

<p>Academic Senate February 28, 2012</p> <p>Present: Baker, Bice, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Buhler-Scott, Burroughs, Colnic, Deaner, Espinoza, Foreman, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Held, Keswick, Khodabandeh, Lindsay, Manrique, Marshall, Mayer, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Silverman, Strahm, Stone, Tan, Vang, Wallace, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: Al Petrosky for Steve Filling, Koni Stone for Michael Drake</p> <p>Excused: Coach Representative, Werling</p> <p>Guest: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Annie Hor, Robert Marino, Halyna Kornuta, Dennis Shimek, Linda Nowak, John Sarraille, Brian Duggan, Wendy Smith, James Tuedio, Daryl Moore, Betsy Eudey and Noelia Gonzalez</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First Reading Item of 1/AS/12/FBAC/FAC CSU Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy. This item will return as a second reading item.</p> <p>Discussion of XX/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System, CSU Stanislaus. Returned to SEC for further discussion.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 13, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Chris De Vries, Clerk</p>
---	--

1. **Call to order**
2:02pm
 2. **Approval of Agenda**
There have been a few changes prior to meeting. Approved.
 3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 14, 2012**
Change gender on pronoun user to refer to Mira Mayer on the minutes of 2/14/12. Approved.
 4. **Introductions**
Guests were Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Annie Hor, Robert Marino, Halyna Kornuta, Dennis Shimek, Linda Nowak, John Sarraille, Brian Duggan, Wendy Smith, James Tuedio, Daryl Moore, Betsy Eudey and Noelia Gonzalez.
 5. **Announcements**
Sarraille invited all faculty to a CFA luncheon tomorrow from 11:30 to 1:30pm in the South Dining Room. All CFA and faculty unit employees, members and nonmembers are welcome to have lunch on CFA tomorrow.
- Gerson announced that the time has come for the call for applications for the Director, Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, 2012-2015

The announcement should be out this week and we are looking for applicants. If you know someone, please encourage them to apply.

Provost Strong said that he had a discussion in a recent chairs meeting concerning an issue raised in a department meeting he attended. The issue concerned Coded Memo B–2012–01 which instructed CSU Financial Officers to plan for the \$200 million system trigger cut. The Chancellor has put \$200,000 in reserves, planning that the trigger cut will be imposed and instructing campuses that their budgets will be reduced proportionally. There is a figure in this memo for CSU Stanislaus regarding “changes in student enrollment patterns” that is inaccurate and is based on changes that took place in past years and have already been factored into fee tuition revenue for CSU Stanislaus. It is an artifact of how these spreadsheets are prepared. . The Chancellor’s Office has been informed of this and will remove this figure. It makes it look like we don’t have to take a budget cut, but that is not true. We were anticipating a \$4.6 Million dollar cut, but our cut is more likely to be around \$5 Million due to additional costs of benefits and other issues. He wants this body to be aware of these conversations and the inaccuracy of the spreadsheet in the coded memo.

O’Brien distributed a document that SEC has created detailing the student faculty ratio (SFR) for the University. It was brought to the attention of SEC that certain student-faculty ratios were mentioned in UBAC that did not seem correct so members of SEC checked the newest figures from the Chancellor’s web site. What was reported in UBAC was that we had the lowest student/faculty ratio of 20:1. However, what we found was that in fall 2010 our numbers were 21.7 and this fall it was 24.1, so we had an increase of 11.1% in our student faculty ratio. We wanted to ensure that we have correct numbers. We also included the URL if anyone wants to check our math. This memo was delivered to the Provost and VP Giambelluca.

http://www.calstate.edu/es/intranet/applications/aa/apdb/apdb_discipline-report-by-campus.shtml

A second announcement was informational noting that the College Reorganization Committee met yesterday. In addition to faculty from each college the following administrators are part of that committee. Marge Jaasma, Kevin Nemeth, Linda Novak, Gabe Bolton and Cullen Vance from ASI are on that committee. Kenneth Schoenly from Biology is the chair. The Provost came to the meeting and provided some data.

Khodabandeh shared that the state-wide ASI has drafted a shared governance motion in CSSA. We are looking for shared governance and not shared responsibility. Stanislaus was put forward as a good example of shared governance and what other organizations are looking for statewide in terms of placing students on committees.

O’Brien said that Mark Thompson sent out an email on FACNET which is the front page of the Los Angeles Times this morning. Trustee Carter, chair of the BoT’s term ran out yesterday. The Senate in Sacramento did not convene to reaffirm his position, so he is out and no one really knows why. When we spoke to the CSU Senate Legislative Representative he said that the Senate wouldn’t call a Senate meeting if there weren’t enough votes. He was a good man and former President of Dominguez Hills. We’ll see how this develops.

6. **Committee Reports/Questions**

None.

7. **Information Item**

a. **Fund Administration: CSU, Stanislaus Foundation policy, Effective Date: December 2, 2011**

Speaker Stone said that this document was found on our webpage and goes along with our next motion.

Peterson asked how will this effect accounts that are already set up. In regards to page 4 part d which indicates accounts unused for 15 months can be frozen, she is wondering how that would effect a situation like we had last year where the Foundation funds were in a bad state and so some were not allowed to give scholarships. Would these then be considered inactive? What have the foundation account earnings been over the last 5 years?

Tuedio suggested that we invite Jack Reho, Associate VP for Auxiliary Services, to answer these questions.

Lindsay noted that this policy refers to endowed “chairs” which is a sore point. Recently, we advertised to hire an endowed chair. When he was hired his appointment letter stated that he was not an endowed chair, but rather an endowed professor.

Tan said that this is a new policy coming from the Foundation side, signed by the President and the Foundation chair. In that policy, it shows chair endowments at \$0.5 million. She wonders what happens when the Foundation makes policies and how does that correspond with the state-side policy? Which one prevails and how do we resolve conflicts?

Speaker Stone noted that this is the issue.

Tan asked if this isn't what Senator Leland Yee stated that Foundations may not be operating separately from the state-side.

Khodabandeh thinks he was saying this should be transparent. What Senator Leland Yee made available was the ability to ask for information about these Foundations. There is nothing confidential in them except personnel records.

Wendy Smith is tasked with any Public Records Act request, including requests under the McKeevy Act. It is true personnel items are withheld and donor identities are also privileged, but most other information is available for the Foundation.

Shimek noted that to follow up on the language, he sees things on joint funds which should be checked on consistency, so he will take this back and look further into it.

Tan wants to point out in terms of the endowed chair policy that FBAC and FAC have agreed upon the version in front of you approved by FBAC on 11/16/11 and endorsed by FAC on 11/30/11. This policy came before the CSU, Foundation policy dated 12/2/11 before you.

8. First Reading Item

a. 1/AS/12/FBAC/FAC CSU Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy

Lindsay noted that we at CSU Stanislaus are very fortunate. Recently, several donors have stepped forward and funded endowed professorships. These include the Foster Farms Endowed Professor of Business Economics, the Gemperle Endowed Professor of Finance and the Demergasso Endowed Professor of International Business, among others.

The Foster Farms Endowed Professor was hired last fall. The Department of Accounting and Finance regards Dr. Soydemir as a valuable addition to our faculty. However, there were many problems with the search. It was unclear which College was receiving the endowment. We were told that the position was an endowed chair in econometrics which would be housed in the College of Business Administration. But the College of Business Administration does not teach courses in econometrics; the College of Humanities and Social Sciences does. Similarly, it was unclear which department was receiving the endowment. The sole forecasting course taught in the College of Business Administration is part of the Operations Management concentration, but the endowed professorship ended up being a finance position. These problems could have been avoided had faculty been involved in the process from the beginning. Clearly, there is a need for a policy.

1/AS/12/FBAC/FAC California State University, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of the CSU Stanislaus adopts the attached California State University, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy, and be it further

Resolved: That the California State University, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy take effect upon approval by the President and be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale:

As of late, multiple donors have stepped forward and offered to fund endowed faculty positions. Such generosity is to be applauded. However, the Campus' recent experiences related to the search for the Foster Farms Endowed Professor of Business Economics has made clear the need for an Endowed Faculty Policy.

I. PURPOSE

Endowed faculty positions enable CSU Stanislaus to recruit and retain distinguished and accomplished scholars and teachers. The specific purpose of the endowed faculty must be consistent with the curriculum and mission of the University and shall be specified in writing, as part of the endowment agreement, at the time the endowment is established.

II. POLICY

Following a search, appointment to a faculty endowment will be made from distinguished individuals, including California State University, Stanislaus current faculty and faculty outside of the university. The holder of the appointment to a faculty endowment is expected to carry a teaching responsibility. The appointee shall contribute to the scholarly and creative activity within their specific discipline, and through seminars and other contact with students, add to the enrichment of the California State University, Stanislaus campus as a whole.

The endowment shall cover any cost over and above the normal salary and benefits of the position to which it is being applied, including but not limited to travel, research, release time and increased pay.

An endowed chair is expected to provide significant development of existing faculty/program and/or support of community activities. An endowed professor is expected to lead faculty research and teaching. An endowed scholar contributes a greater portfolio of research and/or teaching.

A faculty endowment will be established only upon acceptance by the President of cash or a binding pledge that, within a prescribed period of time, a fund will be created to provide sufficient income to meet the purpose(s) of the endowed faculty position. The position will not be filled until sufficient funds are available to meet the purpose(s) of the endowment. A donor may be encouraged to donate funds toward the establishment of an endowed faculty position even if the funds at the donor's disposal are not sufficient to meet the purpose(s) of the endowment agreement. A donor may give funds to be invested until the fund is sufficient to meet purpose(s) of the endowment agreement. During this investment period, funds may be added to the endowment, but income may not be withdrawn for other uses except by explicit directive of the donor. Expenses incurred in the management of the endowment will be covered by the endowment funds.

The University recognizes the desire of donors to support a wide variety of academic and research activities through the creation of endowed faculty funds to enhance, in perpetuity, State support for the University's mission.

Depending on donor interest, a faculty endowment may or may not be in the disciplines currently offered at California State University, Stanislaus. Appropriate policy will be followed to establish a new program or department. New programs to be created subsequent to the hiring of the endowed faculty member must have the support of the relevant department(s) and college(s.)

III. PROCEDURES

A. Position Establishment

- 1. Preliminary discussion concerning the establishment of a faculty endowment shall include the appropriate department faculty, dean(s), the Provost, the VP of University Advancement, and the President.*
- 2. A faculty endowment shall not be established in a department without the approval of a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of that department. Should the department not yet exist, approval will be required of the majority of the faculty in the college.*
- 3. Following the preliminary discussion, the dean shall prepare a proposal for review by the Provost, and the VP of University Advancement. The President will make the final approval of the proposal.*
- 4. The donor may specify the academic discipline for the faculty endowment. If the academic field is not specified, the Provost in consultation with deans may specify the field or, if the field is specified, the Provost and deans may specify a subfield, with final approval resting with the President.*
- 5. Commitment for a faculty endowment will not be made to a prospective donor without the prior approval of the President.*

B. Selection Criteria

- 1. A search will be conducted and a search committee shall be used to fill an existing vacant position or create a new position.*
- 2. The search committee will be appointed by the Provost upon consultation with department faculty and will include departmental faculty and individuals with knowledge of the academic field from which candidates will be drawn. The search committee will be chaired by a tenured full professor. A majority of the members of the search committee shall be CSU, Stanislaus faculty members from the department that will house the endowed faculty. Should the department not exist or if there is a limited number of faculty in the department, a majority of the members shall be recommended by faculty of the college.*
- 3. If a search firm is used, the expense will be funded by the endowment.*
- 4. The following general definitions and selection criteria will apply:*

Endowed faculty: The holder of an endowed faculty position should be considered as receiving a high honor, as well as recognition of consistently outstanding performance

and ability. The institutional expectation of a distinguished record is one who has made significant contributions to educational, research, scholarship, or creative activities to his or her discipline.

5. *The President will make all appointments.*

C. Appointments

1. *All appointments to endowed faculty shall be renewable term appointments. The initial appointment shall be for a period of up to five years; subsequent appointments shall be for a period of up to five years. A review and recommendation concerning the reappointment for the incumbent will take place in the fall of the last year of the appointment.*
2. *Endowed faculty titles shall be reviewed at least every five years, and may be reassigned or terminated at the discretion of the University on recommendation of the college dean and of the department to the Provost and to the President. Faculty so terminated would normally continue to hold their current academic positions under normal pay and workload status.*
3. *Upon recommendation of the departmental RPT committee, the individual may be granted tenure.*
4. *As soon as it is known that an endowed position may become vacant, the academic dean will consult with the Provost. Together, they will develop a plan to fill the position consistent with the intent of the donor. Final approval of the plan rests with the President.*
5. *As a condition of appointment, all endowed faculty shall annually submit to the chair, dean and Provost a report of each year's activities, including an explanation of expenditures, along with a budget request for the use of the endowment income for the following year.*
6. *Appointment shall be made only after the host college has received full salary and fringe benefits as a permanent budget line from Academic Affairs. Any assigned time will be funded by the endowment.*

FBAC approved on November 16, 2011

FAC endorsed on November 30, 2011

Tan wants to provide some comments from her department and college. Besides the problem of chair vs. professor, another issue was that we were told that the person we hire, because of their endowed status, was to be recruited as a full tenured professor. Our understanding is that tenure is a decision of the department; our department voted against tenure, but that decision was then overruled by the Dean and Provost. Another issue is that because the person comes in at a higher level, our college felt that the endowment of \$0.5 million is not enough. The person comes in with tenure so the person is expected to be here long-term. The endowment is supposed to be invested, and that the interest from the endowment is used to fund the long-term endowed position.

We should not use the original endowment money as then we would get less interest every year, but we will still have the person in our college. Half a million is not enough to provide the interest to fund the position; if the half a million was invested at 5% interest rate, the interest only comes out to \$25,000 a year. The person we have hired as endowed professor gets \$140,000 per year, and this pay is much higher than what a current professor in our college would get. A new person would not be getting such a high a salary. The endowment amount has to be bigger to help pay for the person's salary, or else state-funded resources from other parts of the university would need to be diverted to fund this endowed position. The amount of the endowments was an issue for FBAC too, so the committee decided to include a statement in the endowed professor policy that the endowment will cover any costs over and above the normal pay, including travel and other expenses.

Khodabandeh asked if are discussing the resolution or the policy.

Speaker Stone noted that this is a first reading, so we are not amending but we are discussing the whole policy.

McGhee said that the need for a policy is critical, especially in these current times. If faculty have no say, we are looking at large amounts of money being dedicated to someone getting recognition. He believes that the Foster Farms endowment will be \$500,000 when it's fully deposited, however we are looking at \$200,000+ costs for any person to get recognition for this. You can get a CD at 2.2% if you deposit \$250,000 and anything below that is only receiving 0.2%.

We should get all we need from the endowment to fund activities beyond their teaching duties, as the state will cover teaching duties. We have to be very careful about this, and if they come in with tenure this is a long term commitment. The salary they get stays at that level even if they are no longer endowed. We have to be careful about doing this because otherwise we may esteem ourselves into bankruptcy.

Tan heard that if you hire a part time instructor the cost is \$5,000 per semester for one course. So if you pay an endowed person \$140,000 you can perhaps hire a new tenure track faculty at \$100,000 then you have \$40,000 for part time hires. Usually endowed professors don't actually

teach as many classes as a regular professor. We are concerned in FBAC that if we divert resources from other parts of the campus, then less money will be used for instruction. We felt that the endowment money has to be large enough to support the endowed position. We also included in the policy that if this person is no longer endowed then they should be bumped down to a normal salary.

It was noted that 2 pages are missing from the handouts. Pierce provided the missing pages.

Eudey noted that under the following item III. Procedures/ Position Establishment #2.

2. A faculty endowment shall not be established in a department without the approval of a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of that department. Should the department not yet exist, approval will be required of the majority of the faculty in the college.

For clarity it might be helpful for parallel wording in the second sentence to read, "a majority of tenured and tenure track faculty in the college." We need to say who gets to make the decision. She thinks it is important because the original document allowed the Foundation and the donor to decide which department the appointment was in. It is important that we look at our program reviews to see where needs are for new or enhanced faculty lines and make that a priority as we try to match donor interests with our program goals.

Eudey also noted that it's not clear under item C. Appointments, #2 that the salary would decrease if the endowment is removed. As noted below,

2. Endowed faculty titles shall be reviewed at least every five years, and may be reassigned or terminated at the discretion of the University on recommendation of the college dean and of the department to the Provost and to the President. Faculty so terminated would normally continue to hold their current academic positions under normal pay and workload status.

It mentions "normal pay" but what constitutes normal pay is not clear. She thinks that "normal pay" and "workload status" is a little vague. It could be challenging if a faculty member decides not to continue or is removed from the endowment and if the donor requires that we have a person, then we could be double dipping. Especially, if there is no need for two people with the specific disciplinary expertise tied to the endowment.

Tan noted that if you look at section III. ***“Appointment shall be made only after the host college has received full salary and fringe benefits as a permanent budget line from Academic Affairs. Any assigned time will be funded by the endowment.”*** She thinks we used the word “normal pay” as the pay for faculty varies across colleges, and we need to look at what is considered normal pay for each college.

Nagel invited the committees to reconsider the exclusion of lecture faculty from the voting. He doesn't know if the exclusion is really justifiable and he thinks lecturers have a vested interest in such things as well.

Shimek said that the comment in the second paragraph, "normal pay" was intended to convey what Kim Tan suggested and he thinks that it needs to be further clarified to mean what they would have made as a regular professor and not in the endowment.

Regalado is curious if there are other universities similar to ours that have endowed faculty. The idea is to recruit people who can do good work and have good names and work at schools that have resources commensurate to supporting those positions. He is not sure our school has those resources.

McGhee said that FAC looked at Sonoma, Fresno, Chico, and several other campuses, and most of them had much higher endowment requirements. Several did require that the endowment cover all costs. Unfortunately, we are in an area without as many resources. Bakersfield is about the same size, but they have more resources than we do here because they have more money in oil, gas, and farming combined. Even if you look at similar size institutions you might not get a good comparison because it's not apples to apples. A lot of institutions require higher amounts and break them down between lecturer, professor, and other faculty, so there is a whole range of policies even within the system. He's curious about Nagel's comment about including the lecturers and adjuncts. Do they normally have input into tenure track hiring decisions? He doesn't know and thinks that is why it was set that way.

Foreman thinks that serving on RPT committees requires that faculty be tenure track, but he believes that in hiring all full-time faculty get a vote.

Speaker Stone noted that we may have to do some research on that one.

McGhee thinks that we should do what is normal in this area.

Khodabandeh said that on position establishment, he doesn't know if this is supposed to be a list or just stuff you are going to do. He feels that number II under Policy supersedes all other points.

“ Following a search, appointment to a faculty endowment will be made from distinguished individuals, including California State University, Stanislaus current faculty and faculty outside of the university. The holder of the appointment to a faculty endowment is expected to carry a teaching responsibility. The appointee shall contribute to the scholarly and creative activity within their specific discipline, and through seminars and other contact with students, add to the enrichment of the California State University, Stanislaus campus as a whole.”

He doesn't see the Foundation involved in numbers 1–5. He thinks that the Executive Director and the President of the Foundation would be involved, but they are not noted in the policy. For any of the Auxiliaries, they should fall under these umbrellas, but that doesn't mean they want to be involved in all of these decisions.

Nagel clarified that he was talking about establishing of the position, not the hiring decision. That is the decision he was referring to.

Provost Strong said that his concern with the Endowed Faculty Policy is that it is too restrictive. He would encourage FAC and FBAC to provide more flexibility to make it more operationalizable. The purpose of an endowment is to enhance the academic culture and reputation of the university. In order to do that, he thinks the policy needs to be more flexible. One example is that to hire an endowed position without tenure is relatively unworkable and in 99 out of 100 decisions we would be unable to get a candidate to fill that position.

Regalado noted that the only thing he sees under teaching falls under category 2 in the third paragraph down. ***“An endowed chair is expected to provide significant development of existing faculty/program and/or support of community activities. An endowed professor is expected to lead faculty research and teaching. An endowed scholar contributes a greater portfolio of research and/or teaching.”*** He wonders if something would cover the teaching load. Also, a high-reputation person coming into this position would likely be expected to work with graduate students. He wonders who determines the teaching responsibilities.

Foreman is concerned that in the business community there is a concept of leveraging, and donors may be willing to contribute some money and may feel that the State of California is expected to put in more money. As far as administrator’s retreat rights on campus, the faculty vote on those tenure decisions.

McGhee responded to Regalado’s questions. He thinks that would depend on the nature of the endowment. For example, in the Foster Farms position there are responsibilities to the community that necessitate a half time teaching load. Some might be more research based, some might be more for teaching, and some might be to mentor other faculty. It would depend on the donor.

This is what I said first, so it should go above everything else. Betsy, Shimek and others were responding to this statement. Baker hears the Provost saying that the policy needs to be less rigid. We have our position, but he has veto power, and that worries him. If we decide to go with what is here and it gets turned down by the President where do we go from here? Will the President go ahead and hire Endowed Chairs without a policy?

Eudey's memory is that the Senate voted to have a moratorium on endowed chairs and professors until we have a policy that was approved through Academic Senate, so we do have a moratorium in place [this was part of the Trust Restoration agreements]. With regard to the promise of tenure for a full professor, we and many other campuses have made tenure commitments to professors at hiring and later regretted it. So there has been a more common trend to hire people with tenure review after 1 year. That has been good because faculty can take a 1 or 2 year leaves from their campus and if tenure is not going well they can retreat to their old department. There are some people who are going to come in with fabulous credentials and departments will be able to offer

tenure, but in many cases the department might not have enough information to make a decision. She doesn't think that it will be a big impediment if we can say a tenure decision is 1 or 2 years down the line.

Tan noted that you may see policies approved by AS, but would not be approved/signed by the President. She thinks that happens quite often. For FBAC, when the administration wants us to insert something the committee does not agree with, we may decide to stand our ground.

Shimek said that the intent was to get a policy passed and the intent is to gather comments and come up with something that we can all agree with, and that is the spirit he brings to this discussion.

Baker thanked Shimek for his comments as that makes sense. One thing he would like the Provost to expand upon is what other areas he thinks are inflexible in the policy.

Provost Strong would like to write down what his concerns are. There are a number of concerns that he has and he would be happy to share them with the Senate. He will write them down so he doesn't miss any.

Garcia asked if the Provost's concerns were expressed in the FBAC meeting, prior to the policy coming to the floor of the Senate.

Tan noted that the issue of the half million endowment was addressed.

McGhee said that the Provost raised the concern that if we wanted an endowment to provide the entire amount of the funds then that would be limiting. We saw it as if a donor was only going to be putting up \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year that was going to be cheap naming rights for the donor and might encumber hundreds of thousands of state funds. Also, the Foundation could contribute, but that means less funds that they will spend elsewhere. If that is taken out of our control it would become a decision just on the donor side and of the President or VP of Advancement. From the academic side we are just trying to protect against that.

Provost Strong thinks he mentioned a number of concerns during the FBAC meetings regarding this policy, so he doesn't think anything he sends will be anything new. He's also certain that VP Dennis Shimek had discussions with FAC so the issues are on the table.

Baker shared with faculty in his department last year that donations for Endowed Chairs did not cover the cost of the faculty position and they were surprised. Maybe there is a different category for this sort of thing, so maybe there is a way to work that into the policy.

Khodabandeh wants to return to the representation aspect. In reading what is current practice with endowments there is a lot of involvement with the person who is holding fiduciary responsibility which is the Board. He is not sure how they will react to this policy. It's a very nice jargonistic way of saying you raise the funds from the donors but after that you have no involvement. It runs into issues there. He's thinking of this from the Auxiliary standpoint.

Dean Moore said that an endowment is a source of income, so thinking about the size of the endowment is important because the bigger it is the more it generates.

Strahm is thinking for a second of the Koch brothers and the universities in Florida. Foundations are a nice place for well-off people to put their money and get a tax write-off. When it comes to things like having direct intervention in the University she would say that the University is filled with experts who understand the needs of their departments and the changing demographics of businesses and society. These would be the best people to make those decisions. She comes from University of Oregon where Bill Knight and Nike have been allowed to intervene, and the same is true at the University of Florida with the Koch brothers. So she would be very careful about the level of influence.

McGhee noted that Strahm said half of what he was going to say. There was some talk about the need for coordination. Don't go out and buy a Cadillac and then pay the money for a Yugo. It's good to get recognition, but you need to be sure to get the right level for the money. This is done at other places.

Khodabandeh is not saying involve them in the stateside funding, just in the funds they are providing.

De Vries said that the current endowment is involved in stateside funding. Let's assume that we got \$25K per year from the donor, we still have to fund the remaining \$115K and these endowed faculty are only teaching half time. About \$70K of these funds are for teaching and this is where the slippery slope comes in. We already had this leveraging of stateside funds into the endowed chair position.

Regalado said that should the donors not want to be involved because they don't have enough control over the funding, he might argue that we don't need them anyway. We already have scholars in the university with good names, and he is not sure we need to go after this money.

Wendy Smith noted that we need to be wary of instructing the Foundation how to operate as they are not state-side funded.

Garcia said that he is kind of perplexed by the argument. He understands getting money from the community is a good thing, but on the other hand we need to have our house in order. Getting this policy approved is critical.

9. Discussion Item

a. **XX/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System, CSU Stanislaus**
Speaker Stone noted that this is a resolution in the making, and we want to get feedback to draft something that will pass.

Foreman doesn't have much to say aside from what is written in front of you. Last year at about this time we had another 2 pass resolution. It was rejected and the reasons for that are listed in

your packet. This resolution is a modified resolution of something that was brought to us by administration. The difference is that this includes 12 units in the first pass and that registration runs until the day before registration. These 12 units are for Financial Aid.

***XX/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System
California State University, Stanislaus***

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves a two-pass registration system; and be it further

Resolved: That the two-pass registration system allow students to register for 12 units during the first round of registration for a period of 10 days, and that this must be followed immediately by a second, open registration period that normally lasts until 11:59pm of the day before the first day of instruction.

Resolved: That the registration priority change to reflect a new order by class level. Priority of registration is to be determined by units completed within class level in the following order: seniors, master's and credential students, juniors, sophomores, freshmen and unclassified post baccalaureate students; and be it further

Resolved: That the two-pass registration system be effective beginning with Fall 2012 registration cycle; and be it further

Resolved: That a preliminary review be conducted following the registration cycle for Spring 2013 to evaluate the effectiveness of the two-pass registration system and, specifically, whether the system positively impacted student-athletes; and be it further

Resolved: That subsequent reviews be conducted every 2 to 3 years.

Rationale: As our course offerings have become more limited and our student population has grown, the registration process has become more difficult for both students and administration. Students frequently are unable to enroll in courses they need as prerequisites to other courses, and students are often prevented from making progress toward their degrees as a result.

Additionally, CSU Stanislaus coaches have expressed concern that their athletes, whose schedules are necessarily restricted, also have particular difficulty scheduling courses effectively. In many cases, students sign up for classes they do not need in order to maintain sufficient enrollment to qualify for financial aid. These students make be taking seats from students who genuinely need those courses, aggravating the problem.

In response to these concerns, UEPC and the Academic Senate in 2010-11 passed a resolution for a two-pass system set at 9 units for the first pass. The aim of this change was to give

students an incentive to more strictly prioritize their course selections early in the registration process, thus encouraging students to sort themselves into classes they most need.

This resolution was rejected at that time due to the following concerns: the change would create extra work for staff, students might under-enroll if we create barriers to enrollment, it would be difficult to implement on a short time-line, under-enrolled students may face difficulties with financial aid, and the updating of PeopleSoft at that time would make implementing a new registration system that much more difficult.

The resolution above is based on one suggested by administration. Administration suggests that by raising the bar on first pass to 12, much of the benefit of a 9-unit first pass would be realized, while minimizing the concerns raised when last year's resolution was rejected. A key detail is that at 12 units, students may receive financial aid.

The order of registration is also changed in this resolution. UEPC believes that the current registration order, which puts sophomores rather than freshmen last among regularly enrolled students, is unusual, and no argument was developed for keeping this unusual order. The resolution would allow regularly-enrolled undergraduate students to register in reverse order of seniority. The sense of the UEPC is that this order better reflects common practice among universities and the needs of our students.

WF:rlc – UEPC approved 2/23/12

Espinoza noted that the 12 units is for full time Financial Aid and is wrapped up in satisfactory academic progress.

Foreman noted that we are also suggesting that we change the order of priority to place Freshman last behind Sophomores. It came to our understanding that sophomores are taking courses that they should take as freshman and bump freshmen out of courses, but he believes the opposite is also true.

Espinoza would like to add that as long as they can find the manpower, they will make sure that freshmen are registered within the registration office to make sure they get the classes they need.

Foreman said that a question came up at UEPC. It is possible that someone might not hit exactly 12, so can they go over 12?

From Espinoza's perspective it makes sense to raise the number to 13, but not go back to 9 because 9 is problematic for a number of reasons.

McGhee would assume any program system would be able to make it so that the last class that put you at 12 or over would cut off registrations so they wouldn't be able to take 18 units in the first round. It should be able to be programmed. That should be allowed. He also thinks that since Freshmen are most limited then they might not even be able to register into school. Maybe they can have priority to at least register for freshman level classes.

De Vries thinks that is possible under PeopleSoft. He'd like to know what is problematic about 9 units. They had some discussion at SEC about the original proposal from last year. We understand the Financial Aid issues, but we're not clear on what other problems exist with going with 9 units on the first pass.

Espinoza wants to make sure people do manage to register for 12 units initially. We can work through the difficulties with that, but we are trying to not add more difficulty that would require more manpower.

The other issue with respect to 9 units is that we are trying to manage enrollment but not overcorrect. We want to get students to enroll and register, but we don't want them to horde classes. We don't want to put them into the possibility of not getting full-time status as that would affect our graduation yield rates and our targets.

Khodabandeh said that here was one compliance issue with the failed Two-Pass policy from last year and that was for student athletes who need 12 units. He thinks addressing McGhee's issues comes down to advising. As far as 12 units vs. 9 units, he thinks De Vries makes some good points about running 9 and 12 units before the Financial Aid deadline. He also thinks that we have to worry about operations, and we cannot access the server when everyone is accessing the server at once.

Foreman said that we were told it is not feasible to have a second open appointment period for registration and that it would have to be open registration at that point.

Colnic noted that for all the pedagogical reasons from last time, it was provided that we can do 9 units by 2-3 weeks prior to the Financial Aid deadline and he thinks it is still a good idea.

Gerson is concerned that if we go with the 12 units, we think that there will be no possibility of students getting 3 more units to get up to 15 units. Those 12 units will become defacto full-time. Also, Biology is a department heavily impacted by having non-freshmen in freshman courses, as that puts freshmen off-track from the beginning. They would like having freshmen as priority in freshman courses.

Noelia Gonzalez, Director of the Financial Aid and Scholarship office, stated that they are concerned that it might generate multiple financial aid refunds if we go with 9 units first.

Regalado said that regarding the athletics provisions, we debated this last year and voted a lot of them down. He recalls that we agreed that many students had issues similar to athletics students.

Espinoza said that it is unfeasible for us not to have a second pass. She thinks it would be a good thing for student to take more units instead of fewer. Regarding freshman students it would be continuing a past practice. I am not sure if we are doing that for second semester freshmen.

Marshall wanted to take us back to the rationale for what the two-pass system was. It was so that students could get the top 9 units they need and then fill in with one or two other classes they can get. Some people may get 12 units in this system, while other people may only get 6 units.

Foreman wanted to respond. With regard to the second pass, they wanted to put something into the resolution that assured the second pass would proceed. As far as Regalado's comment is concerned he thinks that the committee would support everything Regalado said. Last year we heard impassioned pleas from athletics and our committee believed all students should be treated the same way. Athletics is mentioned in the rationale because he wanted to make the rationale as clear as far as the history of this resolution. UEPC wanted it noted that they are aware of the situation of the athletes, but that they wanted to be fair.

Bice said that Mathematics main concern is that we have trouble with students not passing a class multiple times. He wonders if a student could be blocked from taking a class if they are taking it a second or third time.

Espinoza said that there is an Executive Order stating that a student can't take a class a third time. We are allowed to block them from signing up again. She is suggesting that we limit it to 1 repeat.

Stone thinks the question is if can we block them during the first pass.

Bice confirmed that was the question.

De Vries asked Espinoza what is the average number of units students take on campus.

Espinoza replied 12.87 units is the average on campus.

De Vries questioned if making the first pass be for 12 units would then have the desired effect. If students on average already end up at approximately 12 units after enrollment ends, it seems that the average student would effectively see no difference

Espinoza is not sure there was as much shuffling this semester as in past semesters.

Noelia Gonzalez said that the way the system works is that when students repeat a course for a third time they can't enroll.

McGhee thinks that the reason for this, even though we have a 13 unit average, is that we may find that students have 6, 9, or 12 units but we are trying to stop those who sign up for 20 or so units. Then it does open it up for everyone to load up, but you are not blocking out an entire category like sophomores from registering.

Espinoza noted that it's also another opportunity that allows you to have a chance to load up in the second registration.

Regalado thanked Foreman for his comment and he is wondering about the last resolved.

Foreman said that they didn't discuss that, but he can take that back to the committee.

Regalado said that it is vague and he is not sure what all of it means. If the policy is not meant to single out athletes, why does it note athletes?

Strahm noted that one thing that can help sort out this issue is permission numbers. Faculty do have the ability to add students, for example seniors, to their courses.

Colnic asked if we have any idea how 9 vs. 12 units will play out. He feels like with 9 we can be much more confident that students will get the 9 units they really need while with 12 units, he is not so sure.

McGhee thinks we should keep the mention about athletes in the policy. If this system alleviates the issue with athletes it is nice to know if it does help them. Even if it was not designed to help them, if that is an effect this could be good information for future decision making.

10. Open Forum

11. Adjournment

3:55pm