Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:36 pm. An amended agenda was distributed to reflect the following changes: Move 7) Open Forum before 3) Approval of AS Minutes. Change Reports and Announcements to Announcements. Add Questions about Reports after Announcements. Add First Reading Item-continued: 13/AS/02/UEPC--Principles of Assessment of Student Learning. The agenda was then approved as amended.

**OPEN FORUM**

1) Trustee Farrar

President Hughes introduced Board of Trustee Chair Debra Farar as a young and upward moving trustee who is a very effective advocate for faculty and students. She is a product of CSU Northridge, receiving her bachelors and masters there. She holds a doctorate and has also taught in elementary school.

Trustee Farar thanked President Hughes and Speaker Thompson for inviting her to CSUS. Specifically, Speaker Thompson made the effort to reach out to her, and she thanked him for it. She stressed the importance of campus visits because it helps her to do her job better.
She is impressed with CSUS's leadership in the Senate. They truly embrace the mission of the CSU, which is our commitment to affordability and quality education. She further stated that the CSU is the largest in the country and it is looked to as a national model. The strength of our system is its diversity, not just the student body but also campuses. The Board is very sensitive when setting policy recognizing that not one size fits all. She sees the Trustee's role as "noses in but fingers out." It helps her do her job better when she hears from faculty. Farar stated that it bothers her that faculty are sometimes unaware of how much the Board respects and appreciates what they do.

She wants her tenure as chair to be thought of as a time of shared governance. We need to keep talking and communicating.

Thompson voiced concern about the effect of student enrollment management on remedial students and asked what her or the board's position is on this. Trustee Farar stated she did not think it would effect selectivity because our charge is to take all students. Further, many remedial students have received A's and B's in high school. We should be on target in Math by 2007, but English is more of a problem. For many students, English is a second language. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence is proposing a policy that during high school in their junior year, students take a placement test to see if they need remediation. Then it could be accomplished during their senior year. It would also allow students to matriculate during the summer before to do remediation. The remediation policies should not affect enrollment. We are basically making up for K-12 deficiencies, she stated. Shipley noted that most of her students in Liberal Studies are transfers. Remediation is something that comes up 8-10 years down the road, not in high school.

Aronson questioned the CCTC and the CSU relationship. CCTC is setting guidelines for credential programs, but also for subject matter programs. We are seeing more and micro management. There is a lot of concern about where the line is between credentialing and academic freedom. Aronson asked if the system is looking at this issue in any way. Farrar explained she did not think the Board would be involved in this. President Hughes noted it would probably be led by Executive Vice Chancellor Spence. The Provost can take this issue to Long Beach.

2) President Hughes advised Senators that a letter has gone out to appoint a Smoking Policy Committee. Susan Macdonald will chair the committee.

3) The President reported another committee would be formed to review lottery funds. Previous constraints do not apply now, so the committee will review the numbers and establish criteria in guiding us in making decisions.

4) Diana Demetrulias has been chairing a Committee on Extended Education. There is a strong connection between continuing education and global affairs. An external review committee has been appointed which will be chaired by Bill Locke.

5) Sarraille advised Aronson she could ask the SWAS representatives (Sarraille and Thompson) to take the academic freedom issue to the SWAS/Chairs meeting.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The September 24, 2002 Academic Senate minutes were approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1) Morgan-Foster announced that the summer reading author, Masumoto would like to come back to campus.

2) Avilla reported that students are still being assigned to committees. Please let him know if student representatives are needed.

3) Avilla stated that the ASI is putting together a student assessment list (grading goals of class, student retention, how well the faculty member did instructing the course). He assumes there will be questions so a meeting will be held on October 24 at 2 pm in NorthView Conference Room. Morgan-Foster suggested allowing feedback on the name.

4) Afonso announced that next Friday, October 18, the chorale will be performing at the Turlock Presbyterian Church on Berkeley at 8 pm. It is a memorial concert for September 11. The Music Department would like to see more of the general faculty in support of their events.

5) Thompson announced his goal is by the May Senate meeting, all committee reports will be in one email.

6) Thompson reported that Executive Vice Chancellor Spence will be here later in the Fall. Chancellor Reed will be here on October 22 and may come to the Senate. He asked for the Senate's preference.

7) John Garcia, new Social Work Senator was welcomed.

8) Speaker Thompson thanked Provost Dauwalder for providing refreshments.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

None.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1) Strategic Academic Priorities

Provost Dauwalder advised that the strategic priorities were developed over the summer at the Deans Council Retreat in preparation for the Cabinet Retreat in August. There was considerable discussion. He recognized the input from Speaker Thompson and Speaker-Elect Aronson. The Cabinet committed to four goals and within each goal are sub goals. We are trying to identify what we need to work on in the coming year. He wants to move toward a strategic planning process that will involve faculty much more in developing the goals. This document is at the
Senate for review, comments, and suggestions. Thompson further advised that there will be different venues for input and response and this is just one of them. It is the Senate's chance to provide input in response to strategic planning.

Concerns under Goal 1: This talks about review of faculty salary compression and an increased percentage of tenure-track faculty. How does workload fit? A goal involving workload should be incorporated.

It was questioned if we are 'learning centered now, what were we before? Thompson replied he thought the distinction was we were teaching centered before and now the focus goes from inputs to outputs. Demetrulas explained that although we all have our own perceptions on this, the genesis was from the WASC accreditation process that emphasized teaching and learning. Dauwalder voiced his impression from his interview, it was made very clear that not only academic affairs and faculty viewed this as a learning institution, other areas did as well, and it has an effect throughout the campus as learning centered. Vice President Stephens agreed, stating it is meaningful on the administrator's side because it keeps us focused on students and supporting faculty better. The broader meaning is that as an organization, we must stay learning centered as a better way to provide services.

Goal 2, first bullet, last sentence, last phrase "each using the 2002-03 level of funding as a base." Concern was voiced that it is not a good year for us budget-wise so 02/03 might not be a good year to base funding on. Dauwalder replied that the Academic Technology Plan, which was developed last spring, is moving through the governance process and will be at the Senate soon. Funding for the proposal begins 02, so we may need to update and decide what we are shooting for. This is a request that we recast the plan in terms of where we are now. Sarraille asked if we could assume our intention is that we remain at or above 75 percentile and Dauwalder replied that as a campus, we need to define that. What is our target, do we maintain, more, less? Once we decide, we need to define where we are going and it helps us create the context of what investments we need to make in academic technology.

Oppenheim questioned what 75 percentile means in terms of other campuses. Manoharan once said this campus devoted a very small part of the budget to academic technology. We should get figures for all CSU campuses. Until we know what other campuses spend compared to us, we can't tell where it is leading us. Tan asked if the CSU didn't have a budget format for academic technology funding and Morgan-Foster replied that at one time we had the orange book, but not now. Stephens added that there is money tagged for OIT, but other than that, we are free to add any amount. There is no trigger from the Chancellor's Office if campuses don't spend enough on academic technology. Morgan-Foster added that there is also a systemwide academic technology initiative and she is on the committee that will be meeting frequently to advise the Chancellor's Office. She will share information when she gets it. Sarraille noted that recently there has been a lot of planning going on, but also a lot of funding taken away from the current budget. Thompson shared that the Institute for Teaching and Learning will put out an RFP for multi-campus technology initiatives, so there is a possibility for grant money if we can get a couple of campuses involved.

Goal 2, 2nd bullet: addresses the relative importance of technology. How are we to do that?
Especially with the development of fully online courses and programs. Dauwalder stated that there needs to be discussion as to various modes we want to pursue. We cannot do it all. It is important to get direction from faculty on this. That will determine what we want to do. This is also an appropriate topic for the Academic Technology Subcommittee to discuss.

Goal 3, 2nd bullet, how are/can we assess advising?

Dauwalder explained that we are talking about creating a task force to look at our advising systems. We need to understand and define the roles of all functions of advising: faculty, staff, peer advisors. We need to define clearly and identify what we are doing and how well we are doing it and understand the needs of our students.

Morgan-Foster added that the student surveys we've received have indicated that advising is an issue. Too many students have excess units when graduating, and it's not their fault. We don't want to just graduate students, but we want them to use their time here wisely. Sarraille suggested using this kind of rationale for all the goals.

It was agreed that advising is very important and students should be encouraged to be advised. Although some departments still require it, not all students show up. A suggestion was made to control mandatory advising by saying the student can't get the hold clear until they have been advised. It was noted that there is also an opportunity to connect with students through mandatory orientation. It was also questioned if most of this lack of advising is happening here or at the community colleges.

It was noted that it isn't whether faculty are doing advising, but that it would be difficult to assess how well faculty are doing it. Dauwalder suggested looking at our existing policies and practices and create a definition of advising and the roles and responsibilities related to various elements of advising (including workload) and make recommendations. Further, the reason advising comes up as an issue is because there is not really a shared understanding of what advising is.

It was suggested that a questionnaire be prepared and sent to our recent graduates. It could also be used for the WASC Report. What our graduates think is the ultimate assessment. Morgan-Foster advised that there have been surveys done, just not as systematically. Also, First Year Programs has been working on constructing a survey about advising and they are about to distribute it. Sarraille suggested holding a seminar for advising rather than one on one advising.

Goal 4, bullet 2, redefine the MAP Committee and it's functions. It was noted that in the past the committee did not function well for various reasons.

Goal 1, bullet 2 " Develop by mid-October 2002 a plan to make appropriate and effective use of the new John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center (sounds too top down) and 3, Continue implementation of the Stanislaus Academic initiative (what does this mean?). Dauwalder explained that last March Dean Cullinan and Assistant Vice President Hogan prepared a document called the Stanislaus Academic Initiative which attempts to identify the total cost of hiring faculty. It was noted that faculty governance might wish to support the Academic Initiative were it formally forwarded to us. Cullinan and Hogan tried to look at the whole picture
to make sure it was funded up front rather than ex post. The goal here is to try to confirm cost of
the initiative and build into the 03/04 budget. One concern about bullet 2 was that it only
addresses faculty development on this campus. Funding for travel is inadequate, so this should
also be addressed.

Thompson stated he would compile these suggestions and forward to the proper authorities.

**ACTION ITEM**

**a. 12/AS/02/UEPC--Units for Writing Proficiency Courses**

Amended resolution:

RESOLVED: That the writing proficiency designation of a course be considered justification for
a department to request the assignment of an additional course unit; and be it

RESOLVED: That the request for the assignment of an additional unit be subject to the review
and approval of the University Writing Committee prior to review and approval by the college's
Curriculum and Resources Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the assignment of an additional unit be utilized as scheduled class time.

**RATIONALE:** California State University, Stanislaus supports writing in the disciplines as an
essential component of the university writing program. Originally it was thought that a regular
three-unit course could be taught as a writing proficiency course. Now, we recognize that writing
instruction requires instructional time and that some faculty may need an extra unit in order to
cover all of the necessary course content and deliver effective instruction on writing in the
discipline. This extra unit is an option that departments may request.

Dauwalder questioned the first resolved clause referring to the presence of WP designation being
considered as justification. Should there be some statement that presence within the content?
Thompson replied the WP criteria require that there be content. Zarling further explained that the
only way it makes sense to interpret that resolved is to say that it is talking about WP being
additional justification on top of content. The literal interpretation is nonsensical.

Oppenheim asked about the third resolved that the assignment of an additional unit be utilized as
scheduled class time. Is this a systemwide requirement or can you meet with students outside of
class time? Stone noted that we are already supposed to be in our office to meet with students.
Peterson stated it seems like the first resolved almost contradicts the third resolved. It seems like
this limits the faculty member.

Klein queried whether the proposal had been reviewed by FBAC.

Nagel reminded Senators that in prior discussions, justification is not in terms of 3 units of
contact and separate 1 unit for writing but the writing element of the course is an integral part of
the course itself. The entire course is content and writing. Youngblom further explained that the
rationale was very specific. It is not the idea of extra work, but losing content because of writing.

Gackowski suggested this should be left to the discretion of the department. We could ask for an additional unit for the instructor and it could be class time or limit the number of students in each class. Some felt that there is more work for students and instructors in a writing proficiency course.

Dauwalder asked if this resolution changes current process in any way. The process would change to UWC reviewing the course before the college committee.

It was MS Oppenheim/Jaasma to amend the first resolved clause to read "That the writing proficiency designation of a course, the time spent on developmental writing above and beyond course content, be considered justification for a department to request the assignment of an additional course unit; and be it

Zarling explained that WP courses do not have course content above and beyond, but Oppenheim disagreed stating it depends on what the department does. Zarling clarified that what was being discussed was course content and he was objecting to the terminology suggesting separation of writing and course content.

Nagel suggested a friendly amendment that "the time spent developing discipline-specific writing skills in and through the course content." The maker and seconder of the motion accepted this.

Vote on the amendment passed. The first Resolved clause now reads "That the writing proficiency designation of a course, the time spent developing discipline-specific writing skills in and through the course content, be considered justification for a department to request the assignment of an additional course unit; and be it

It was MS Peterson/Oppenheim to eliminate the third Resolved clause "that the assignment of an additional unit be utilized as scheduled class time."

Peterson explained that would give the instructor more flexibility. He/she could schedule an extra hour of class time, or one on one with their students. Nagel reminded Senators that the point of the additional unit was not to compensate faculty for their work, but use it for additional instructional time so they would not lose content in their WP class. Oppenheim felt it should be left up to the department. Zarling questioned if others could request an additional unit if they think work in their course has increased but they don't want to schedule an additional hour of class time. Would that be considered? Are we changing procedure? Klein explained it is all paper assessment. We just indicate in the course schedule there is additional time arranged.

Demetrulias noted that there are types/levels of instruction that influence C,K,S factors. We use accreditation standards to compute times and criteria for arranged time.

Some questioned the need for this resolution; Thompson replied that it's basically for leverage rather than actual change in policy.
Vote on the amendment to strike the third resolved clause: 15 yes, 14 no, passed.

It was MS Filling/Aronson to table until the January 03 Senate meeting so the University Writing Committee can explore these issues. Vote was 17 yes, 15 no, motion fails for lack of 2/3.

It was MS Oppenheim/Nagel to table until the November 19 Senate meeting. Vote was 23 yes, 1 no, motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.