1. **Call to order**  
2:08pm

2. **Approval of Agenda**  
Approved.

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of August 27, 2013 (distributed electronically)**  
Pending slight modifications. Will be resubmitted at the October 1st Academic Senate meeting.

4. **Introductions**  
Speaker Garcia welcomed the guests to introduce themselves as follows: Deans James Tuedio, Oddmund Myhre, and Annie Hor. Ann Strahm, Dennis Shimek, John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Lisa Bernardo, Ashour Badal, and Lauren Byerly.

5. **Announcements**  
Salameh congratulated VP Dennis Shimek on his recent permanent appointment. ASI is hosting the CSSA event on campus from Friday to Sunday and encourages faculty, students, staff and administrators to attend the 1-4pm session on Saturday, September 21st in MSR 130. It’s an honor to host this event on our campus, and 60-70 student leaders will be on hand to discuss university and legislative affairs.
Marge Jaasma noted that the WASC Special Visit is looming. The WASC self-study team is preparing in part through a survey; it is important to get many responses from all constituencies. Regalado queried whether we have an administrative statement on shared governance as responding to the survey may be problematic without such a statement.

Eudey noted that most importantly is the talk by our own Paul O’Brien on Life-Death and Faculty Governance taking place tomorrow, Wednesday, September 18th, from 3-4pm. O’Brien is the recipient of the Outstanding Service in Faculty Governance for 2011/12 and the presentation explores the intersection of the faculty career life-course, governance and health.

Eudey noted the Fiction and Non-Fiction book clubs will discuss *From Brain to Mind, Facilitating Seven Ways of Learning*, and *Universal Design in Higher Education*.

Brian Duggan noted that Wednesday, September 25th is the 10th Annual Technology Fair which will be held in the MSR lobby. This event is open to faculty, students, staff and the campus community, and will feature demonstrations of instructional technology, innovations by our own faculty, and technology vendors.

6. **Committee Reports/Questions**
   Schoenly noted that UEPC has met twice so far this semester. They had 15 carryover items from last year on their agenda. UEPC has discussed and addressed the Two Pass Registration pilot program and the related Add/Drop policy and a policy on wait lists. UEPC is continuing discussions regarding the Student Internships/Service Learning EO #1064. Schoenly thanked Ian Littlwood who is serving as the COS representative this fall term and also thanked Mark Grobner who is serving as the UEPC representative on the RSCAPC.

Sims noted two important items under consideration in the FAC. Department chair workload was brought by a majority of department chairs who are concerned with the scope and nature of duties assigned to them. Chairs should expect a communication from the FAC soon. Also, the FAC is engaged with Student Affairs to develop a policy and procedures about disruptive students in the classroom. We do not have a policy and procedure in response to some extreme behaviors. The FAC will first be looking at current procedures and then the chain of response. In response to a question about the definition of “disruptive students,” Sims explained that some faculty have felt threatened by disruptive students whose actions in their classes went beyond what normal procedures encompass. Currently, we are following the Student Conduct Policy.

7. **Information Items:**
   None.

8. **Consent Item**
   a. 33/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC – Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching
The first item is an amendment to our current policy which relates to the resolution passed last spring, 27/AS/13/FAC RESOLUTION ON INCREASED STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSES. This amendment is necessary because we neglected to include in that resolution a resolved statement to update the current policy. The following amendment was accepted.

33/AS/13/FAC—Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC—Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89FAC)

All faculty unit employees and administrators who teach shall be evaluated in two courses annually, *are required to conduct student evaluations in no less than 50% of all courses per year with a minimum of one course per semester* using the IDEA Short Form or approved substitute(s). Faculty unit employees and administrators teaching one or two classes annually shall have all classes evaluated. **UEE courses are not part of the 50% as required by the Unit 3 faculty contract.** The classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee and his/her department chair. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the total courses to be evaluated. The department chairperson may approve evaluation of additional courses if requested by the instructor.

Parts I. Evaluation (Progress Ratings), II. Students’ Self Ratings and III. Summary Profile of the IDEA Report, or the results from (an) approved substitute(s), for the two required courses shall be placed in the faculty unit employee’s Personnel Action File. The results of any additional evaluations shall be given only to the instructor.

By November 1 of each academic year, the department chairs shall inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee of the classes to be evaluated that year.

Departments are encouraged to develop and test alternative teaching assessment instruments, using the IDEA long or short form or other theoretically grounded standards for establishing reliability and validity. If specified in department RPT elaborations, and if explicitly approved by the URPTC, results from such instruments may be substituted for or supplement the IDEA short form placed in the employee’s Personnel Action File.

The Faculty Affairs Committee will submit for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook a report advising faculty members and administrators of the best diagnostic practices for using the IDEA instrument. This report will be examined each year and revised when needed.

*Per 27/AS/13/FAC, the new requirement that “All faculty are required to conduct student evaluations in no less than 50% of all courses per year with a minimum of one course per semester” will be evaluated by an ad hoc committee of faculty and administrators who will make recommendations after 2 years as to long-term student course evaluation policy. The recommendations of this committee shall be brought to the President and to the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus, so that a long-term student course evaluation policy of maximum efficiency and efficacy may be decided upon.*
b.  34/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to CSU Stanislaus Evaluation Policy & Procedures for Temporary Faculty (replaces 3/AS/08/FAC and 15/AS/07/FAC)
These are changes that were approved this past Spring by FAC. The resolution brings the policy for evaluation of full time lecturers into agreement with the contract. The resolution and amendment to current policy was accepted.

34/AS/13/FAC—CSU Stanislaus Evaluation Policy & Procedures for Temporary Faculty
(replaces 3/AS/08/FAC and 15/AS/07/FAC)

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate at California State University, Stanislaus recommend the attached amendment to 3/AS/08/FAC—CSU Stanislaus Evaluation Policy & Procedures for Temporary Faculty be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that this policy become effective upon approval by the President.

RATIONALE: The new CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement has necessitated revisions to this policy to provide for greater clarity for the process of evaluating temporary faculty members. This resolution brings campus policy into compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

9/11/13 Reviewed and recommended by FAC

9. Discussion Item
a. Two-Pass Registration Process Survey: In Brief (distributed electronically)
Schoenly said that this survey was in response to complaints from faculty and students concerning registration practices. Enrollment Services conducted a survey of students (they had 25% response; results distributed electronically). UEPC received the survey in April, so a resolution is coming forward now. Survey results reflect that students like the two-pass system but want the first pass cap raised to 12 units, due to concerns such as eligibility for financial aid and athletics. Registration during finals has been eliminated, and sophomores have been given priority over freshmen. Some students will benefit from the higher cap if they need to register for 4 or 5 unit courses in the first pass. However, freshmen will have significantly fewer classes to select from due to the lower priority coupled with the higher first-pass cap.

Espinoza noted there is no way to assess beforehand the effect on freshman registration. Bernardo reported that Institutional Research compiled the responses, and the report is representative of concerns that Enrollment Services heard.
It was noted that negative survey responses were rather vehement; could improved communication of rationales help? The UEPC agrees that communication should be improved in several ways.

Early registration for athletes was questioned. Bernardo clarified that student athletes do not have priority registration and that several groups will benefit from the 12-unit cap. The only groups with priority outside of class level are veterans, foster youth, and some disabled students.

The revised program is again a one-year study; the results can be compared with the previous one-year study.

10. First Reading Items
   a. 35/AS/13/UEPC - Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot)  
      California State University, Stanislaus  
      Replaces the previously approved  
      2/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot)  

Speaker Garcia said that in the ideal world we’d have a discussion of this item prior to having the first reading to allow time to review. M/S Schoenly/Eudey:

35/AS/13/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot)  
California State University, Stanislaus

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve 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, which shall include appointment times for individual students and last for approximately 10 days; and be it further

Resolved: That this first pass be followed immediately by a second, open registration period that shall continue for at least 15 business days and should continue until 12:00am of the first day of instruction; and be it further

Resolved: That the registration priority reflect order by class level. Priority of registration will 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 the Spring 2014 registration cycle and be used for two registration cycles; and be it further

Resolved: That a review be conducted following the registration cycle for Spring 2014 to evaluate 1) how effectively this two-pass registration system allows students to register for the courses they most need each semester in order to make progress toward their degrees and 2) how well it allows administration to effectively manage enrollment; this review shall be undertaken jointly by the University Educational
Policies Committee and the Vice President for Enrollment and Student Affairs and shall be completed by Spring 2015.

**Rationale:** It is the intention of this resolution that all students be afforded an opportunity to register each semester for the normal limit of units, so they may make timely progress toward their degrees. As our course offerings have become more limited and our student population has grown, the registration process utilized until AY 2012-13 had become more difficult for both students and administration. Students frequently were unable to enroll in courses they needed as prerequisites to other courses, and students were prohibited from making progress toward their degrees as a result.

Additionally, economic uncertainty has made it difficult for administration to manage enrollment, since we have seen significant fluctuation in the enrollment choices made by students whom we have accepted. A two-pass system has allowed better management of enrollment.

Much debate went into the choice between two alternatives, a 9 unit first pass or a 12 unit first pass. Student feedback from the one-year pilot (conducted during AY 2012-13) suggests that 12 units (rather than 10) will allow students to more easily sort themselves effectively into their top-choice courses and be less likely to take up space in the wrong courses during the first pass. Student feedback also suggests that 12 units on first pass reduces stress because students are able to maintain financial aid eligibility, maintain athletic eligibility, accommodate 4 and 5 unit courses, and remain on track for graduation. This policy will need to be widely advertised to ensure all students complete the second pass and sign up for all the available courses they need to make timely progress toward degree and secure complete financial aid.

KS: rle UEPC approved 9/12/13

*This resolution replaces the previously approved 2/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot)*)

Schoenly reported that the major change proposed is a shift from a 10 to a 12-unit cap on the first pass. The resolution includes an expanded rationale. The proposal is for a one-year program through two registration cycles. The first pilot ended with a survey in April that provides a lag time until the fall registration cycle for studying results and approving a new program or reverting to the old. Once the program is no longer a pilot, departments can be better assured of the best advising times and processes.

The more rationales such as greater access to classes are publicized, the better reception should be. The survey or a revised survey should be repeated after the spring 2015 registration, which would again allow time for analysis, reflection, and a resolution to finalize the system.

Salameh noted that the ASI is writing a resolution about the registration to find ways to inform students thru social media etc.

Espinoza noted that if the Senate passes this, it could go into effect in the spring 2014.
Senators are encouraged to discuss the resolution with their colleagues. This item will be a second reading for action on the next agenda.

10. **Open Forum**
O’Brien queried whether governance groups are reviewing the university budget with a report forthcoming to faculty in light of the improving budget scenarios.

It was noted that the President announced that Eileen Hamilton will be the chair of UBAC. Will FBAC have representation in UBAC.

FBAC Chair Lindsay reported that no data is available to FBAC to review the budget. The FBAC meets on September 18th and will revisit the FBAC template for information and data requests, listing key items needed each year so as to regularize the process of populating the template at the beginning of the year. FBAC will also be meeting with VPs and will report to the Senate.

Sarraille noted the importance that the FBAC continue its practice of bringing a resolution concerning faculty budget priorities to the Senate.

11. **Adjournment**

3pm