Academic Senate  
April 27, 2010  


Proxies Colnic for Cotten, Alcala-VanHouten for Keswick, Pamela Contreras for Heredia, Sari Miller-Antonio for Ellen Bell, Ian Littlewood for Julia Sankey, Viji Sundar for Michael Bice, and Weikart for Regalado.

Guests: Lisa Bernardo, Lauren Byerly, Lilia Dekatzew, Brian Duggan, Mark Grobner, Peggy Hodge, Nancy Lewis, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, John Sarraile, Mark Thompson, Deans Fassinger, Goodwin, McNeil, Moore, Nowak and Stefanco.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

Second Reading of 07/AS/10/SEC/RSCAPC Responsible Conduct Research Policy. Passed unanimously as policy.

Second Reading of 08/AS/10/FAC Resolution Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes and Rationale. Passed without descent as policy.

First Reading of 10/AS/10/ FBAC—Budget Priorities Resolution Returned to FBAC for suggested amendments.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:  
Tuesday, May 11, 2010  
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:  
Betsy Eudey, Clerk

1. Call to order  
2:34 PM

2. Approval of Agenda  
Approved as issued.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 13, 2010  
Manrique clarified that the language presented on the April 13th Senate minutes on the 08/AS/10/FAC Resolution Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes and Rationale was inclusive of any type of taking of notes and that the amended policy wording looks good.

Bender clarified that his comments at the last Senate meeting on April 13th regarding the evening time blocks should have stated the following: He asked if there been a study about students taking back to back courses in the evening. If it’s a small number taking them back to back, then having the schedule predicated on a small minority of needs didn’t make a lot of sense to him.

4. Announcements  
Filling noted on behalf of the Chancellor’s Office that he was distributing the Institute for Teaching & Learning Connections handout.

Filling said the Nursing Department has submitted a proposal to change from a department to a School of Nursing. The Provost has set up a task force to review this proposal. There will be a forum scheduled for May 4th, 2:00-3:00 pm in MSR 130. The change is consistent with the discipline of nursing as 71% of programs are in schools or colleges of nursing which has a positive impact on getting grants and generating funds.
C. Davis said that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and the National Council for Accreditations of Teacher Education (NCATE) review of the College of Education just occurred. She thanked the 150-200 community members and current and former students who participated. They have been recommended for continued accreditation by CCTC and by NCATE.

Nagel announced that on Thursday, April 29, from 10:00am-Noon, a Bargaining Q&A has been scheduled with former CFA President John Travis. Nagel and Sarraille will be there as well. Last Friday they had a meeting in Sacramento and made an approval of sunshine proposals that will be available in late May.

Nagel said that a coach has communicated a desire to have a coaching representative on the Academic Senate. Currently the coaches are being represented by Nagel as the lecturer representative. This item has been referred to FAC to carry forward to 2010/11.

Noble noted that tomorrow is the Career Fair in MSR 130. There is a chance that students will look for it in the Quad and it would be helpful if faculty reminded their students that it’s been moved to MSR 130.

Colnic was asked to announce the upcoming Turlock Farmer’s Market which is supposed to start on Friday May 7th. Several colleagues have been working on this and it’s supposed to be held in the morning till 1 PM in downtown Turlock. It will be great to have a farmer’s market again and he thanked the campus folks for helping to get it going again. Note from the Clerk: more information on the Market is available at http://turlockmarket.org/.

Sundar reported that on Saturday April 24th the Central California Math Project (CCMP) in cooperation with the Mathematics Science and Teacher Initiative (MSTI) conducted an all day Conference on campus called “Expanding Your Horizons”. The EYH Conference brought 110 participants to the campus which included sessions for teachers, parents and students in grades 8 to 12. Presenters included Faculty from CSU Long Beach, CSU San Francisco and University of Nevada, Las Vegas and a Physician who gave a Brain Scan demonstration on “Brain Games for Better academic Achievement – Losing is not an Option.” Stay Tuned for Spring 2011 EYH Conference!

Cotten has the distinct pleasure and pride to announce that the Chancellor’s Office approved the Ethnic Studies major. He extended a hearty thank you to the faculty that worked on this as Ethnic Studies is very appreciative of their work and also the backing of the Senate. He pointed out that the key players include Dr. Lilia Dekatzew and Diana Demetrulias. They went through draft after draft and we want to extend thanks to them. We’re very proud and happy that this succeeded. DeKatzew also thanked Sari Miller-Antonio and Dean Carolyn Stefanco for their guidance and advice through the process.

Mayer wanted to encourage all to meet the candidate for the Enrollment Management position. They will be interviewing a couple more candidates between now and next week. John Mayer and Thomas Carter are the faculty representatives on this search committee and would appreciate any input.

Mayer announced that next week is A Midsummer Night’s Dream in the Amphitheatre. It will run from Wednesday - Sunday night and is free to all. Chartwells is a co-sponsor and will have concessions. You can preorder gourmet box dinners by contacting Chartwells directly. He hopes this is a successful project, as the weather should be lovely. He encouraged departments to try to get together as a group to use this as a social opportunity for a free event. This event is good for ages 12-up as it’s a very accessible Shakespeare play.

Mayer noted that on the following week a comedy group from Utah called Off the Cuff will be performing on campus. This is an improv show on Thursday and Friday May 13 and 14. You can get a coupon for $2 off if you attend the Midsummer’s Night Dream event.
O’Brien thanked Mayer for these announcements. He noted that it’s come to his attention that we’re not having an Outstanding Student celebration this year, which is sad.

Bender says that the lack of an Outstanding Student Awards ceremony does not prevent us from selecting an outstanding student. If your department would like to recognize a student and would like someone to develop a 19x21 poster, Ag Studies will print that for you. This can be displayed in your department area. This is an important recognition for students and it’s an uplifting experience for students.

O’Brien received an email that this event wasn’t occurring but his Dean encouraged the departments to hold an event and offered to provide a professional award for the students. He appreciates Dean Stefanco’s offer and Sociology will take her up on it.

Eudey announced the upcoming book clubs and presentations. She distributed a flyer announcing the Online Pedagogies: Reflections and Musings on the Learning Experience. You must RSVP by May 5th to get lunch. They will be discussing experiences and insights related to the pedagogical aspects of online teaching, including similarities to and difference from face to face learning environments.

On Wednesday May 12th, the GIS Introduction by Pam Pallotta will be held in the GIS Lab. She hopes that more of us across campus, herself included, will attend as spatial literacy is an important literacy for people to have. Finally, in two weeks the last book club of this semester will be held. The Ten Cent Plague is about the great comic book scare and how it changed American. Kim De Vries will be leading the discussion. Eudey is starting to order fiction and nonfiction books for next year. If there are any texts you’d like to read, please send the title to Eudey. She’d especially like to include texts with content that matches faculty areas of expertise so that we can have lively and informed discussions.

Filling recognized the visitors with us today which include Lisa Bernardo, Lauren Byerly, Lilia Dekatzew, Brian Duggan, Mark Grobner, Peggy Hodge, Nancy Lewis, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, John Sarraille, Mark Thompson, Deans Fassinger, Goodwin, McNeil, Moore, and Nowak.

5. Committee Reports
Littlewood announced that UEPC had its next to last meeting. A new Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs policy was sent to SEC with the expectation that it will come to the Senate for approval. There’s also a revised Academic Calendar Policy and a recommendation of when courses should close for the semester titled Class Registration Closure Policy.

Littlewood gave a quick update on the registration model that UEPC is looking at. The current registration priority at CSU Stanislaus is determined by units completed within class level in the following order: seniors, master’s and credential students, freshmen, juniors, sophomores, and unclassified post baccalaureate students. UEPC is looking at the possibility of implementing a two-pass registration system (i.e., allowing students to register for two classes only during the first round of registration and then allowing a second registration period for the remaining classes still required).

Littlewood consulted with L. Bernardo regarding the two-tier multi-pass registration model. If it were to be implemented, that may resolve the issues presented at previous UEPC meetings – student athletes and that of sophomores being last on the priority registration process. L. Bernardo will be speaking with other campuses that use the two-pass registration process to find out how well it works. Littlewood also inquired about closing enrollment prior to the first day of classes. This would allow students to add classes by permission number only and would prohibit students getting into classes automatically prior to waitlisted students being added to the class.
McGhee asked if UEPC was counting units or classes. Littlewood said that they were tentatively thinking of 8 units for the first pass, that way those who require more than 3 unit courses could still get 2 classes. They’re tentatively looking at 8 units but are not yet decided.

Garcia said the division budget scenarios are now available for review on the Business & Finance website at: http://www.csustain.edu/BF/UniversityBudget/10-11UniversityBudget.html
FBAC will be discussing these scenarios tomorrow and they welcome observations of the scenarios.

COC Ballots went out Monday and are due back to the Office of the Academic Senate by 1 PM this Friday, April 30th. Note that the mail is slow and you shouldn’t count on it arriving overnight. It’s better to hand deliver the ballot to the Senate office. If it is late, we can’t count the ballots. McGhee recommends I. Pierce sending an email notifying faculty of this.

Brown reported the approval of the Masters in Digital Media and Anthropology and it will be coming forward to SEC soon. He congratulated the Department of Anthropology for this achievement.

6. Action Items
   a. Second Reading of 08/AS/10/FAC Resolution Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes and Rationale (Referred by FAC)
Schoenly has an update from the last meeting. FAC reviewed and discussed suggestions from the last Senate meeting and the questions posed by the Senators. One question was who retains rights to the recordings at end of the semester. FAC said faculty could request that these recording be destroyed, but students could still retain the notes. This is similar to those who buy E-Notebooks who have book access for a limited time but retain their notes. If students post recordings or notes without permission, the matter can go to Student Affairs and have Judicial Affairs address the issue. In terms of Course Hero, faculty can stamp each syllabus, test, etc. with copyright language. FAC believed these solutions were sufficient but felt the policy should be kept as is to maintain faculty flexibility. The policy allows faculty control over student recording while maintaining accommodation for DRS students. Given the multiple intents of this policy, FAC felt a requirement for copyright language was unneeded and would not seek advice from the campus Compliance Officer on this matter.

Marcell noted that Schoenly mentioned the consequence of distributing materials, but Marcell feels there should be a single line statement that unauthorized use will result in consequences. He’s hoping to get clarification as to why a statement of consequence is not there.

Schoenly said that one FAC member said such a statement could be included but we are trying to keep flexibility in the policy. It is something worth revisiting.

Eudey noted that it is not necessary because it’s already noted in the student and faculty policy manual. It’s not typical to do this because of context.

Voice vote. Unanimous approval. The 08/AS/10/FAC Resolution Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes and Rationale passed as policy and will be sent to the president.

8/AS/10/FAC--Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes (amended)

Audio or video recording (or any other form of recording) of classes is not permitted unless expressly allowed by the faculty member as indicated in the course syllabus or as a special accommodation for students who are currently registered with the Disability Resource Services Program and are approved for
this accommodation.

Recordings allowed as special accommodations are for the personal use of the DRS-approved student, and may only be distributed to other persons who have been approved by the DRS program. Faculty may require the student sign an Audio/Video Recording Agreement, which they may keep for their records.

April 27, 2010 Approved by AS
April 22, 2009 Approved by FAC
Based on discussion at AS, amended and sent to Lee Bettencourt
April 15, 2009 Approved by Lee Bettencourt
April 7, 2009 Discussed at AS
March 24, 2010 Approved by FAC
March 18, 2009 Approved by FAC and Lee Bettencourt

8/AS/10/FAC—Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the attached Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes— and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be effective upon approval by the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook.

RATIONALE: A policy to protect the copyrights and the intellectual property rights of an instructor’s classroom pedagogy is needed. Further, students with disabilities have special needs that require them to utilize learning tools that instructors need to accommodate. This policy allows the instructor to maintain control of the property rights, while meeting the needs of students with disabilities prescribed by law. The policy also provides faculty a means to permit any form of recording they deem useful to support the academic success of those who do not require special accommodation.

4/27/2010 Approved by the Academic Senate

a. Second Reading of 07/AS/10/SEC/RSCAPC Responsible Conduct Research Policy

Insert resolution here

Eudey feels that this resolution puts in place a good policy but also creates a resource that we all should use.

Marcell said the training sounds simple, but he’s concerned with the language in the fifth paragraph on page one regarding researchers. He understands it’s on research policy but some could take it out of context for all behaviors and not just research behavior. He wonders if the sentence can say research behavior and activities to clarify the focus. He suggested adding the word “research” to read “ensure that their research behaviors and activity is consistent.” The body agreed to add this.

Voice vote. No dissent. One abstention. The 07/AS/10/SECRSCAPC Responsible Conduct Research Policy passed as policy with one small change and will be sent to the president.

07/AS/10/SEC/RSCAPC Resolution concerning Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research

Be it resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus approves the attached Policy on Responsible Conduct of Research, and be it further
Resolved: That this policy be effective beginning with the 2010-2011 Academic Year, and be it further

Resolved: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook and provided to all faculty submitting funding proposals to both the University and outside funding agencies.

Rationale: As a recipient of federal grants, CSU Stanislaus must be compliant with research conduct policy requirements of the funding agencies. The attached policy is largely drawn from NIH and NSF recommendations.

4/27/2010 Approved by the Academic Senate

7. First Reading Items
   a. 10/AS/10/FBAC—Budget Priorities Resolution

Garcia moved the resolution, seconded by Schoenly. Garcia apologized that FBAC had a late arrival of this document, but FBAC felt that it is important to bring this item to the Senate to make sure that the document and FBAC’s thinking on these priorities is current. We had a considerable debate in FBAC especially about the bulleted priorities. FBAC only made 1 subtle change after considerable discussion and that was to emphasize what we think should be in the resolution is that these priorities are equally essential and mutually dependent to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus. They are dependent but cannot be separated and there is no hierarchy to the list. FBAC had a discussion about whether to reduce or add to the list and thought it was important to bring to the Senate with these five remaining as priorities.

O’Brien is glad that FBAC sent this forward. Weikart said that this is for the academic year 2010 and thereafter so that it stays in place until we decide to change it.

Petrosky said that given agreement and the short number meetings left he would like to move to a second reading, Eudey seconded. Weikart asked what the urgency is for a second reading. Eudey recommended it because of the FBAC and UBAC consideration of budget proposals.

Weikart moved to amend the last resolved to say “shall be effective immediately.”

Nagel wonders why we need the last resolved if we are making it not year specific.

C. Davis indicated that we had the shorter time frame noted on the resolution when we were trying to indicate that in years like this one we have fewer priorities, but we could return to more priorities in better budget years.

McGhee asked if FBAC discussed adding a statement about transparency of information. Garcia said not in this document. There is another letter to be sent to the president that speaks to some basic budget principles we believe in and transparency is one of them.

Phillips asked if the fifth bullet should include “teaching resources”, given the primacy of teaching it seems odd that that is missing. He wondered if there was discussion about this. Garcia said he doesn’t remember a specific discussion about teaching, but feels that FBAC would be amendable to adding teaching resources to the list.

Peterson suggested adding faculty and staff as she recalls a longer list in earlier years. This is why the year was specified. This is something people should think a little bit about, so perhaps she does not support a second reading at this meeting.
Tuedio isn’t sure the suggested revision is as direct as we’d want. It seems the first, third and fourth bullets are implicating that teaching resources are expected and required. It talks about access to courses, courses in the schedule, reducing SFR’s, and if asking to preserve tenure-track faculty. It’s talking about quality and he would like us to say that these priorities are the ones that “are essential to fulfilling the academic mission for the campus; including commitments to these five things.” He’s not sure what the mutually dependent on means. If we mean it’s essential to the mission, that’s clear, but if we’re claiming maintaining SFR’s is essential then we need to say that.

Garcia said that in FBAC the essence was that we can’t pick and choose these bullet points. Each is connected to the other so that when looking at the priorities we can’t only do some of them. We wanted to emphasize that we don’t see a hierarchy in this resolution. The first bullet item is not the most important as there is no hierarchy used here. C. Davis wanted to use a matrix, but instead we opted for language that would suffice.

Phillips said his suggestion is more targeted to “physical resources” and in this budget cycle it is likely that this should be taken into consideration.

S. Davis said in the second resolved the term “including” suggests that there are other priorities of which these five are mutually dependent and equally dependent. And while suggesting other priorities, should we take those into consideration or are these exclusive. If exclusive, should we not remove the term including.

S. Davis suggested the following 2 options for the language for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} resolved:

\textit{Version 1: single clause}

\begin{itemize}
\item Resolved, that the faculty’s major priorities are the following mutually dependent items, equally essential to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus:
\end{itemize}

\textit{Version 2: two clauses}

\begin{itemize}
\item Resolved, that the faculty’s major priorities are the following:
\item Resolved, that these are mutually dependent items, equally essential to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus.
\end{itemize}

Garcia said that this would hold from the prior document before FBAC modified it.

Sundar wanted to second Phillips’ statement about including teaching resources and would like it mentioned specifically. Gomula echoed that “physical resources” are an issue in her department.

Filling noted some changes that have been brought up. First to change the fifth resolved to read “be effective immediately” which originated with Weikart. There was no dissent to making this adjustment.

Second was to add to the fifth bullet “maintain resources for fostering teaching, research, scholarship….”

Marcel suggested adding the teaching resources section to the beginning of the first bullet.

Tuedio thinks that this is a separate issue; one is instructional resources in support of the instructional mission and that fifth bullet is about RSCA and if we want to add to that or add another bullet for
instructional resources, he’d prefer a separate bullet. Phillips supports a separate, sixth bullet.

Filling reiterated a sixth bullet that says “maintaining sufficient resources for the instructional mission.” O’Brien suggested this as the first bullet. Eudey reminded everyone that the items are in no particular order.

Sundar said the teaching bullet should precede the RSCA because our mission is first and foremost teaching.

Colnic is not trying to discount teaching resources, but for flow and overall document, we mention high quality instruction in the first resolved, and second it’s equally essential items related to high quality instruction. He suggested another bullet that says that may be redundant with the creation of this document when we condensed 12 points to five. The question is whether we want to stick to these five or want to revisit that larger discussion. Patch working this together doesn’t make him comfortable although he’s comfortable with minor adjustments.

Eudey notes we should be careful about having concerns about which items are in which order because we’re claiming that there is no hierarchy on this bullet list. It seems in the discussion a difference is being made between saying that we’re supporting quality teaching and we need sufficient resources to make that happen.

Sundar said that teaching should be mentioned ahead of RSCA as teaching is the bridge or ladder to other activities.

Gomula thinks there is a difference between high quality instruction and high quality resources.

Filling indicated that adding another bullet to say “maintain sufficient resources to maintain the instructional mission.” McGhee said if we’re talking about physical support, shouldn’t that be read in many ways. We’re talking about physical resources as opposed to human resources.

Weikart said the mission language is problematic, and that terminology like resources is better.

S. Davis suggested resources for teaching and C. Davis suggested “effective instruction.” Reiterated as “physical resources for teaching.”

Black believes that we moved too quickly to a second reading, and that this needs to go back to FBAC. Black moved to return 10/AS/10/FBAC –Budget Priorities Resolution back to FBAC for further editing, and to return to the last Senate meeting on May 11th. Seconded by Mayer.

Littlewood asked if FBAC has a meeting, response was that they do tomorrow. Littlewood asked if FBAC could finish it in one meeting. Garcia indicated yes. Black noted it was a first reading item so they should have expected it. Garcia said they were expecting feedback, but not a requirement to come back, but he thinks that FBAC can make it happen.

Tuedio said with the first bullet, as an institution we made a choice and is not sure it’s the one he would have advocated for. The wording says to retain access to qualified students. We get a target from CO, and if we exceed that by more than 2% we’ll lose their fees, we’ll get penalized. Wondering if we want to say we want to maintain the maximum access we are allowed by the system to provide. That is important because if we stop at cap but don’t push to 2%, those to serve are not being served. Is that a priority? We want to see the resources to support that.

Voice vote, approved to return to FBAC for further review.
Mayer has questions about some of the previous statements. If Senators have questions or concerns they need to submit them to Garcia by tomorrow before 2:30pm when FBAC will meet.

Mayer said that department chairs met with Provost Lujan, President Shirvani and the Russ Giambelluca yesterday and a question was posed in regard to the system used on the scenarios. He asked that when FBAC looks at the scenarios they will see the strain on smaller colleges in the face of the proposed budget cuts if they remain horizontal. The impact is significant on the smaller colleges, especially the COA.

Garcia requested that any comments sent to Garcia should also be copied to I. Pierce.

8. Discussion Items
   a. Time Blocks—Evening Courses
Filling noted that this is an item of recurring discussion. Filling indicated there was a handout with the most current version of scheduling blocks. S. Davis asked if there was a change from the previous versions. Filling said this is the same version that was provided at the last meeting, and it is the most current version dated 2/18/2010.

Lisa Bernardo indicated that there were no changes since 2/18/2010. Filling introduced Lisa Bernardo to the Senate. Filling indicated this would be the time to raise concerns or questions.

O’Brien mentioned that there was an issue of evening time blocks from 6-9pm, and that Nagel had reviewed 2005 minutes which noted that there were a certain percentage of courses that must adhere to the 6-9pm timeslot.

Bernardo said we are still accommodating the 6-9pm time block requests. Enrollment Services has placed as many as they could based on availability. Some may be denied if they don’t have enough classroom space. She noted that if the timeslot can be accommodated they will include it into the schedule. They especially try to fit evening requests which are not as uniform as during the day, which is no different than prior terms. They currently have about 50 unplaced classes for fall 2010.

Tuedio read the comments from the last meeting, and there was a suggestion that we didn’t want to leave this up to nuance if there were ways to identify some days when clearly 6pm starts occurred. It appears that on MWF this seems natural to have a class from 6:00-8:40pm if they started at 3:00-5:40pm and 6:00-8:40pm, especially on Fridays. He likes the sentiment of more structure to accommodate the 6pm interest. Maybe for Tuesdays and Thursdays it makes sense to have two evening slots.

Bender wonders if the classes that were requested outside of this existing time block are primarily from 6-9pm. If they are, then the 6-9pm timeslot should be regularized across all nights. If all requests outside of this are from 6-9pm then a large number of faculty or students are interested and we should make it an option.

Eudey noted that the minutes that Nagel read were from November 2005. Provost Dauwalder agreed to set aside the 6-9pm timeslot guaranteeing that a percentage of these timeslots would be available.

McGhee suggested that last time we had a difficult time planning for classes if we were uncertain if the 6-9pm timeslot was going to be available. It would be helpful if we could regularize this timeslot to assist in planning the schedule.

Bernardo said that it boils down to the timing. She’s sure they can accommodate 2/3 of the 6-9pm requests.
Part of the reason they can’t accommodate it is not because we are not trying to accept them but because there are no rooms available. There is not enough space because we have too much demand. To know if you’re being accommodated, they would need to know this before the schedule is built. We need to put up an accurate schedule as soon as possible for our students. Hundreds of class changes are coming in and they don’t stop in time for students to register. The schedule would need to be produced much earlier and she’s not sure if that is possible.

McGhee noticed a change in terminology being used. He understood from what Nagel read that 2/3 of the timeslots would be for 6-9pm, and Bernardo said they would get 2/3 of the requests fulfilled. That’s a different terminology and a different impact. He wants to make sure we’re talking about the same 2/3 of the same number and not talking about the same thing in terms of number of sections available.

Tumolo said that there could be a front-end solution of switching to different time blocks with 6:00-8:40pm sections. Then every class on those evenings would be noted instead of those who could get approved. Why not make the 6:00-8:40pm the standard operating procedure. Gomula concurred with this observation.

Bernardo said that would make it easier for Enrollment Services, and if it could be standardized it would be better for the scheduling process.

Bender noted that if we don’t have rooms we don’t have rooms. The idea is if we regularize the 6-9pm timeslot and know it’s available they can plan accordingly. If there is no room, then we have to switch. If the 6-9pm slot is a special situation that needs permission to be allowed then it’s more difficult to plan.

Tumolo asked if there are enough classes available. If we take the 4-7pm and the 7-10pm timeslots and make it 6-9pm, do we know how many evening courses we need to have to serve students? If we have that information we could go forward with only needing one block. If not, it’s not worth discussing.

Bernardo said we did gain one more timeslot but lost it because the class time is shorter. She doesn’t know if the second part of question can be answered, as they don’t know how many classes are needed.

Marcell asked if we are only discussing evening class blocks on MWF or TR or trying to standardize every day of the week. Evening classes are a departmental scheduling issue than the daily block for GE and LIBS Core classes. Some electives are in the evenings but they rely on night classes especially for their majors.

S. Davis asked if Bernardo can estimate the classroom capacity for the 4-7pm and 7-10pm slots. Bernardo noted that the 4-7pm and 7-10pm timeslots are approximately 30% of the total classes. It’s not a crisis in those times, but we don’t want to eliminate them altogether because some programs do set it up to have two sections on one day.

Filling said could move all of these to 6-9pm and still have room for the 4-7pm and 7-10pm classes based on the 30% capacity. Bernardo said about 30% of programs use the 4-7pm and 7-10pm timeslots and the other 70% are using the 6-9pm timeslot. We probably can’t accommodate all 6-9pm requests because they run out of space.

S. Davis wants to know the number of rooms in use from 6-9pm because on MTWWR nearly all rooms are in use but on Fridays we have plenty of space. Bernardo indicated that MTW are packed and they have to turn away most requests for these days.

Peterson thinks a common situation is the master’s programs when students are working full time during the day and they are required to take classes at night. Would it work better if 70% of programs are using the
6-9pm slot to give them MWF and the TR would be for the 4-7pm and 7-10pm slots? This way Enrollment Services gets automatically 40% of the slots to accommodate others. If you want to offer a 6-9pm timeslot on TR it would be considered a special accommodation. Bernardo is in favor of some standardization as this could be better for scheduling.

Eudey said that what Peterson is offering makes sense. There could be some programs and faculty challenged but it seems like a good plan. The current programs are offering courses MTW from 4-7pm or 7-10pm, and there might be a problem if they like the 4pm slot, but we can go back to our departments to see if this is something that is functional to offer. Some faculty are only teaching in the evening, so this model could work for most of us.

Duggan said that when looking at the schedule, we need to know that there are 3 distance learning classes which are unique as they are the only rooms that transmit courses to Stockton and Merced – and their scheduling is governed by UEPC policy. When requests come in for evening courses, M-R, there are four departments that have priority because of advertised programs to be completed by distance learning. They need to have two classes per night in those rooms. There are 42 plus other classes where different schedules can occur, but these 3 rooms for ITV are different and that needs to be understood before anything formal goes forward.

Brown clarified that it’s not the 4-7pm timeslot but starting at 4:30pm in the new schedule. Brown has found that when talking to people with full time day jobs, on occasion they can flex to get to a 4pm class and some could likely do that for a 4:30pm starting time. We might want to check with students to see if they can get a flex day for the 4:30pm timeslot. S. Davis said that this perhaps is true for MBA students but not for schoolteachers or social workers.

Colnic hesitates to ask, but it looks like two days a week, 3 units, and the last daytime segment ends at 4:45pm, and then the one day a week starts at 4:30pm. Aren’t we losing that whole 3:30pm-4:45pm slot with the evening class? Bernardo to verify that we were not losing a timeslot.

Marcell noted if you look at the current schedule, there are no Friday night classes offered at 7pm, and there’s only a few being offered at 4pm. Most offer M-R evening classes. If we went MW and TR, you’d get most classes covered. We want to keep proportions to the 60/40 scheduling.

Jasek-Rysdahl hears a lot of questions, assumptions from departments, and no real data. We’re going into the new calendar year and perhaps the Student Success Committee should look at the trends of classes and timeslots. Instead of asking questions we should try to get the information needed. S. Davis asked if there was a strategic enrollment management group to look at this. Bernardo said there is not a SEM group, but she agreed that we can pull some data. She pulled data when they reviewed the original document from David Dauwalder and got some information. It would take a couple of months to pull it together to see what the percentage of the 6-9pm requests are and what we are able to offer. She thinks it’s a great idea to look at this data.

Filling asked if it can be done in two weeks and is there any window left to effect next fall. Bernardo said no to both.

Silverman agrees with Jasek-Rysdahl that we need information. The Institutional Research office may have some information, so somebody who is in this business should take control of this.
Tumolo said if we have a class that ends at 16:45 and a class that starts at 16:30, every class that is scheduled to 4:45 should be open for a 6pm time block. There is a built in justification for adding a 6-8:40pm block on MTWR since there is a block of classes that must be open after 4:45.

Bernardo said that there are many requests for 6-9pm and that on paper that should be available, and if you want to formalize it you can. They have been doing this already, but they can formalize it and should be able to add that timeslot.

Bernardo noted that they have already dealt with 6-9pm timeslot for fall, so collecting data is perhaps not the best use of her time. She asked that the Senate not codify this schedule as the law. She understands that we’re asking for more flexibility than what is listed. This needs to be negotiated with Bernardo, Deans, etc. The danger is not having the 6-8:40pm or 6:20-9:00pm slot listed here.

Marcell wanted clarification as to why we are having a discussion on having a time because the current approach works. Enrollment Services is doing the best they can, so does having it fixed in stone make a difference.

C. Davis wonders if we can get data on the number of classes this year that met from 6-9pm, 4-7pm and 7-10pm. If we can say that in this year there were X number of each in the schedule as a basic piece. That might help us to understand the numbers we’re looking at. Bernardo said that is very basic and can be done quickly.

Filling suspects SEC can carry this forward and give Bernardo the summer to collect the data.

9. Open Forum

S. Filling wanted to thank all for their work. We passed some policies and can move forward on these.

10. Adjournment

4:15 PM