

<p>Academic Senate March 11, 2008</p> <p>Present: Bender, Bice, Broadwater, Brown, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Dempsey, Eudey, Filling, Floyd, Garza, Gomula, Grobner, Hall, Hejka-Ekins, Helzer, Janz, Johnson, Keswick, Manrique, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Poole, Ringstad, Robbins, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Snizek, Sumser, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Werling, Zong</p> <p>Proxy: Bailey (Lawson)</p> <p>Guests: Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Roger McNeil, Gary Novak, Lee Renner, Armin Schulz, Carolyn Stefanco, John Weddle, Ted Wendt</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</p>	<p>FAC Statement on Post Tenure Review, Information Item</p> <p>5/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the GFC, Article VI, Section 2.3, First Reading Item</p> <p>6/AS/08/FAC—Amendment to Support Unit Review Policy, First Reading Item</p> <p>7/AS/08/UEPC—Policy on Unretrieved Student Work, First Reading Item</p> <p>8/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Academic Advising Policy, First Reading Item</p> <p>9/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Class Attendance Policy, First Reading Item</p> <p>Prioritization of the Strategic Plan, Discussion Item</p> <p>Master Plan, Discussion Item</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, April 1, 2008 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>John Sarraille, Clerk</p>
--	--

1. Call to order at 2:34 pm.
2. Approval of Agenda-Add Information Item as 6 b) Budget Advocacy Summit. MSP Nagel/Eudey.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 26, 2008-MSP Filling/Eudey.
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - a. Eudey reminded Senators of the Empire Conference this Friday through Sunday.
 - b. Tynan advised that the Conference on Methamphetamine in the Community is on March 28, 2008.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

a. AS Resolution-FBAC - Schoenly explained that AS unanimously passed a Sense of the Senate resolution at its Nov. 6 meeting that requests that:

“... Business/Finance assist FBAC in performing a longitudinal five-year analysis of administrative positions and organizational structure. This analysis should include financial impacts and costs, both incurred and foregone. AS also requests that FBAC direct special attention to the impact of the ALS reorganization.”

In response to the resolution, FBAC produced reports, copies of which that have been distributed: spreadsheet (front and back), graphs (one page), and AA ALS Reorganization page (given out earlier this year). An FBAC subcommittee comprised of Schoenly, Filling and Tan created the spreadsheet and graphs now before Senators. The third page is the analysis performed by Academic Affairs that motivated the Sense of the Senate resolution.

Data gathering was in progress by mid October and continued to mid February. FBAC requested data from five individuals and groups: Mary Stephens (five-year MPP schedules, five-year staff counts), the Provost (five-year student counts), Ted Wendt (five-year faculty counts), Ken Whitfield (five-year FTE-staff) and four Deans.

FBAC met twice (20 Feb, 5 March) to review the subcommittee analysis. After our second March 5 meeting, a majority of FBAC members voted to release this analysis to the campus community.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 show five-year growth estimates (in FTEs) of our four campus populations (table 1) and disaggregated FTE's for staff (table 2) and for faculty (table 3). The same data are shown on the top panel of the graphs page. Note from the subheading above Table 1 that individuals in each campus group are funded by a combination of dollars coming from general fund, grants/contracts and self-support.

Tables 4, 5 & 6 (flip page) show estimates of what was spent in each year for MPP's and their staff before the breakup of ALS (2005/06), the next transitional year (2006/07), and the founding year (2007/08). Note the cost increases by year at the bottom of table 5. The same data are shown in the pie-charts on the graphs page.

In the Oct. 3, 2007 document that FBAC distributed to AS last October, total cost of ALS reorganization was given as \$1,063,530, considered an increase of \$398K. According to the FBAC analysis of the data provided, the ALS reorganization cost \$1.3 million - a \$600K increase.

Schoenly stated he would be happy to take questions.

Discussion:

Covino explained that MPPs, faculty, staff, and students are aggregate figures in the growth chart. Some MPPs are funded through the general fund but some MPPs and staff are funded through grants and contracts, or by self support structure like Health Services. FBAC decided not to break out the data according to funding source. Twelve of the MPP positions indicated for last year are self-support or grant funded. He said that when he received them last Wednesday, he asked the Faculty Affairs Budget Analyst S. Mollard to look at the final figures. She came up with somewhat different numbers. Her estimate of the 06/07 transition costs was higher. The difference had to do primarily with positions that we thought had been funded during that year, but were not. Some things were paid for with existing dollars rather than new dollars. Mollard's compilation of the 07/08 cost is different. Covino said they found the ALS cost in 05/06 was approximately \$700,00 not \$600,000. Also he stated they found if one takes the \$1.3M, subtracts the \$700,00 and subtracts salary increases, the net cost differences appears to have been \$400,000 or \$500,000. As to why that happened, he said he didn't know. It would seem that the additional cost of \$400,000 to \$500,000 about \$25,000 to \$50,000 per college. Perhaps salaries that were higher than projected could account for this difference. It would be a good idea to learn more of the reasons for the differences.

Filling stated he appreciated the Provost attempting to do further analysis, but FBAC asked him in November to do this. He is a member of FBAC and he has had an opportunity at FBAC meetings to discuss with us, have input and correct any misunderstandings. Schoenly asked Covino if it is possible his total cost estimate does not include the four additional staff positions that were created. The Provost replied that might be so. Schoenly pointed out that four staff positions would account for another \$244,000 (including benefits), so that would bring the Provost's estimate closer to the FBAC estimate.

O'Brien commented on the 3 year averages. In looking at that, it seems MPPs increased 10% and students increased only 4.5%, tenured/tenure-track faculty increased 3.5% and permanent staff increased 2.0%. So administration increased double the rate of anyone else. Is that attributed to the ALS breakup? Schoenly replied that deans are included in the MPP column so some could be attributed to the ALS breakup, but not all. Morgan-Foster added the increase in MPPs could also be due to converting some staff positions into MPP positions.

Johnson asked faculty to review and come back next time for discussion.

6. INFORMATION ITEM

a. Statement on Post Tenure Review

R. Floyd advised that the PTR Policy was signed by President Shirvani last Fall. A meeting was held with FAC, Associate Vice President Wendt, CFA Chapter President Filling, and Provost Covino to discuss implementation of the policy. The statement or report attached to the agenda is a summary of meetings and discussions on PTR. This statement will go to the general faculty by email. The first cycle is Spring 2009. The FDC will host two faculty conversations in April and in the Fall where faculty can gather and develop ideas for their review. Representatives from FAC will attend. The statement also says PTR citations on the AAUP website are helpful. Feel free to contact any FAC member with questions. Members are: Renae Floyd, April Hejka-Ekins, Andy Young, Pam Russ, Chuck Floyd, Annie Hor and Daniel Afonso.

Poole asked what happens if someone that needs to be reviewed doesn't submit any documents. R. Floyd replied the department would have to decide what to do. PTR policy implementation is a departmental issue. Filling reminded Senators that the collective bargaining agreement says there will be a PTR process. He indicated that failure to abide by contract provisions might result in reprimand or discipline. R. Floyd added that the requirement is we perform PTR and examine teaching evaluations. Sarraille pointed out that the CBA language requires that for faculty unit employees who teach, the process must include examination of teaching evaluations.

b. Budget Advocacy Summit

Filling advised that the Governor's budget proposal includes a cut of \$386M to the CSU budget. Cuts are not inevitable. The Alliance for the CSU will fight the cuts. We are holding a budget summit on March 19 in MSR 130, from 11:00 to 12:30. It is being sponsored by President Shirvani, the CFA and other unions, and the Speaker. Eudey asked if talking points are available. Filling replied there will be a power point presentation and that will be distributed.

7. FIRST READING ITEMS

a. 5/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, Article VI, Section 2.3 ASL Subcommittee

It was MS Filling/R. Floyd

Be it Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the below amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty be approved:

Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee: ~~Five~~ Seven voting members, four faculty with no more than one from any college, two additional faculty members currently serving as Assessment Coordinators of their academic programs, and one student representative appointed by the President of Associated Students. The Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning and the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning shall be ex-officio, non-voting members. And be it further;

Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the amendments become effective upon approval by the General Faculty and the President.

Discussion:

Nagel stated it doesn't say how they will be selected. Filling replied it is in the General Faculty Constitution that states the COC appoints the entire committee. Tuedio noted that this was probably put together before the GE director so that should be added. Filling agreed.

This will be second reading at the next AS meeting.

b. 6/AS/08/FAC—Amendment to Support Unit Review Policy

It was MS R. Floyd/Schoenly

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus approve the following amendment to the Support Unit Review Policy:

1. Selection of review team and schedule for the review: The review team is comprised of people mainly from outside the unit being reviewed as well as those involved in preparation of the self-study report to ensure continuity and appropriate interpretation of the data. When the unit has university-wide responsibility, all sectors are represented on the review team. The vice president's or president's responsibility includes soliciting nominations for team members from the faculty through Committee on Committees ~~and the unit administrator~~ and selecting the members and chair of the review team; and be it further

Resolved: That the revised policy take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: This recommendation for revision to the Support Unit Review Policy is consistent with 14/AS/06/FAC which was unanimously approved by the Academic Senate. It is recommended by the Committee on Committees, the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Senate Executive Committee. 14/AS/06/FAC states that the Committee on Committees is the governance body that recommends faculty members to administrative committees.

Discussion:

Filling stated that the revision came from the COC. They recommended the phrase 'and the unit administrator' be struck. FAC reviewed and concurred. FAC and COC felt that one might infer from the current wording that the COC and the unit administrator could make recommendations for faculty appointments. The words should be struck in order to align the policy with established practice.

There was no discussion. This will be second reading at the next AS meeting.

c. 7/AS/08/UEPC—Policy on Unretrieved Student Work

It was MS Filling/R. Floyd.

RESOLVED: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate recommend that the following policy be adopted:

Policy on Unretrieved Student Work

- Instructors must retain all unretrieved student work (whether paper, electronic, or online student work) for any given course for at least one academic year following the submission of the final grade for that course.
- Instructors (such as adjuncts and visiting lecturers) who are uncertain of their continuation through the two semesters following submission of the final grade should submit unretrieved student work to the department chair/program coordinator.
- Disposal of unretrieved student work should be carried out in such a manner as to protect the student's confidentiality and intellectual property rights, and to prevent its subsequent use for purposes of academic misappropriation.
- Instructors who anticipate using student work for pedagogical purposes (for example, using a high quality paper as a model paper for other students to consult) must obtain the written permission of any student whose work

might be so used. [Alternatively, an instructor might choose to request only denials of permission in writing. If affirmative permission is not obtained, instructors must give written notice to students at the beginning and end of the course that student work may be used for pedagogical purposes unless a written denial of permission for such use is filed with the department chair/program coordinator.]

- Each individual graduate department will identify in their written comprehensive examination procedures, conditions for availability and the length of time designated for retention of the examination for their respective department. The written procedures will be kept on file in the Graduate School

RESOLVED: That the policy become effective beginning in the academic year following final approval of this resolution.

RATIONALE: A formal policy on unretrieved student work would be helpful for several reasons:

- It will help ensure that such work is not disposed of prematurely, particularly with regard to grade appeals. The one-year specification should allow ample time for grade appeal processes, including possible unforeseen time delays.
- It helps prevent confusion about expectations.
- For some, it will allow the freeing up of space in file cabinets, hard drives, and/or online course delivery systems.
- A policy that includes information on how materials are to be disposed of will help support student and faculty privacy needs.
- Students aware of such a policy will be more inclined to pick up their graded papers or other work in a timely fashion rather than hoping that they will still be available to them when they realize that something is missing from a portfolio or is needed for some other purpose.

Discussion:

Filling stated that this policy was developed in response to requests from faculty. The question is: Who owns student property and how long does it need to be saved? UEPC researched and consulted with GC and other bodies and decided one year was a reasonable time. The ASI agreed.

Schoenly agreed this was a good idea. But it might require another filing cabinet, so it is also a budget issue. Eudey stated her appreciation for the third bullet regarding online course delivery. We might want to decide how to backup material. Thompson asked what the rationale was for the time period stated, as opposed to just keeping it until the time expires for a grade appeal. He also asked if he sends something back electronically, can he then delete his copy? Is it a legal requirement to get the permission of the student? Are we creating additional restrictions on ourselves?

In reply to Thompson's first question, Filling said that the period is one year because it seemed the longest feasible amount of time. The answer to the second question was: no, what is sent electronically counts being returned. Thirdly, as an example to our students, we wish to maintain a high standard regarding intellectual property. The creative work of students is copyrighted. They can legally require that a professor not share their work. Poole stated that as of 1989, what is created is copyrighted and they determine how work is distributed. What is written is in compliance with the copyright law. Thompson disagreed. The holder of a copyright does not control all use. We may use copyrighted work in the classroom. Peterson stated she has asked her students if she could put their papers on blackboard. It is an informal process. But this would mean she would need a more formal process. Also, would she have to ask for permission from students who took her classes in the past? We should say we have the option to destroy things sooner. Filling stated that copyright law does not require advance notification. Also, this does not function as *ex post facto* law. Nagel added that the intellectual property issue is more controversial. Maybe that should be a separate policy. Robbins asked how students would be made aware of this policy. Will it end up in the Catalog? Will faculty be penalized if they destroy the work too early? Filling replied it will go into the Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook. Schoenly suggested having a standard statement in course syllabi. Peterson asked if we run something through TurnItIn, is that a violation of copyright? Sumser stated that has been discussed

in the Chronicle of Higher Education. However, the copyright issue should be separate. Eudey suggested under the policy, first bullet, add a clause like unless written permission is obtained from the student to destroy it earlier.

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

d. 8/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Academic Advisory Policy

It was MS Filling/Thompson

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Policy on Undergraduate Academic Advising of the University Educational Policies Committee and be it further,

Resolved: That the Policy on Undergraduate Academic Advising replaces the 1991 policy currently in the Faculty Handbook and be it further,

Resolved: That the Policy on Undergraduate Academic Advising take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The advising mission at CSU Stanislaus is to provide current and prospective students academic advisement that is accurate, consistent, and timely so that students can develop meaningful educational plans compatible with career and life goals. Effective academic advising is essential to the realization of the University's instructional mission. The University strives to offer a workable program of academic advising for every enrolled student. All students are entitled to accurate, reliable, consistent, and timely advising provided by faculty and Student Affairs Staff Advisors and to advising materials available on-line and in print. The Policy on Undergraduate Academic Advising clearly defines the goals, objectives, roles, and responsibilities of academic advising at CSU Stanislaus.

Discussion:

Filling stated the last policy we have dates back to 1991. At the behest of several groups, the UEPC took on the task at looking at recommendations from a task force. The result is a nice balance trying to urge people what is proper and leaves them the freedom to do what they want.

O'Brien questioned III. Goals and Objectives 4) Make referrals to university and community resources. Does it obligate faculty to take action? Notify the University? And 4) a) Provide advisor training on available university and community resources. Will faculty go to learn everything about advising? He stated his comfort level is unsure where this is going. And under IV. C. a) Roles and Responsibilities of College Deans, to supervise and monitor the development and implementation of clearly defined advising policies and practices within their colleges. Were the deans in that conversation? They are already stretched. The reply was no. O'Brien questioned under IV. E. 2. a) Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty, Participate in advisor training sessions as needed in order to stay current on issues related to advising within the major. The question is, who will decide as needed? A chair? Will faculty give themselves up and say they need it? Filling stated his sense is that UEPC thinks the majority of people will self identify they need to go to a workshop and the probationary review process talks about advising. Hopefully it is a faculty driven process.

Taniguchi questioned III. Goals and Objectives 4. a) Provide advisor training on available university and community resources. And then under 6) Provide regular training for academic advisors on all relevant issues. It seems like duplication. S. Davis stated one goal of the document is to clearly delineate who is responsible for what. It seems under 4 a) and 6) are referring to a different group of people. This needs to be clarified.

Sarraille IV. A. 2. c) Roles and Responsibilities of students. Students are strongly encouraged to take advantage of the resources available to them such as the student handbook, the academic calendar, the schedule of classes, and the university catalog when selecting or planning their program of study. There is a lot of reference to responsibilities of various parties but here there is a weak admonishment to students. Maybe this should be worded more strongly - say it is the responsibility of students to know what is in the catalog and not expect other people to do their leg work.

Filling will take these suggestions back to UEPC. This will be an action item at the next AS meeting.

e. 9/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Class Attendance Policy

It was MS Filling/R. Floyd

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached revised 3/15/05 UEPC/SEC Class Attendance Policy of the University Educational Policies Committee and be it further,

Resolved: That the revised Attendance Policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook, the University Catalog, and the Student Handbook and be it further,

Resolved: That the revised Attendance Policy take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The University Educational Policies Committee was requested by the Academic Senate at its 5/08/07 meeting to prepare a draft of a revised attendance policy for consideration by the Academic Senate.

Discussion:

Filling stated that the proposed policy is the result of previous discussions of faculty and students. There is concern that on occasion students are academically penalized for participating in a wide variety of university activities.

Thompson stated he had asked about what would be a representative list of university sanctioned activities. He also said that he found it interesting what the rationale doesn't say. He questioned what the change in the language really means and said he'd like to see that addressed in the rationale. For example, part of the language to be struck from the existing document is: "The instructor is the judge of the validity of the reasons for absence and of what arrangements, if any, are to be provided for the student to make up class work." He said he can't tell whether the if any that was put in means the same as the if any taken out. It may mean that if there is a need for arrangement, then the instructor will determine that. It seems more ambiguous and he stated he's not sure if there is a change. What can he expect to be different if this is approved? Filling replied there is a difference. As originally written, the instructor is the judge of the validity of the reason for absence. This re-write attempts to take away a small amount of that. This is in response to some very specific problem areas. We have university sanctioned activities such as athletics and performing arts, which instructors should respect. The second if any addresses how assignments are made up. We come very close to infringing on faculty academic freedom. Taniguchi said that if it is not there already, something should be added to the Academic Advising Policy saying students engaged in university sanctioned activities should get special advising. Colnic stated that the issue seems more to be one of equity. Some students are here in part to participate in certain activities.

Sumser offered that he states in his syllabus how many classes can be missed. There is nothing about specific activities. However if one misses a lot of classes the same penalty should apply to all. Most of our students work. Equity means equal treatment. Wendt stated university sanctioned events would be any activity that is sanctioned by some element of the university. The list would be endless. All faculty members here likely have university sanctioned activities related to their department. We need to acknowledge that many things make up what a university is - more than just taking classes.

O'Brien stated that the issue came up last year because a faculty member was approached by a student who said he would have to miss every Friday. That would be thirteen or fourteen classes. What would you do in a case like that? Is that legitimate? Eudey stated her response would be to ask what would be the effect of the absences. If the student can demonstrate the content has been learned, the matter of how it was learned is not her greatest concern. The fact that students are present doesn't mean they learn. O'Brien then questioned what value can we conclude the instructor adds. If a student can pass a class without attending, what does that say?

Covino opined that the proposed policy makes a very good statement. It respects faculty judgment. The advisor of the student athlete usually tries to work with the students and put them into classes that work out for them. The faculty member does not have to feel responsible to make everything work for the student athlete or the activity participant. S. Davis asked what the student's views are and Janz replied they have been working with Filling and they feel this is a fair compromise. The if any at the bottom allows faculty to say, I can't provide you with an alternative assignment. He stated he personally feels it could be stronger, but it is a fair compromise.

Filling stated two issues UEPC struggled with. How many classes missed are too many? UEPC did not feel it should try to resolve that question, and so the policy makes no mention of it. The policy is intentionally vague. We rely on the judgment of our colleagues. He noted that students would prefer a much more lenient policy. It is a fair compromise. It provides guidance for those few cases that have been at issue. Sumser stated that at some institutions, one can't use attendance as a criteria for grading, and he would prefer that. Sarraille and Johnson pointed out that sometimes a student can pass a course without going to class and that does not necessarily reflect badly on the performance of the instructor. Filling asked Senators to please consult with their departments and email concerns to him.

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

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Prioritization of the Strategic Plan

Janz stated he was contacted by the Provost office and asked that the ASI come up with a single list of priorities. He asked if that was true for everyone. Johnson stated we are in the process of doing here what ASI already did. We are trying to come up with a priority list from faculty, but in order to obtain information she sent out requests to all committees to look at the SP and advise her of their priorities. The same request was also sent to faculty in general, and staff. ASI input is at the bottom of the spreadsheet because she thought it might be helpful if faculty knew the students priorities.

Johnson asked Senators what they think the priorities should be. Garza stated the Library supports 2.4: "Provide accessible, comprehensive library services." C. Davis noted that 1.2, 2.1 and 2.4 were the priorities of the committees and faculty so maybe those should be the AS priorities. Morgan-Foster stated that 1.6 might be the push the program needs. Taniguchi stated it is all interrelated so that is why it is difficult to prioritize. If we emphasis 1.2, a lot of the others are subsumed under that. But she stated she likes the top three C. Davis mentioned. It is a matter of emphasis. Johnson suggested we include 2.3: "Professional development, growth, and achievement of staff." She explained that staff have felt demoralized, have had a lot of pressure put upon them, and faculty should show support of them. Taniguchi, Tynan and Thompson agreed.

A straw vote was taken that 1.2, 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4 will be the items we will focus on first. Vote was unanimous.

Priorities are:

- 1.2-Continue to provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs.
- 2.1-Recruit and retain an engaged, diverse faculty.
- 2.3-Professional development, growth, and achievement of staff.
- 2.4-Provide accessible, comprehensive library services.

- b. Final Exams on Reading Day/Last week of class-carryover
- c. Workload-carryover
- d. Master Plan (time certain 4:00, AVP Gallegos)

Associate Vice President Gallegos gave an overview of the 2008 Master Plan. Any input faculty would like to give him, please send forward.

9. OPEN FORUM

11. ADJOURNMENT at 4:35 pm.