Academic Senate
March 23, 2010


Guests: Lauren Byerly, Bryce Dias, Kristina Kelly, Brian Duggan, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Eve Hightower, Deans McNeil, Moore, Nowak, and Stefanco.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

First and Second Reading 05/AS/10/SEC Resolution for Commendation of Self-Study Process passed unanimously as a Sense of the Senate.

First Reading 06/AS/10/SEC Resolution Doctoral Academic Program Review. Second Reading scheduled for April 13, 2010.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, April 13, 2010
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:
Betsy Eudey, Clerk

1. Call to order
2:40 PM

2. Approval of Agenda
Agenda approved as issued.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 9, 2010
Minutes approved

4. Announcements
Petrosky announced that the CSU Stanislaus HR Games teams competed at last weekend’s Pacific Regional HR Games in Reno, Nevada and two of the teams placed second and third. Please join him in congratulating our CSU Stanislaus HR Games team for their impressive victories. He also thanked the team’s advisor Ed Hernandez.

Floyd reminded everyone of the meditation sessions held in FDC 118 on Monday and Thursday from 12:15-12:45pm. These are silent sitting periods open to faculty, staff and administrators. If interested, you may come in a few minutes early for brief instructions or contact R. Floyd at the Psychological Counseling Services at X3381. There is no need to commit to regular attendance and there is no religious orientation implicit in these periods. A substitute room is provided if the Reference Room is occupied.

Mayer reminded everyone of the upcoming performance by last Heather Raffo in the Sounds of Desire on March 30th on our Main Stage Theatre. The play is about the lives of 9 Iraqi women post 9/11. Ms. Raffo received wonderful reviews on her performance at the Lincoln Center in the New York Times. Please show your support on Tuesday, March 30th by purchasing your tickets through the Book Store and the Box Office.
Filling shared on behalf of Eudey that the Faculty Development Center will continue with a series of dialogues this spring semester. Filling announced the campus dialogues on Marriage and Parenting Rights for Same-Sex Couples to be held in the Carol Burke Lounge on Wednesday, March 24, from 4:30-6:00 PM. Please encourage your students to also attend.

Filling welcomed Ron Noble, Administrator in charge of the division of Student Affairs, on behalf of the Senate. He also welcomed the guests with us today. Lauren Byerly, Bryce Dias, Christina Kelly, Brian Duggan, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Eve Hightower, Deans McNeil, Moore, Nowak, Novak and Stefanco.

5. Committee Reports
Littlewood shared that after the last Senate meeting; UEPC met and discussed the dates of spring break for the years after 2011. UEPC is considering one of the 2 weeks at the beginning of April. If we go with the first week of April it should align with Turlock High’s spring break. UEPC will be declaring a new policy to reflect that change.

Sarraille asked if this was already decided. Littlewood replied that it’s going to be the UEPC recommendation but the president will need to act on that recommendation.

6. First Reading Items
   a. 05/AS/10/SEC Resolution on Academic Calendar Resources
Littlewood moved 05/AS/10/SEC resolution and it was seconded by Schoenly. Littlewood read it aloud.

05/AS/10/SEC - Resolution on Academic Calendar Change Implementation

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus urge Interim Provost Lujan, Vice President Giambelluca and President Shirvani to acknowledge the workload issues involved in changing not only the number of weeks in a semester but also the length of each class session, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urge the executive administration at CSU Stanislaus to delay the changeover of our Academic Calendar for one year to allow departments, programs and faculty time to reshape the curriculum to the shortened class periods and extended semester, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate formally request, on behalf of the faculty, sufficient resources to enable faculty to engage in timely and thoughtful conversion of each one of their courses to the new calendar and to revise program requirements and course rotations/roadmaps to graduation.

Rationale: Despite a preponderance of the considered opinions of faculty and students at CSU Stanislaus, President Shirvani chose to change our Academic Calendar. Some of the effects of his change include a lengthening of the fall and spring semesters by two weeks and a shortening of each class period from 58 to 50 minutes. These changes will require a complete revamping of each session of every course taught on this campus. Further, courses previously taught during the winter term will either need to be significantly reconfigured or removed from the course offerings, and may require changes to academic program requirements and course roadmaps.
The current Academic Year commencement events are scheduled for 4 and 5 June. That leaves faculty with less than two weeks of time under contract after completing spring semester. The altered calendar indicates that classes will be starting in mid August. There is no time allotted for the immense work of reshaping every course each faculty member teaches.

Other campuses that have undergone such significant shifts in their calendar have done so with one or two year lags between notification and implementation, so that the work of changing courses can take place in a measured fashion. It is clearly prudent to take that time and allow faculty and staff the time needed to get the conversion done in a thoughtful and effective manner. Other campuses have also seen fit to provide stipends for faculty [working over the summer or in one of the semesters during the academic year] on curriculum changes. Our own campus has a long history of providing either reassigned time or stipends to faculty working on new or enhanced curriculum.

Schoenly noted that there is a cost involved in revising syllabi for classes and there is insufficient time to make the changes. The policy on other campuses allows for resources to be available to assist in this work. Schoenly noted that he’s still concentrating on the current semester and making sure that it’s going well. Labs and lectures will require more time and he would like to see more time provided for the conversion.

Petrosky said that since this seems to be pretty straightforward he suggests moving to a second reading. Sarraillé seconded. Filling asked that all in favor to please indicate by saying AYE. Unanimous the AYE’s have it. The second reading was approved.

O’Brien is in favor of the resolution. We’ve had many discussions on how to deal with the new time slots that we must fit the schedule into. He’s mainly concerned with the 4:20pm & 7:00pm time slot. The newest version of the time module has changed all the 7:00pm ending time slots to 7:20pm. He thinks this process should not be rushed.

Colnic is also in favor for similar reasons. He noted the timing for the Public Administration Comprehensive Exams that were technically given during the winter term for students to take. They will have to redesign the process to figure out how to administer these exams in the new calendar.

Blake Fair is also in favor of the resolution as it is such a large change and more time to review the changes would be beneficial.

McGhee noted that anyone who’s taught on this campus does not have a point of reference to change and restructure classes so quickly. If this is the only place you’ve taught; this presents a challenge for faculty to prepare the information in the best way to present it to students so they can make the transition.

Strahm is also in favor of this resolution. She has a colleague who does a large part of research outside of the university during the summer. We are asking faculty to interrupt their research to prepare for the new calendar. Part of our job is to do research outside of our teaching and bring some kind of recognition to the university. Now we’re asking people to do their regular research while it completely disrupts that schedule. It’s still important to this university’s reputation to have folks doing research and getting published and they should be supported.

C. Davis noted that her department meets 2 days a week in the summer on their own time to prepare for the fall semester. Now they need to change everything about their classes, and they can’t do it justice by rushing
it. We need the time to have those discussions preferably during the academic year and we need time to think it through.

It was suggested that the vote be by paper ballot. Filling clarified that a Yes vote is in approval of resolution 05/AS/10/SEC and a no vote is disapproval of the resolution 05/AS/10/SEC. Pierce to send the resolution to President Shirvani.

b. 06/AS/10/SEC Resolution Doctoral Academic Program Review Policy from Graduate Council

Brown moved the resolution 06/AS/10/SEC. Brown referenced the attached items 1-19 on the Doctoral APR Policy. Brown noted that we need an academic policy for this as it is intended to include other programs. The resolution was seconded by Jasek-Rysdahl and read out loud.

06/AS/10/SEC – Resolution Doctoral Academic Program Review

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Doctoral Academic Program Review Policy, and be it further

Resolved: That the Doctoral Academic Program Review Policy take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The doctoral academic program review process at CSU Stanislaus is the most important method by which California State University Stanislaus will evaluate the effectiveness of its doctoral programs in promoting high levels of student achievement. As such, current (and future) doctoral programs will be subject to periodic academic program review on a cycle not to exceed five years after program initiation and seven years thereafter. The proposed Doctoral Academic Review Policy is intended to describe and guide the process.

Governance responsibility for the development, implementation, and periodic review of the effectiveness of the doctoral program review procedures is vested with the Graduate Council.

Filling said this resolution was open to commentary council. Nagle said that it seemed like the 1st statement on the policy as follows seems ambiguous. Does it mean not more often than every 5 years or not less than 5 years?

1. Doctoral programs are subject to periodic academic program review on a cycle not to exceed five years after program initiation and seven years thereafter. Earlier reviews may occur as deemed necessary by faculty or administration.

Brown said that it is not less than 5 years on the first time it is reviewed.

This item will return as an action item on our next meeting on April 13th.

7. Discussion Items
   c. Update on the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Inclusion on committees

Filling stated that the committees that reviewed this item are supportive of inclusiveness but do not think it’s fair to ask lecturers to work an overload. They’re currently working with CFA and SEC to ensure that people can volunteer without implication of further work. There will be more updates as we get more
Sarraille announced that the Chancellor's Office has authorized semester campuses to charge a per-unit instructional support fee of up to $80 for summer 2010. He asked if anyone knew whether Stanislaus would charge such a fee, and if so, how much it would be. No one offered to respond to the question.

Sarraille asked if the Provost could answer the following questions:
What was the total amount of stimulus funds the campus received and how much of it is being spent on opening up new sections? How much is to be used for opening up new sections next fall and how much is to be spent on such things as graduation initiatives, student success measures, and deliverlogy? Provost Lujan replied that an answer could not be given because these matters are still under discussion. Sarraille asked if Lujan could give responses to the Senate within 2 weeks about the stimulus funds and the summer fees. Lujan said he would get back to the Senate.

8. Information Item
   a. 3:00 PM Time Certain, Bryce Dias, Chairman of the University Union Board of Directors to discuss the Union Renovation

Filling noted that everyone should have received some information on the University Union Renovation. Bryce Dias and Christina Kelly are both here today representing the University Union.

B. Dias noted that he and C. Kelly are 2 of 8 current student board members, and they are in the process of preparing a student fee referendum.

It was noted that the University Student Union Board of Directors has been working on the Student Union renovation and expansion project for the last twenty months. It is a project led by the student members of the board under the leadership of Matthew Moberly and Bryce Dias.

With the approval of the Board of Directors an architectural firm was hired to work with the Board to develop the program statement detailing the services to be included within the facility. This exercise was done based upon previous student union plans for renovation and expansion, insights of the board members and an extensive student survey in spring semester 2008. Once all the data was collected and distilled, the architects developed a project plan which was given to project estimators. Once the estimator’s work was completed the financial projections were finalized.

Dias noted that it’s been since 1978 since the students were last in this position. They wanted to unite the campus focus on the student life aspect and rebuild the Student Union. Up to 2 months ago the campus was growing and for the last 2 years the University Union has focused on how to increase services to all students. The current facility is at maximum use in terms of square feet. The University Union has been working on this project for the last 2 years with the Board of Directors. They’re ready to ask the students if they want the new Student Union or not. Dias is here to ask the Senators to share with their students all the information and reasons the University Union thinks it’s necessary to renovate the current building. Tell your students to take this information and show up and vote on Tuesday and Wednesday, March 29 or 30th.

It was noted that even though the CSU University Student Union is organized as an auxiliary operation of the University, they are much more. They are an integral part of the CSU Stanislaus learning community. They are student-centered, and are committed to meeting the needs of our learning community. They understand the importance of providing a “healthy learning environment” that provides our learning community with facilities, support, and resources students need to succeed in their academic endeavors.
Thus students will have the opportunity to discuss, debate, and determine whether or not they wish to add to their student fees to renovate and expand the Student Union. Students will be able to decide if they want the following:
- A commuter lounge providing needed services.
- Office space for student clubs, organizations, Sororities and Fraternities.
- A multipurpose room able to hold up to 1000 for a lecture or a concert or a play performed by our students.
- A food service operation designed to be able to watch sports programs on large screen TV’s, play video games as well as billiards and ping pong and listen to a comedian or a student play an acoustic guitar.
- A variety of office and meeting spaces for students: who are a part of ASI; or who are members of the University Student Union Board of Directors; or who are student programmers who create, organize and bring a wide variety of programs to the campus community; or who are student volunteer members of the “Warrior Squad” or “Warrior Fanatics.”
- A really awesome place where students can feel safe being who they are while discovering all that CSU Stanislaus has to offer.

Dias showed slides that highlighted the project and will open this up to a Q&A. He shared a slide of the current organization chart for the University Student Union. The Board of directors is the governing body composed of a student group. This is a student run organization with student focus on projects. Dias showed a conceptual design of what the new University Union would like, and shared their Mission Statement. The Student Union exists as a student run organization and is a non-for-profit organization. They’re here to supplement the campus life experience and also supplement the overall college experience. Faculty know the value of an education, and they want to make sure that students have a burden free stay.

Ms. Christina Kelly said that they want to reach out and provide more of these services to nontraditional students. Currently, they feel they are providing services to only a few select groups of students.

O’Brien thanked Bryce for coming. He’s heard about this but hasn’t investigated it. He asked what are improved business services. Dias said that it’s the conceptual design and not only the identifiable Information Help Desk. Guests can hopefully find the University Student Union Information Desk and they will also find a Welcome Center with an extended lounge space. Washington State University has a welcome center with food service and an immense lounge space for studying and hanging out.

Peterson asked where students can find the information on how this will affect their fees. Where can we direct them to view the benefits and costs associated with the benefits? Dias stated that they can give them the University Union pamphlets and they are welcome to meet with Bryce Dias, Christina Kelly, and other board members for a one on one interaction. Students can also visit the Face Book page. There is also a regular webpage but nothing is currently available. Ron Noble said that every student got this information via email with a PDF of the brochure.

McGhee asked what is the construction time and the Student Union down time. It was noted as 2012 – 2014.
Sarraille asked how the elections are conducted. Do ballots go out by mail or do students have to go to a polling place? Dias said it was the latter, and that the voting will occur next Monday and Tuesday, March 29-30 from 7 AM to 7 PM. Sarraille asked what is the percentage of students that show up to vote. Dias said the highest turnout he ever saw was about 13 percent. Sarraille asked if the Union has considered requiring students to vote. Dias replied that this had not been considered, and that it would be up to a student fee advisory committee to propose something like that.

Tumolo asked if there might be a consequence of this potentially leading to the creation of a new student center. Is the policy the students are voting for connected to the new recreational center or student fee increases?

Dias said that the referendum will increase the amount of total fees from $140 to $440 annually over 5 years. It will be set at $50 per year and then at the final year it will be $100. It will increase student fees by $300 over the next 5 years.

It was noted that we have 500 students in Stockton and how will they get their share of the services. Dias said that there is a commitment to improving the Stockton USU Lounge and other elements of the Stockton Center, but it would be difficult to assure that they would get their fair share of the services. Those details have not been determined yet as this project is still in a conceptual state.

Strahm asked how much is this all supposed to cost and what demographic of the Student Union body will you be serving? Dias said it will cost a total of $27 Million and apologized for not having more figures. He noted that about 6-8 months ago it was estimated at costing $35 Million and they realized that was too much for students to bear, so they scaled the cost down by working with the Auxiliary Business Services, annexing the Moms area and having more student presence.

Dias didn’t have an answer for the question about demographics for student population but can get that information. Strahm said that this speaks to the costs you’re asking the students to bear and you should know who those students are. She noted that there are about 40-50% of students on this campus that receive financial aid.

Strahm noted that most students are first generation from not well off middle class backgrounds. Most students are on Pell grants so essentially you’re asking a lot of people who don’t have much in way of means to bear an excessive increase of almost $500 per year.

Dias disagrees. They’re not asking them to bear the burden their asking them to come out to vote in a democratic process. This is the first time this year that they are being asked to vote.

It was noted that Dias said that only 13% of the students vote so how is that democratic. Dias said that they’re trying to deal with that. He’s been volunteering extra hours and trying to meet with clubs and random students to explain the referendum. He appreciates what Strahm is saying but it is not being indicative of all students.

Marcell noted that students are currently paying $140 independent of or on top of the $180 for the Student Recreation Center.

McGhee asked if they’re forecasting to generate the revenues to pay for the bond? The most recent and up to
McGee asked if they have provisions built in on their forecast? Dias said that they can multiply out to get the revenue for the next few years given that they don’t know the funding for the next few years. Dias also stated that the Board of Directors has established a strategic plan to develop a fee management plan if the project is approved by students. Within the current forecasts is already built in a project reserve account for unforeseen issues.

It was asked what will the extra money be used for and would they give rebates to students?

Ron Noble stated that they recently made some repairs to the Union which cost approximately $10K. If the Union could manage additional revenue it would go into reserves for future unexpected expenses. Costs will be different in 10 years from now. Noble also noted that 4 years ago they used some of the reserves to add what is now the Carol Burke Lounge. Dias noted that project reserves are required.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if there are any announcements for additional student forums that we can announce to our students? Dias said that they are all over but there is an open house on Thursday, March 25th. They will be serving breakfast and lunch. They will be providing tours of the current student Union and representatives will be there to answer questions. Dias invited everyone to come to see what it’s all about.

Dias noted that at the open forums they didn’t have a very good turnout. This is why they have been trying to meet one on one with students and meet with established clubs.

It was asked what are the comparisons of square feet and the fee structure of the new University Union to other CSU campuses?

Bryce noted that other campuses have as much as 10 square feet per student and we would be able to offer about 7 square feet per student. Comparing the current costs once the door opens it would be $140 per year compared to other universities. About 1 year ago we were among the 2-3 lowest cost campuses in the system. The maximum was about $400-$500 per capita still paying the same amount.

Filling thanked Bryce Dias and Christina Kelly for joining us. Applause.

9. Open Forum
O’Brien made a motion to adjourn.

10. Adjournment
3:45 PM