1. **Speaker Sarraillie** called the meeting to order at 2:37 pm.

2. **Approval of Agenda:** Approved as distributed.

3. **Minutes of October 10, 2006:** Approved as distributed.

4. **Announcements**

   a. **CFA (Filling)**

   CFA President Filling presented a powerpoint presentation regarding the bargaining situation between CFA and the CSU.

   Questions followed:

   - Eudey asked if there are plans we can do locally to support this effort and Filling replied yes. CFA will schedule a series of meetings the next few weeks so faculty know what is going on. Sarraillie added that there is a link on the CFA web site that allows faculty to send a fax to the Chancellor. He hoped faculty would do that, although Filling stated don’t expect a response from the Chancellor. He’s emailed him many times and has yet to receive a response from him.
   - Mayer asked if we should have any optimism and Filling replied yes. It basically becomes a game of staring each other down. But it’s hard to stare down with a large group of faculty staring back. And faculty also have the support of students. When students, parents, and staff speak, the Administration tends to listen. Nagel added that we have optimism that CFA is united and forming allies with other unions. There is power in numbers.
Thompson questioned if merit pay becomes part of the contract, is that considered continuing in the contract or is it an entirely new merit pay structure? Filling replied that it is undefined at present, but probably is not a continuation. Sarraile stated the old merit plan is gone from the contract, so this would be a newly created procedure.

Janz asked how long Filling expects CFA and the CSU to be at impasse and Filling replied, it takes from 60-90 days to get a mediator. Mediation rarely produces anything so then you go into fact-finding. Fact-finding rarely produces anything either, so best guess is that CSU will impose working conditions in early Spring semester.

b. Sarraile reported that faculty interested in being considered for faculty trustee should contact the Academic Senate Office, ex 3400.
c. Sarraile advised that faculty interested in being considered for a resident director position should contact the Senate Office by December 1, 2006.
d. Sarraile assured Senators he is working on the cookie problem, and hopes to have a solution shortly. Senators were overjoyed.

Questions about reports

a. O’Brien questioned item b) in the FBAC Report that said the President had earmarked $1.5 million for faculty and staff equity raises, $750,000 each. In the second paragraph it was reported that $408,000 was awarded to faculty and $273,000 to staff. So about $800,000 should be left from the $1.5 million. In addition, the President reported we would receive $1.7 million this year, so that adds up to $2.5 million somewhere. The President reports there is no new faculty or staff positions, so is the University holding the $2.5 million until the contract is resolved for faculty and staff? Lindsay replied he directed the question of ‘where is the rest of the money’ to Vice President Stephens and she said it was in the general fund. Since it is there, we can’t answer that specifically since funds are fungible. He continued that FBAC then asked her for a Sources and Uses Statement over the last 5 years that will show where money has gone and she said she would provide it. O’Brien questioned if there is anywhere on the University web site we can access that information. Lindsay stated he didn’t know but will ask Stephens. But, Wendt indicated the salary increases have not stopped, but they have been temporarily placed in abeyance until the contract is settled. O’Brien stated he went to the University web site and couldn’t find anything regarding the budget so he called a Senator in Long Beach that is a budget guru and he directed him to the Chancellor’s Office web site. They pride themselves on being a fully transparent system. Everything is listed. Given we are a state supported university, we should also do this.

b. Garcia advised he was asked by his department to ask Graduate Council about a rumor that there is a transition of the Graduate School and the oversight of masters thesis is now in the hands of the Library. Nelligan replied that is not quite right, but the rumor is correct. The thesis or project should now be submitted to the Library’s Circulation desk for all steps in the process, including the reader review and the final bindery submission. While the day-to-day responsibilities and physical location have been transferred to the Library, the Graduate School retains final authority on all thesis/project-related policy issues. Garcia asked if there was discussion in GC about concerns. Nelligan replied the general impression was it was a good idea.

Consent Item

a. 11/AS/06/FBAC—Support for Proposition 1D

It was MS Lindsay/O’Brien

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D is an investment in our schools, in our children and in California’s future; and

WHEREAS, Providing a quality education for our kids is the most important thing we can do to invest in their future; and

WHEREAS, The best way to grow our economy and create good-paying jobs is to create world-class public schools — with adequate educational facilities — that give our students the skills they need to succeed in the workforce; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D provides over $7 billion for Kindergarten through 12th grade education and an additional $3 billion for
Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D allocates funds to retrofit and upgrade our schools and colleges to ensure they can withstand the impact of natural disasters like earthquakes; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D includes funding directed at our kids’ safety, including school security, playground safety, removal of asbestos and replacing leaky and dangerous roofs; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D will relieve overcrowding, help reduce class sizes and give students a real opportunity to learn; and

WHEREAS, more than 60 percent of California’s schools are 25 years of age or older and require major repairs; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D will help pay for wiring classrooms and providing 21st Century technology, and builds vocational education facilities so that all students are given the skills they need to get a job and succeed in life; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D will help pay for wiring classrooms and providing 21st Century technology, and builds vocational education facilities so that all students are given the skills they need to get a job and succeed in life; and

WHEREAS, For every dollar California invests to get students in and through college, the state’s economy receives a $3 net return on that investment; and

WHEREAS, California’s community colleges and state universities (UC and CSU) continue to grow exponentially – with community colleges providing instruction to over 2 million students every year and California’s universities expected to grow to accommodate nearly 650,000 students – we need to provide funding to modernize and upgrade teaching and research facilities to remain competitive with other states; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D provides strict accountability to ensure that the money is spent properly; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D will be subjected to independent audits, and misusing them is a crime, punishable by time in jail. This information will be made available to the public so taxpayers can ensure their money is spent properly and will NOT go to waste; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 1D is so important for California’s future that both candidates for Governor, Phil Angelides and Arnold Schwarzenegger, as well as a bipartisan majority of the Legislature, support the measure; and

WHEREAS, CSU Stanislaus will receive a total of $6 million from this bond, $4.95 million for Science II equipment and $1.05 million for Science I retrofit; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Budget Advisory Committee at CSU Stanislaus supports Proposition 1D; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus, support Proposition 1D on the November 7, 2006 ballot.

Lindsay explained that CSU Stanislaus would receive a total of $6 million from this bond, $4.95 million for Science II equipment and $1.05 million for Science I retrofit. O’Brien shared that this was discussed at the last statewide meeting and passed. There was no further discussion. Vote to support this resolution was unanimous.

This resolution will be sent to the Statewide Academic Senate.

First Reading Items

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

It was MS Carroll/Filling

RESOLVED: That the “Declaration or Change of Educational Objectives” paragraph found on page 53 of the 2005/06 University Catalog include the following additional language:
“Declaration or Change of Educational Objectives

An undergraduate student who selects or changes the degree objective at CSU Stanislaus after enrollment must file a Declaration or Change of Degree Objective form with the Enrollment Services Office. To change and/or declare a degree objective officially, the student is required to receive mandatory advising from an advisor in the receiving major/concentration/program, and all appropriate signatures must be obtained on the form. Students admitted to a credential program will have their academic status updated by the Credentials Processing Center;” and be it further

RESOLVED: That the “Declaration or Change of Educational Objectives Policy” be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

RATIONALE: The University Educational Policies Committee has been discussing Facilitating Graduation at CSU Stanislaus. It was found that students may not be receiving effective advising upon declaration or change of major. The UEPC agreed that mandatory advising by a major advisor upon declaration or change of major would be in the student’s best interest to assure timely completion of degree.

Discussion: Carroll stated that UEPC thinks it is a good idea just to ensure that students do get advised in their major. This is related to the notion of facilitating graduation. It is better to keep our students moving along toward their degree. Nagel questioned if there had been a problem on our campus and Carroll replied he had heard of anecdotal information about graduation delays. Carroll also advised there is no effective date on the resolution so Fall 2007 will be inserted by the next meeting. Eudey asked what it would mean for a minor program and Carroll replied it does not imply advising at the minor program level although we could revisit it. He continued that the reason this was put in was when it was brought to the SEC, it wasn’t clear what advisor we meant, so UEPC wanted to make it clear who the student would go to.

Morgan-Foster stated she supports the resolution. It links them up to their faculty advisor, and they presently can change majors without doing this, so it is needed. This should really help our students. Janz questioned if this has been mandated by the CSU and Carroll replied no, they mandated we look at advising broadly in the context of graduation progress.

Tuedio stated in the first Resolved clause, the wording is a little strange. It implies that there will be an amendment to the 05/06 catalog. Carroll stated the intent is the language will appear in future catalogs, but this can be changed before the next Senate meeting.

Janz asked “what is Faculty Handbook?” Saraille replied it is lots of policies faculty have passed. It is posted on the web. Bowman will send link to Janz.

b. 13/AS/06/UEPC—Repeated Courses Resolution

It was MS Carroll/Filling

RESOLVED: That the first paragraph of the current Repeated Courses Policy, as it appears on page 58 of the 2005/06 University Catalog be revised as follows:

Courses may be repeated by Undergraduate students and may repeat a maximum of three courses, one time each. Exceptions require approval of the program/major/concentration advisor. Only the most recent grade earned will be used for credit and grade points. The grading option for the original effort and the repeated effort must be the same. This provision for repetition is not applicable when a course may be taken additional times for credit. The replacement grade policy also is not applicable to grades or administrative symbols which do not affect units allowed or grade point average (e.g., NC, I, RD, W, RP, AU); and be it further

RESOLVED: That 4/AS/05/UEPC in the Faculty Handbook be amended to reflect the above changes.

RATIONALE: The University Educational Policies Committee has been discussing Facilitating Graduation at CSU Stanislaus. It was found that students may be repeating courses to raise their GPA. The UEPC agreed that limiting the number of times a student may repeat a course would be of benefit to students trying to register for courses that may be filled with other students repeating a course.
Discussion: Clarke stated this resolution does not address if students have passed the course. Carroll replied that is what UEPC intended. Johnson added that it says they can’t repeat it without approval of their advisor. This was discussed last year in UEPC. We aren’t trying to prevent them from doing it, just ensuring that they talk to their advisor about it to find out why they aren’t doing well. Clarke stated she thought this was addressing bulking up the GPA. It should not be a random advisor. She stated she wanted more consistency. Some advisors are more lax about this than others. Eudey commented that she feels we don’t have strong advisor training to help people have those conversations. She agrees that it is crazy for students to raise their GPA by taking a course multiple times. We might want to limit repeats to a minimum required for credit. If we have a policy that says failing twice means you can take it no more, they probably will not take it again. They are already disempowered as failing the class twice, so they won’t go see an advisor. We’ll lose students we shouldn’t lose. But, to help them meet minimum requirements, we should do this. Carroll asked Eudey if she wants a policy if the student fails, they can repeat it again without having to ask for an exception and Eudey replied yes. Janz asked if he received a D in a class and then took it again and received an F, would the final grade be an F? Carroll replied yes. Morgan-Foster added that if a student failed the course twice, they need a conversation with their advisor to find out why they failed again. Maybe they are not in the right major. The intention of this resolution is to get them help, not scare them away. Riedmann questioned if a Sociology student fails a Mathematics class, would she be the advisor or someone in Mathematics? Johnson stated her concern that students are retaking classes for a better grade, and they’re taking the course more than twice. She stated if this happens in her class, she writes on their exams to please come see her. They might lack interest of the skills they need to succeed in her class. The idea is to have them evaluate their career goals and problems. She stated she doesn’t want them to retake it endlessly. The problem with granting exceptions is that people who whine get beneficial treatment. Maybe we could say “a student desiring to repeat a course must obtain the approval of an advisor in their program/major.” Taniguchi felt this is a different issue. The question is why did the committee come up with a maximum of three courses? There are students who wound up flunking because of stopping without withdrawal and 4-5 years later would come back and want to retake the entire semester. Carroll stated again that the student would just have to see their advisor to go around the rule. Davis wondered in the last sentence referring to N/C, if you give them a N/C, does the student have to come in for advising? Carroll stated it refers to the replacement grade policy not repeated grade policy.

Riedmann asked for clarification in the second line of the second paragraph, “Exceptions require approval of the program/major/concentration advisor”, is that the student’s major advisor or the program coordinator for the course they are flunking? Carroll replied it is the student’s primary advisor. Riedmann stated she is not clear where they go if they are flunking a course not in their major.

Thompson asked Johnson if her language meant anytime a student repeats a course? Johnson replied no, she is not trying to modify who needed advising, just to get rid of the ‘exception’ appearance. Thompson continued that maybe we’d want to be more specific about how this information is put out. This would be an important change, students need to be informed that they could apply for an exception. Maybe something in the resolution could indicate how we notify students of change and of their options.

Tuedio stated that the first sentence is closely connected to the exception rule, so if we change wording in the second sentence, we need to change the first sentence. Johnson stated she would get rid of the first sentence. Silverman suggested adding a requirement that the student would have to do some work for that exception. Maybe write why they need the exception. Janz asked how the policy applies to courses taken outside the University. Carroll stated he doesn’t know, but it is worth following up. Clarke asked who would be monitoring this. How are we to catch students? Sarraille suggested the instructor would have to notice. O’Brien added we might want a repeat course monitor. Eudey suggested there are a lot of questions that needs to be responded to before the next meeting. UEPC might want to hear more recommendations. Also, it is important that advising conversation occurs, and the form would do that. One idea might be to add “approval by the student’s program advisor before repetition of three courses.”” It needs to be a process, not an exception. Sarraille stated this could be referred back to committee if someone wants to make a motion. Tuedio suggested this could be added to the form students use to substitute a grade. Robbins noted that the form does not require a signature, and she doesn’t think there is a limit. An evaluator sometimes catches the repeat course, but not always. Right now, there is no check or control over that. Tuedio added that the form could be altered to work. O’Brien suggested the resolution should be referred back to look at various scenarios.

Carroll responded to Taniguchi about where UEPC got the number, we looked at other CSU’s and this was the average. How do you enforce is a good question. Lisa Bernardo talked to UEPC recently and advised there is a new system going in Fall 2007 and we can ask her if this can be build in. Taniguchi stated we currently let students repeat as many times as they want, so why do we want to limit this? Carroll replied it is in the Rationale. One concern is students repeating courses are keeping other students out. Tanaguchi
pointed out that students in our service area face a wide array of challenges which might motivate them to behaviour not in keeping with this policy and that we should not penalize those students unduly.

Riedmann asked if we could have numbers to justify policy change. If students are getting shut out of classes because of repeaters, how many students are repeating? Johnson again reiterated that to facilitate graduation is not the only reason for this. By not requiring this, we are not meeting our student’s needs because we are not communicating or forcing communication with non-successful students. She added that sometimes she gets students who are in there because of family pressure not because of an interest in Accounting. We need to talk to those students. This resolution will force that conversation we need. Nagel stated his confusion about what the resolution will do. It seems to be a bureaucratic paper thing, not a philosophic thing. It seems like it is a response to hastening graduation and not much else. Johnson replied if implementing this policy will help only a few, it should matter. Tuedio wondered if we are not getting closer to seeing this as an advising problem.

It was MS O’Brien/Riedmann to refer back to UEPC. Thompson asked what it means to refer. It is always referred after the First Reading, so does this return as a First Reading rather than an Action Item?

Consensus: If referred, it would be placed on the Senate agenda as a First Reading when returned. Janz asked UEPC to consider the transfer issue and Riedmann asked Carroll to find out how many students repeat and repeat. Carroll agreed.

Vote on motion to refer passed unanimously.

**Discussion Item**

**a. Change in Commencement (Morgan-Foster)**

Morgan-Foster advised that as many Senators know, Commencement is getting longer and longer, 6:30 am to 10:30 am last year. Classes are getting bigger and bigger. The ceremony is important to our students, their parents and faculty. We have just begun discussion on how to improve Commencement and would like faculty input.

**Ideas/Issues/Concerns:**

- Hold a separate Graduate Commencement
- Individual College Commencements, with one large Commencement where no names are called. Speakers would be discipline specific at the College level.
- Merge 2 Colleges together for a joint Commencement
- Department or College Commencement the night before followed by the large ceremony the next morning.
- Many areas could hold ceremonies: Pergola, Faculty Center, Gazebo, Snider Recital Hall, Amphitheatre.
- Funding comes from student fees. It could be an issue. It would have to be costed out.
- Have it in the evening.
- Would we have enough sound systems for everyone if we had separate ceremonies?
- Would we have enough volunteers to help with the ceremonies?
- Calling each graduate’s name is important as well as the Student Speaker.
- Each department have their own ceremony where afterwards parents can meet with faculty and students.
- Staff that works Commencement could be overworked. They do set up and clean up. Robbin to check with Staff Council. There is a lot of work involved and we need staff input on this.
- If you have department or college ceremonies, very few would attend the large ceremony.
- Colleges could switch off each year for the location of their Commencement.
- Times could be staggered.
- What stands out here is the students walk the gauntlet. That is unique to us.
- If days/times are staggered, the President and such could attend all without conflict.
- Don’t spend money on a guest speaker. The campus would save money. Have a faculty member as a speaker. It would be more meaningful.
- Morgan-Foster to talk to ASI.
- Have two ceremonies, one for Graduate Students and one for Undergrad Students. Although it was noted it would
not solve the problem.
· It was noted more Graduate Students might attend if it were more special to them. There were only about 250 grad students last year that walked.
· Main celebration is not necessary. Just have two smaller ones. That keeps the personal connection.
· Concern, we have only a few traditions and it would be troubling to discontinue the vision where we do have rituals and rites that engage the entire University at one time.

Consensus: It is a faculty concern, so if anyone wants to get involved, please contact the Senate Office at x 3400 or email Diana at dbowman@csustan.edu. We will make sure Vice President Morgan-Foster is advised.

Garcia asked if Commencement will be done differently this academic year and Morgan-Foster replied hopefully so. Garcia stated they need to get the word out early so departments can plan. The Social Work department has their own hooding ceremony and their students are already planning for that.

Open Forum

- O’Brien advised he was in LA last Thursday and the CSU is rolling out a whole new Strategic Plan. We will be hearing about it later. He was there with Provost Covino and they spoke briefly about a variety of things going on here, e.g., WASC, Assessment, the new SP here and systemwide. At some point we need to look at that and coordinate. The system’s plan is basically Cornerstones II.
- Also, there was a whole day for a student success conference. He stated he doesn’t know if it’s tied together with quicker graduation, student success or what.
- Sarraille questioned Provost Covino if there is a search for the Director of Institutional Research. And if so, are there faculty representatives and if so, who are they? Covino replied it was his understanding the search has been going on for some time and it started last year. There are faculty on it. Novak stated he is a member of the search committee as well as Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl. It started out as a large group but was reduced to Jasek-Rysdahl, Bernardo, Wendt and himself. He’s now off because he is an administrator. Covino stated it has been difficult to recruit for this position, but just this past week he made an offer to a candidate. Hopefully the person will be coming on board in the spring.
- Provost Covino chimed in with O’Brien’s comment that we did work together on some brainstorming at SWAS. There is a new SP effort in the CSU. They were at the table with Achtenburg and other faculty and administrators working on one of the sets of questions that might be used in campus discussions. It is important to know that this effort is going to begin and take its final form from campus activities. Although there are questions being recommended, they are not set in stone. There will be meetings on each campus. Campus Provosts and SWAS made it clear that campus autonomous interests need to be preserved and acknowledged. That was taken quite seriously. The process laid out was campus-based. Materials will then be brought to a ‘big convention’ with a couple dozen representatives from each campus to get a draft together. It is good to know that this is campus focused and respects particular cultures and emphases campuses have build.

Meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm.