name and she doesn’t see CSUS in that group. She would envision us as a University increasingly recognized especially in our region. The same with professoriate activities internationally recognized. We do have some faculty in that group, but for her that is not reasonable for her to attain. We want our research to support teaching excellence.

Eudey pointed out on page 17, under 2.1 is a discussion of professoriate and 2.2 they recognize faculty, but under 2.3, it doesn’t discuss recruiting or keeping staff. We are putting a lot of effort into faculty and we need to do the same for staff. There are many things in the activities section that could reflect staff activities as well. Further, on page 18, 2.5 Effectiveness Indicators, it looks at the use of technology for all members of the community, but staff is not listed. Also, on page 20, 3.1, we need to look at faculty numbers as well as enrollment numbers, and staff numbers as well. On 3.2 the 3rd point, under activities, the word ‘exploit’ is not appropriate. Further, she stated she doesn’t go along with referring to ‘a state of the art website.’ Page 22, 3.6 under Effectiveness Indicators, she stated she sees ways to enhance the section by saying ‘conference presentations at a national level or service at a national level. These are things that get our name and talents out there. It should be based on what we are doing.

Helzer referred to page 11, third paragraph, which refers to a word-class institution and internationally recognized. When she read this, she thought of an international exchange program. There is a mention of increasing international students, but not programs. If this is a major goal, we should talk about international programs.

Thompson thanked the people who worked on the SP and thanked the AS for reading and participating in this important discussion. He supported Johnson’s concern about using statements. Under 2.1, bullet 7, it has been revised (the word ‘determine’ is used). So there are places in the document that have been fixed using ‘determine’ rather than ‘decided action.’ Under that, it seems to refer to professoriate people who have the title of professor. He suggested adding the percentage of tenure-track faculty in the overall FTEF as an indicator.

On page 19, under 2.8, the forth bullet “coordinate decision making by delineating issues appropriate to faculty and administration,” his concern is who are the determinators and who are the delineators? This could be wielded in many ways. Also, if you look at 3.3, Implement an enrollment management plan to increase admission, retention, and progress to degree in graduate programs, this question keeps coming back. Enrollment management is something faculty should be involved in. At SWAS, they have plans for this and so far have little faculty involvement, so his hope is faculty will be involved with this on campus.

Sarraille stated, right now, he is not sure who would be the person we would send changes to for this document. It could be the Provost or the President. Provost Covino stated one process could be revisions could be sent to him and he meet with the Speaker and they could work out some kind of expansion of the Writing Group to look at the proposed changes. Sarraille will follow up with Provost Covino.

Johnson pointed out on page 22, 3.7 forth bullet, “develop partnerships and create a college town environment,” what is a college town environment? And what about a college town environment do we wish to create?

Riedmann, responding to Johnson’s comment, if we don’t like the SP, we don’t have to vote in favor of it. Taniguchi questioned when we do vote, will we vote up or down on the entire document, or section by section? Further, it will determine how much work we need to do beforehand. Sarraille stated typically the way we work, there will be a resolution calling for approval of the document. On the floor you can edit the resolution, but not the document. You vote it up or down.

Taniguchi suggested if we want international recognition, we need to strengthen our partnership with the local community and we need to strengthen our links to the international population in the community. Part of that is sending our students overseas. Garcia
voiced a word of caution about the idea of looking section by section. The sections seem isolated and they need to be written so that they are interconnected and build upon one another rather than separate.

Sarraille stated in view of today’s discussion, we may want to have another discussion down the road. We are getting some good input and that needs to be reflected in the document. He encouraged Senators to keep looking at the document and making suggestions. Eudey suggested at some point we want to question how these are prioritized and how they are attached to finances. When in the process does that occur, she asked. And how does it occur? Sarraille stated we could put everything in the plan including finances and priorities. Carroll stated when talking about this in SEC, someone drew a distinction between goals and objectives, and in reading the document, he stated he found himself wondering which are goals and which are objectives. Some distinction is needed. DeCaro explained that objectives are measurable.

Nagel questioned if this current document is on line and Davis replied he didn’t know. The question is, who owns the document? He stated he had control of the document until August 2006 and it was sent on to the President and Provost. Sarraille stated at one time Filling was hosting an electronic discussion and people were posting comments. Davis replied it is still alive and kicking. Sarraille asked the Provost to send him the current version and he will post it. He asked Senators to send their input to any member of SEC.

Novak stated it is important to understand the context. The Writing Group was pressed into service because they were working on WASC. The group is not a committee. They took notes at the forums last February, put drafts together, and incorporated the information. The Writing Group has done as much as it can. Someone has to take ownership of the document and decide what to do next.

**Open Forum**

None

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm.