

<p>Academic Senate October 12, 2010</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Broadwater, Burroughs, Contreras, Cotten, C. Davis, De Cocker, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, Marshall, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Noble, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Provost Strong, Regalado, Routh, Sarraille, Silverman, C. Stessman, Strahm, Stone, Wallace and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Trish Hendrix for Dawn McCulley.</p> <p>Guests: Deans Flores, Moore, McNeil, Nowak, and Tuedio. Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, Annie Hor, and Cristhian Duran.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First and Second Reading of 9/AS/10/SEC Resolution on UBAC. Passed unanimously by voice vote.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, October 26, 2010 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order

2:00pm

2. Approval of Agenda

The resolution under item 6.a should read 05/AS/10/GC/UEPC/FBAC to be consistent with what was sent out. Agenda approved as amended.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 14, 2010

The date on the minutes should read September 14, 2010. Minutes approved as amended.

4. Announcements

Strahm introduced Cristhian Duran on behalf of her colleague Tamara Sniezak who serves as advisor to the Hunger Network. Cristhian Duran is the President of the CSU Stanislaus Hunger Network Club. Duran spoke on behalf of the Hunger Network noting that the club does community service for the homeless in the area. He noted that this year they received needs from students who cannot afford to purchase food. Students are dropping out of college because they cannot afford to eat. A study last spring indicated that 44.1% of our students have gone hungry because they cannot afford to buy food. There is an 82% decrease of spending at supermarkets. Also, 67% of students surveyed say that they go hungry. Duran knows of five students who need our help, and he has connected with three of these students. Unfortunately, one of these students has already dropped out of school. The solution is to open up a food pantry. Other campuses such as UC Berkeley and CSU Fresno have opened food pantries. The Hunger Network cannot do it alone. They need your help with this endeavor to feed our hungry students. They could use letters of support for this project, and letters of testimony about hunger on campus and its impact on student learning and well-being. They also need help in creating a business proposal and to locate a room to house the food pantry. Duran noted that there are also some rumors that some faculty might benefit from the use of a food pantry, and they'd like to help out faculty as well. This food pantry will only be for students and CSU Stanislaus employees. Duran thanked everyone for this opportunity and noted that he can be reached at csushungernetwork@gmail.com

McGhee asked if they are a charitable organization. Duran noted they hope to use the campus 501c3 status.

Eudey applauded the Hunger Network, ASI and others working on this incredibly important project.

Regalado noted that he will be on ESPN 30/30 talking on the history of Fernando Valenzuela who made an impact both on and off the baseball field. The show will air on Tuesday, October 26th. For those of the Spanish community, the same show will be aired two days earlier on Sunday, October 24th in Spanish.

Eudey mentioned that there will be a celebration immediately following the Senate meeting for those faculty receiving tenure and promotion this past year. She invited everyone to join in this celebration.

Eudey also announced that Monday, October 25th is the application deadline for the Faculty Voices submissions. Participation is open to all full-time faculty interested in instructional practices, assessment of student learning, and writing as a means of reflection and telling one's teaching story. Junior faculty members are given first priority for participation. We are hoping to have a team of 12 to 16 participants. Please submit a paragraph stating why you would like to participate. If you have any questions, please contact Betsy Eudey or Ximena Garcia at X3216.

Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed the guests as Deans Flores, Moore, McNeil, Nowak, and Tuedio. Also present were Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, Annie Hor, and Cristhian Duran.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that SEC asked the English Department to prepare a resolution regarding Early Start and provided them with key points from the AS discussion. The resolution about UBAC that is on the agenda today is based on the discussion AS had about the issue in the previous meeting. SEC continues to discuss the leadership and governance issues with the administration.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Were sent out electronically.

6. First Reading Items

a. 7/AS/10/UEPC Resolution on Official Program Limits

Stessman introduced the resolution as a first reading item. Seconded by Poole. Stessman read the resolution including the rationale as follows:

07/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution Official Program Limits

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves the below revision to the Official Program Limits that are currently listed on page 25 of the 2009/10 University Catalog; and be it further

Resolved: That the revised Official Program Limits be effective beginning with the spring 2011 semester.

“A student who wishes to register for more than ~~16~~ 19 units for fall or spring semester must obtain the approval of the major department chair at registration on an Add/Drop form. ~~The maximum for which a student may enroll during a winter term is five units, and during summer term, 10 units. Additional units in a winter and summer term require the approval of the major department chair on an Add/Drop form.~~ Enrollment for approved excess units is permitted beginning the first day of class. Units taken for Credit by Examination do not count toward excess units; however, concurrent enrollment courses, audited courses, and courses in which a student is making up an incomplete grade are all counted as part of the student's total course load, making them applicable to this regulation.

When courses in the 5000 series are included, a program normally may not exceed three courses or 12 units

in fall or spring. Students with outside responsibilities are advised to reduce their study loads proportionately.”

Rationale: *Currently, students are allowed to take up to 16 units per fall or spring semester without seeking additional approval of the major department chair. With the removal of Winter Term, the University Educational Policies Committee recommends increasing the number of units to 19 without students needing to seek additional approval of the major department chair. Other CSU campuses on a 2-semester system allow students to take 18-19 units without additional levels of approval.*

UEPC approved 9/23/10

Jasek-Rysdahl opened the resolution up for discussion.

McGhee asked if there should be information about the intersession and do we want to place limitations there as well?

Stessman didn't know if there was a policy regarding self-support and if there are limits. Currently, students are allowed to take 16 units per semester without seeking additional approval. With the removal of winter term, the UEPC is considering increasing that number since we're now a 2-semester campus. Other CSU campuses on a 2-semester system allow students to take 18-19 units without additional levels of approval.

Marcell shared this resolution with his colleagues. He has mixed emotions and needs to clarify the language and the rationale. Based on the document provided titled "Undergraduate Total Student Credit Units Attempted by Student Level" the total units attempted, the difference is 4%. Students who enroll over 16 units tend to be less successful, as they take on too much of a load. We may be encouraging students to take on extra units and not be successful. We may be opening the door to less success without advice before taking more units.

Regalado is concerned with the quality of the program. This seems like a fast food approach to getting done on time. There is nothing to say that students cannot take 19 units, but currently they need to turn to an advisor to discuss it and see that a student is able to handle it. It's in the best interest of the student to discuss their status by drawing upon the faculty expertise. He doesn't see that noted in the rationale for this resolution. He's curious if there is data available that indicates how students have done if they take extensive units. He shares the same concerns of Marcell about providing a quality education.

Cotten sees a lot of students taking lots of units and they are stretched thin. They could have done better if they had more time or had taken fewer classes. We need to think about finances and those trying to graduate without paying for fees and incurring more debt. Students think that they can take that many units, but if something unexpected comes up they may not be able to respond to those things effectively and appropriately even if they are a good student.

Petrosky commented on the sentence following the major strikeout and asked if this means that the student can only obtain permission for going over the 19 units starting on the first day of class? Stessman will look into this.

Strahm said her evidence addressing students taking excess units are purely anecdotal. Students spend more money in the long run because they drop one or two classes and end up retaking them later. We're not sure what the cost savings is in terms of the rationale.

McGhee noted that one issue that may come up if we don't change the 16 unit limit is that we're in transition

from the 4-1-4 calendar when students would normally take 12 units in the fall, 12 units in the spring and 6 in the winter for a total of 30 units. Now are they supposed to be taking at least 15 units in fall and spring? If we set these limits then it becomes an administrative concern without flexibility. With lab classes it's likely to bump the student over the 16 units and it becomes micromanaging. We're going to have problems until our students adjust to the change in the calendar. Our students are used to going at a slower speed because of family obligations etc. We may never see the situation where they get the minimum units to graduate which can mean a 5-6 year degree.

McGhee is also concerned about the quality of education with intersession. If students get behind in the fall and spring, they may try to get caught up in the winter intersession thru UEE.

Poole referred to the spreadsheet showing the number enrolled in each level of units. Looking at the 17 units or more, it's a small percentage overall. The likelihood of the change to 19 units isn't going to affect many students. She'd like to err on the side of giving students the flexibility rather than having faculty make that decision for them.

Bender is in favor of the resolution as lots of things should be the student's choice. Many who are completing more units are overachievers and have reasons why they take more than 16 units. It should be their choice. He recommends students see their advisor regarding career goals, time to degree, and the advisor may or may not approve the extra units. It would be interesting if we could identify the GPA for those students to see if there is a correlation between units taken and the progress in class.

Noble is confused. In the 4-1-4 calendar, 10 units in fall and spring was considered full time, and now it's noted as 12 units.

Petrosky said that hardly any students were taking advantage of the excess load so this may be due to our signaling in our current catalog that says 16 units is the appropriate maximum. If we signal the 19 units as the appropriate maximum it may change.

Marcell clarified that when thinking about the class overload of 10 vs. 12, it is apples and oranges, as in 5 out of 6 separate classes students are writing papers and exams. Perhaps proportional units and the number of units are different. He agrees that the 4% is small but when you signal that, very few will deny the argument that it keeps in place an incentive for those who want to overachieve to still have that flexibility but will be required to get advising from faculty. He's still in favor of the maximum 16 units.

Nagel asked why 19 units. Stessman said fellow campuses use 18 or 19 units, and 18 equals to six 3-unit classes, but if there is a lab 19 units is better. He also noted that 18 is 1 unit under what we allowed before for total units per year and 19 is 1 unit over.

Sarraille expressed concern about the 19 unit limit. That would allow 38 units per year without a signature approval, which is about 27% more units than the traditional 30 units per year. It does not seem consistent with our recent efforts to improve advising. If the number of students that want to go over the current 16-unit limit stays the same at 4%, then that only amounts to about a half dozen students per program who would need to request a signature for excess units. It doesn't seem that would be a significant faculty workload increase. To require a signature does not mean we prohibit more units. It just requires that someone check what the student planned. We could take the opportunity to give students helpful advice.

Eudey explained the policy question that Petrosky asked. Her understanding for the reason for approving after the first day of class is to prevent many students from signing up for 3-4 classes and shopping for their favorites. Some students enroll in excess units as a backup to later drop the classes they don't want. By

waiting to “overload” until the start of classes we allow greater access to all supposedly.

Burroughs said the policy addresses 20 units or more, and that’s a lot of units in one term whether it’s a 13 or 15 week term. This policy doesn’t just impact our high achieving students, but other students who desire to take so many units for whatever reason. Therefore we need to be having conversations about the required work load so that our students clearly know what is realistically expected. They need to know that taking 20 units is a lot of work, which may be a disservice for them to only pass. It’s also a disservice to faculty if the students are not able to do their best work because they are taking too many classes. I’m especially concerned that all students can take 19 units without any question or guidance, as this seems excessive to me. Secondly, why have we crossed out the sentences referring to the winter term and summer term? Essentially, we are we saying that students can take as many courses as they like in the summer as long as they’re willing to pay for them. Whether it’s thru UEE or stateside during the summer, we need a clear policy for each term. It appears unclear if UEPC has addressed the issue of inter-session or summer enrollments.

Contreras said that from a student’s perspective, we pay so much money right now to only take 15 units. Students don’t want to have to pay so much and not get the most out of it that they can. She realized that money doesn’t matter more than education, but many of us are paying for it ourselves.

Regalado thinks the number of students taking overloads is irrelevant. We’re talking policy now. Increased numbers may not mean increased quality of education, which is his concern.

Bender has questions about denying overloads as he does it all the time as he sees students struggling at the lower numbers. We’d do a disservice to students if we allow them to take more units than they can manage. To allow students to take 19 units without advising could affect the quality of their work. We need to see how these students are doing in the courses. Numbers don’t mean anything if even the good students are struggling.

Silverman is against the proposal. He frequently advises students who come to him saying that they've been here for 5 years and need to graduate soon. These students often want to take more courses. He reminds them to look at the quality of their education. The student's objective is time, but that is only one of the variables here and the other is the quality. The faculty member is in a much better position to explain to the student and look at their record and give advice based on their record.

Tuedio keeps thinking about the arguments we made for keeping the 4-1-4 calendar, including the flexibility winter term offered students to manage their workload and complete 30 units a year. Given documented data we have on the extent of nonacademic workloads outside of classes, and the likelihood that fee increases will stimulate their appetite for additional units, we should not assume they will factor in the learning implications of taking on the additional units. We need to help them understand those implications, and advising is the best place to manage this conversation. He agrees with Sarraile that faculty need to play a mentoring role, and should be enabled to do this when students desire to exceed 16 units. We should be providing access that protects students by helping them to make good choices. Quality-of-learning issues are complex and student workloads outside of classes are not going to decrease in the current economic climate. The additional two weeks of class time will not make a five-class load easier. A sixth course represents a significant addition of workload, even for a 15-week semester. The 16-unit norm allows students to complete 30+ units a year, which is sufficient for most students to complete their degree in four years.

McGhee wonders if we have data besides this fall 2010 semester since there is a switch from 4-1-4 to a 2-2 semester. These percentages may be a reflection of the change in activity. It would be helpful to see more information from the prior 3-4 semesters to see what percentage of units students took and to see if there is a pattern. Maybe this does reflect that students have gotten to a semester mindset, or their normal pattern.

Then you may be able to show given our demographics that the 16 units may be more realistic. More background information would be helpful to see if there is a need to change the maximum units.

Petrosky said that since we've arrived at this predicament because of the elimination of winter term and we are concerned with quality, workload and advising; maybe we should look toward using some of the money saved and invest that into a dedicated student advising office for each college. From a college that has one, it works well in providing consistency of advising across the students.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted UEPC has a number of things to look at, and they will consider this before bringing this resolution back to the Senate.

b. 9/AS/10/SEC Resolution on UBAC

Sarraille moved the resolution. Eudey seconded. Sarraille read the resolution and rationale.

9/AS/10/SEC Resolution on UBAC

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University Stanislaus reaffirms the charge of University Budget Advisory Committee which states:

The University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) advises the President on broad policy and priority issues related to the University's budget resources.

UBAC reviews the campus budget within the context of the campus strategic plan and annual goals, considers specific budgetary issues as requested by the President, and organizes and holds open hearings to review the relationships among division budget requests, the university's strategic priorities and the President's annual goals and/or priorities, and be it further

Resolved: That Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) work with stakeholders to develop more specific procedures to improve the transparency and effectiveness of UBAC, and be it further

Resolved: That the procedures specifically address

- *The co-chair structure of UBAC, so that only one of the co-chairs is an administrator*
- *Annual timeline for the university budget process and an annual schedule for UBAC meetings*
- *Open meetings, agendas published prior to meetings, and minutes published after meetings*
- *Closed sessions when specific personnel issues are discussed*
- *Which constituency groups should be represented on UBAC, and how many representatives each group should have*
- *Selection processes for staff, faculty, and student member selection agreed upon respectively by the members of each group*
- *That there be a single set of UBAC recommendations - those agreed upon by the majority of UBAC*

Rationale: Faculty representatives to UBAC have consistently reported concerns about the way in which UBAC carries out its charge. The co-chairs are responsible for calling meetings, setting the agenda, directing discussion, and reporting committee outcomes. The current structure of UBAC is that the Provost and VP of Business and Finance are co-chairs. This co-chair structure makes it difficult for the staff, faculty, and student members of the committee to prepare for and attend meetings and to bring up issues for discussion.

Over the past number of years UBAC has met when the administration has determined they should meet.

Instead of utilizing a well thought-out, deliberative process, the committee works on an ad hoc, just-in-time schedule.

In the past, UBAC has not had agendas that indicate topics for discussion, which would have allowed members to talk with constituents and come prepared for meetings. The committee has not used a process for taking, checking, and approving minutes. Meetings have been closed even though the charge implies that UBAC will hold open meetings.

It is possible that UBAC will discuss personnel issues that involve specific individuals. It is understandable that these discussions occur in a "closed session." Guidelines need to be created to identify when it is appropriate for UBAC to go into a closed session.

There are concerns that students and staff have not been able to select their representatives to the committee. Because of the importance of this committee it is critical that there be a clear process by which members are selected by the constituency they represent, and that this process be respected.

UBAC is responsible for developing a set of recommendations. On at least one occasion a small number of committee members took it upon themselves to publish their own "minority report" when the recommendations they favored did not get a majority of votes. This kind of behavior completely subverts the ideas of shared governance, consultation, and collegiality.

Sarraille noted that 2009-10 members of UBAC are present at the meeting today.

Silverman asked for an example of an issue when a personnel issue would be addressed by UBAC.

Filling said when talking about a reduction of budget for a program of a few people. The administration needs to speak with the unions before talking about eliminating people publicly.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted another reason for having that clause is to have a set procedure of when you can call a closed meeting so they can't generally say it's a personnel issue.

Sarraille said he felt a misconception might arise from the preceding discussion. Over the preceding year UBAC never discussed any particular case of lay off or personnel change, and there never was a need for a closed session to talk about a personnel issue. It might occur, but given the goals of UBAC it would be unlikely for them to 'drill down' to that level and talk about individuals. UBAC does need to discuss the plans for the colleges, for example, and how they're related to each other.

Tuedio commented, with respect to the third resolved, that an annual timeline for the budget process would need to be flexible, given the circumstances encountered this year. A timeline would require flexibility to address the ebb and flow of elements that factor into decision-making, especially when the state budget isn't settled until fall. It's going to be hard to stay within a fixed timeline. Regarding the last resolved bullet, a single set of UBAC recommendations would be a good outcome if the minority views are allowed to influence what gets reported out of committee, but he would caution against subverting representation of minority views, as they can be a significant part of the work of the committee. We should want the UBAC report to reflect the tensions arising out of the committee's discussions; insisting on a single set of recommendations that drops out minority considerations could leave faculty perspectives out of the report.

Tuedio recently asked a CSU Sacramento Dean about the resolution of their conflict and he had one thing to say which was that it was going great because they reached an agreement on how to constitute their UBAC so that each group picked their own people and affirmed confidence in the process. This points to how important this resolution is, and to the importance of resolving unhealthy tensions in UBAC.

Regalado said given the continued problem of discourse between faculty and administration he thinks the UBAC resolution is fine the way it is. It states an ideal and a resolve to the mission of the university. He

doesn't see the need for changes. It's the statement of the faculty position that is in step with where the University should be. He applauds the committee.

Petrosky said given this body has dealt with these issues over and over again, and given the need for UBAC to be in the least dysfunctional form as quickly as possible, he motioned to move to a second reading now.

Seconded by Bender and Regalado.

Filling echoes Petrosky's point that it's mid October and as a member of UBAC no more meetings have been scheduled for this year. Therefore, moving quickly may be a good thing to do.

O'Brien supports the waiver for the reasons Filling mentioned. We're well into the year and to have some structure in place would be good. He also applauds Tuedio's comments about the CSU Sacramento campus. When O'Brien was on UBAC, about 3 VP's of Business & Finance ago, Suzanne Green brought the CSU Sacramento State's document and it's the one they used to precede in their deliberations.

By hand vote the motion to move to a second reading passed by more than the 2/3 vote required.

McGhee pointed out that from a budgeting standpoint the annual timeline doesn't need hard data to do budgeting. It's a process for which implications, outcomes, and strategies can be applied regardless of the budget. We're now halfway thru October and there was a month and a half we could have been discussing how to implement the budget. We now know the numbers, but don't know what the cuts are and how the money will be allocated. It's useful to have a process in place that works constantly with the information as it changes so we can make adjustments to it instead of waiting to react when it's almost too late to do anything about it. He speaks in favor of the UBAC resolution to have an ongoing functional approach to support the University and constancy.

Filling said that the minority report was issued exclusively by administrative members of UBAC and they did have opportunities to edit the majority report, so their voice was not silenced. They had the option to change the report, so they wrote their own.

Eudey suggested wording that faculty should have control and responsibility for the faculty committee members. UBAC should affirm this is how we'd like to have it and hope that the other committees will also affirm this as we do not constitute the staff committee members.

Peterson thinks this is a good idea in general. She thinks that more transparency and openness would foster trust. However, she thinks that in terms of the last part of the resolved that seems to be putting down the idea of a minority report. While she understands why, she thinks that we always want to be open to people voicing their opinion. Honest people can disagree and we do not need to say that some need to suppress their thoughts if they still disagree with the majority. She still sees this as reasonable. She thinks that with the exception of that part it's all consistent with the goals of UBAC. Peterson proposes that in the rationale we should not include a putdown of those who voiced an opinion, but she doesn't want to change to the resolved.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the rationale doesn't move forward, just the resolved. So we don't change the rationale on the floor.

Nagel asked about the effect of this resolution. It appears to have no further effect than to direct FBAC to develop procedures that address the various issues listed.

Tuedio noted that there is also an affirmation of the UBAC charge in the first resolved clause, which states that UBAC plays an important advisory role to the President; this is an important point to reestablish in our current budget climate.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that FBAC will work with the mentioned stakeholders, faculty, students, staff, and administration to revise this resolution. If we pass this, it shows that this is how the Senate wants UBAC to work; that we've been hearing complaints and here are specific ones we want addressed.

Silverman said regarding agendas if there needed to be a timeline for how far in advance the agendas need to be made available.

Sarraille said these are not the recommendations; it's a directive to FBAC to produce recommendations. He's not sure how much detail we want to place into this particular document and how much to leave up to FBAC, but it's up to the Senate.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if there should be an amendment.

Silverman offered a motion to amend to read that agendas should be submitted 3 weekdays prior to the meetings. Seconded by McGhee.

Bender said it's better to leave the details up to FBAC. If specifying one item without specifying others, it's difficult. O'Brien respects what Silverman is trying to do, but he thinks we should leave this up to FBAC to revise.

Marcell moves to remove "and be it further," replaced by "including" and remove the "third resolved line" and have the bulleted points follow as part of resolved #2. Bender would amend to change to "including but not limited to" which would offer more flexibility. Marcell and O'Brien supported that change.

McGhee said that FBAC should consider a timeline for the distribution of minutes. We should consider timelines for this because it would add to transparency of what goes into and comes out of the meetings. He's highlighting this as food for thought.

Voice vote on the amended resolution. Unanimously passed by voice vote.

c. 10/AS/10/SEC Resolution on Respect for Diversity of all members of Campus Community

O'Brien moved the motion. Eudey seconded. O'Brien read the resolution and rationale.

10/AS/10/SEC Respect for Campus Diversity

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University Stanislaus affirms the basic rights of all members of the academic community of students, staff, administrators and faculty to be respected regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, country of origin or sexual orientation, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate affirms that all members of the academic community have a right to an educational environment free of fear for their personal safety and/or beliefs.

Rationale: Recent news events in the national press have reported on continued hate incidents targeted against students. Some of these incidents have resulted in suicides. A core value of academic communities is

freedom and safety where all members can freely discuss and debate ideas and issues. Incidents of hate and intolerance towards any member of the campus community is an act directed at all members and cannot be tolerated.

O'Brien said you might realize the genesis of this was the suicide of a student at Rutgers that was so disturbing that he brought the issue to SEC, and SEC affirmed the resolution. He's tried to make it brief, concise, and to the point but not in regard to a specific group. That's the genesis of this resolution and it's written in a way to include all of us. He sent the resolution out on ASnet, and also included an email with a mp3 file on hate crimes in the US. There was also a document which included the most recent campus statistics on this campus which indicated no reported hate crimes, and the 2008 FBI hate crimes statistics. He's sure that this campus must have an antidiscrimination policy that is mandated by the Chancellor's Office, but this is not a duplication of this. It's important for us to affirm that all members of our community are important, valuable, and need to be respected.

Nagel likes the first resolved but not the second. Maybe it's how the second line is worded. The right to an educational environment free of fear for their personal safety and/or beliefs. He's not sure he could be held to account for making people fear for their beliefs in a Philosophy class. He's not sure the language is right.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that we're looking for clarifications, questions and suggestions, not amendments.

Strahm thinks we should include physical and mental abilities, age and religion in the respect for diversity resolution.

McGhee said that given the importance of this he would like to move it to a second reading. He doesn't think we should wait to voice this concern because of what has happened recently in the media. Respect for diversity is a serious concern and we should move on this now instead of in 2 weeks or days. Strahm seconded.

Filling thinks we should not support a second reading because we should discuss this with colleagues, etc.

Sarraille thinks that taking a little time offline to get input about the wording and taking time offline to do the word smithing will result in a better product.

Marcell supports these points. He would like a more complete version of the Respect for Campus Diversity resolution to share with others. He does support the concept of the resolution.

A hand vote was taken, and the motion to move to a second reading failed.

Filling suggested we consider adding something that speaks to distribution. To add this resolution to the faculty and student handbook and to campus websites.

Silverman said Strahm stated some issues of his interest. When we get to making suggestions, he would like to include age, religion and planet of origin.

Eudey said that we should include all of those names in the CSU non-discrimination policy as we are bound by the state policies. We may as a group affirm these in discussions with our colleges. We should talk about what it means to us to provide a safe environment for our students. This is a great department conversation as we're all interacting in our classrooms. What we do on a daily basis is to try to make everyone feel special and acknowledge that all students matter because and regardless of their identities and/or learning styles. What we do is not just to be nondiscriminatory but to support, enhance and celebrate what our students bring

to campus. She noted that we had webinar workshop about gays and lesbians because of the recent findings of bullying on schools, and only 2 faculty members attended that workshop. These are things we can do to address the student experience on campus. We need to make the commitment to affirm that we want to make a difference for everyone including staff, faculty and administration on this campus.

Bettencourt said adding issues of disabilities is encouraged.

Cotten wants to see citizenship status added to this policy along with what Eudey said. What is the university doing to promote diversity and understanding, cultural exchange, increase social conscious and awareness of diversity, programs and organizations in addition to things in the classroom? He also has questions about how to ensure protection of students, faculty and staff that are not normative in a mainstream sense. He personally has had to deal with similar things, and this happens to a lot of us and not just students. What procedures do we have in place when these issues do come into place? What are the channels in place for a substantive response?

Strahm said social class is tricky, but should be added.

O'Brien will make these changes and bring this back to the Senate.

7. Open Forum

Silverman would like to reopen the discussion on the 08/AS/10/FAC Resolution Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes. The reason is that as the resolution is written it is unusable because part of the process is missing. The question is what is the front part of the process that the professor can use to try to investigate the possibility that a student is using audio or video recording. This part of the process is not specified in the resolution, which makes it completely unusable.

Jasek-Rysdahl said this is a resolution that was passed last spring, and asked what the concern is.

Silverman asked what the process is that an instructor can use to investigate a suspicion that a student is using a recording device in the classroom. For example, a professor has a suspicion that a student is using a recording device. What is the process that can be used?

Duggan said that the original purpose of the resolution was to protect the professor from videos on YouTube.

Silverman said that he was reading the first sentence of the Rationale of the resolution as follows:
RATIONALE: A policy to protect the copyrights and the intellectual property rights of an instructor's classroom pedagogy is needed.

Eudey said that if a student is in direct violation of policy and there is a confrontation than the faculty member should refer it to the Campus Judicial Committee or to Student Affairs.

Silverman said the judicial process is fine, but it does not have the front process either. If he asked the student "are you recording" and the student says no, then what do you expect the judicial process to do at this point?

Jasek-Rysdahl said the concern is that there is a policy but it is useless because there isn't a way to enforce it. Maybe this item needs to be returned to FAC for further review.

Nagel raised a different issue. He just received information from his department stating an October 15 deadline for book orders for the spring 2011 semester in order to comply with a federal regulation that he

thought might be related to ADA. He thinks there is a serious problem with faculty meeting this deadline. He personally has had his schedule changed just a week or two before the semester begins, making it impossible to comply with the deadline. This affects part time faculty more than full time faculty, because they frequently have their class schedule changed up to the date of the beginning of the semester. He's not sure what the solution is if any.

Strahm understands Nagel's concerns. She suggested checking with the bookstore as she read the long policy last year, and it says that if the person is not able to come up with the course book then the Book Store can list TBA on the web site. Don't take her word on this but she believes that is in the Federal guidelines. Check with Book Store.

Eudey cited the HERRA compliance. The main importance for the new date is that the campus is receiving financial aid to post the titles of books so students can factor the cost of the books into the cost of the class. Federal law includes flexibility to the best of our knowledge. Also, earlier book orders helps with providing alternate texts for special needs student. Eudey will share the copy of the law and will distribute to ASNET.

O'Brien wanted to briefly talk about SB 1440. The speaker sent out an email with information about the new transfer law, and referred questions to Filling or O'Brien. This is being discussed statewide and hundreds of emails are being sent out addressing this. He will report back in some systematic way about what is going on and how it impacts us. The problem is probably going to be with high unit majors, and it's not clear what those are. The new law allows students at JC's to take 60 units and they are guaranteed admission with guarantee that they will not be required to repeat coursework. High unit majors may be impacted by this.

McGhee asked if the SB1440 pertains to the graduate with an AA with a specific degree. He attended a community college and that was the norm as he did have the transfer units.

O'Brien asked how many units in the major for a business degree in accounting? Approximately 128 units. How many of the 128 units are prerequisites? That's usually the problem as often many of the units are for prerequisites, and that could cause problems.

Marcell said that his concern is that in the transfer agreement MJC teaches foods, but their contents are very different from the CSU course. What happens for those who want transfer units? They can get credit for nutrition, but will be missing the upper division units in the major.

O'Brien said there is supposed to be an agreement by discipline for the CSUs and JCs. They have the same issues in Sociology. They offer an upper division course and MJC offers it as a lower division course. Supposedly this will be worked out by discipline.

Bender said that Title V says that we can't award upper division credit for lower division work, but we can award subject matter coverage which needs to address units. He speaks to a plan and not articulation. He's been involved in this for a while with Ag. Studies. His only caution is that CID will be the one that will spearhead the development of transfer requirements for degrees, and after four years they're just barely getting the numbering system done. Ag Studies will be ready soon, but he's not sure about the other disciplines. One of the things we have is a very specific sense that it's not legal to award upper division credit for lower division work. If the subject matter requirements are different; you should require students to take the course even if the title and subject are the same.

O'Brien said that articulations with Sociology have dealt with this as it was easy for CSU Stanislaus, but CSU San Diego had a difficult time as they have many more prerequisites. The rest of the campuses would

not accept as many prerequisites as they do.

Stone said that they have the same problem in Chemistry. Chemistry have been making the argument for the need of an upper division O-Chem. course.

O'Brien said the fear is the pressure for us to change. He's seeing this at SWAS folks coalescing around the table to see how we are going to make this work. He's cautiously optimistic.

Bender said the onus is on the community colleges to make this work. CSU has been using LDTP to identify common courses across the state for most majors. Now it says there are 18 units determined by the community colleges. It's helpful for CSUs to interact with local community colleges in identifying if they will have an 18 unit requirement to prepare for your program, and to make sure that you have input into that. Business has a host of prerequisites, so it's easy for them. But what about the others? What other lower division courses are required in the program? He thinks it's to our advantage to work with community colleges as partners as we know this is coming. How can we help you to best prepare your students for our major. We have to work closely with them.

Marcell asked if there is conversation at SWAS level at making all course levels the same. Will Chem1 always going to be the same? Is there a push for normalization?

Bender says there never has been a number that you're required to have on your campus. Instead there is a super number in parenthesis with a catalog description. All CSUs would also use the super number. An advantage as an advisor is to see which course corresponds to a course, but never a suggestion that it would preempt course numbers. Numbers that are not in the CSU catalog are just being implemented. Unless you as a department decide you want to embrace this and get these onto course descriptions, it won't happen in the CSU. He sees this as a problem as this needs to work for CSU, UC and the community colleges.

Marcell said that perhaps a committee could evaluate a resolution as to whether we adopt the CID system? Jasek-Rysdahl is happy to hand it off to someone else. Bender is happy to help with that process. Stessman will discuss this item with UEPC.

Filling said a federal judge in Central CA. just abolished DADT for 60 days. One of the basic rights for respecting diversity is acknowledging who you are.

Strahm said a judge in Massachusetts put an injunction that gays and lesbian have the right to marry so gays and lesbian are being treated as 2nd class citizens.

Eudey encouraged attendance at the party. Funding for the refreshment was provided by the President, CFA, and the Faculty Development Center.

Adjournment

3:45pm