<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>10/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to GFC, Article VI, Section 2.3 (UWC), APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2008</td>
<td>5/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the GFC, Article VI, Section 2.3, (ASL/GE), APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present: Bender, Bice, Broadwater, Brown, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, Dempsey, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Floyd, Garza, Grobner, Gomula, Grochner, Hall, Helzer, Jibby, Johnson, Keswick, Lawson, Manrique, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O’Brien, Peterson, Poole, Ringstad, Robbins, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Stessman, Sumser, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tynan, Werling, Zong</td>
<td>6/AS/08/FAC—Amendment to Support Unit Review Policy, Referred to FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxy: Mobley (Janz), Thompson (S. Davis)</td>
<td>7/AS/08/UEPC—Policy on Unretrieved Student Work, APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests: Nael Aly, Lee Bettencourt, Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Roger McNeil, Ron Noble, Gary Novak, Lee Renner, Armin Schulz, Carolyn Stefanko, Ted Wendt</td>
<td>8/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Academic Advising Policy, APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Class Attendance Policy, APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/AS/08/UEPC—Policy Concerning Access to Instructional Materials for Persons with Disabilities, FIRST READING ITEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget Cuts DISCUSSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday, April 15, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes submitted by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</td>
<td>John Sarraille, Clerk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to order at 2:35 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda-Johnson asked that FBAC’s report on MPPs and ALS Reorganization be deferred to the next Senate meeting because a resolution is coming forth from FBAC. b) Budget cuts will be the first Discussion Item. It was MS Eudey/Schoenly to approve the agenda as amended.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 11, 2008-It was MSP Floyd/Schoenly to approve the minutes.
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Speaker Johnson commented that many saw the article about President Shirvani in the Modesto Bee. Some noticed Sumser’s comments which were published, but no one spoke on the record. Johnson stated the Bee reporter did contact her and they spoke briefly. She told the reporter faculty opinion was mixed and at this point didn’t want to speak for faculty because comments could be interpreted as speaking for all faculty. Also, SEC has been working on a better relationship with the President and is following a strategy that does not call for public discussion of the relationship between the faculty and the President. She stated that SEC would be happy to discuss this with any of the Senators.

b. Johnson advised that discussion between Aspire and CSU Stanislaus has ended. We are no longer pursuing a partnership. The committees established to consider a relationship with Aspire will dissolve. Thompson related that the ad hoc committee met and considered some of the questions that had to be asked about starting up a partnership. Johnson thanked Thompson for chairing the committee and asked him to convey her thanks to the members.

c. Duggan announced that the Office of Information Technology and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will put on the Fourth Annual CSU Stanislaus Technology Fair, Wednesday, April 16th from 10 AM to 2 PM in the lobby of the MSR Building. The fair is open to faculty, staff, students, and the entire University community. Selected vendors such as Apple, AT&T Mobility, ClearWire, Dell, eInstruction, Epson, IT Solutions, MediaSite, SoftChalk and WolfVision will give demonstrations of contemporary technologies. There will also be displays by OIT, the Library, Disabled Student Services and the CMS Project. The Physics and Physical Sciences Department will exhibit its portable planetarium. CSU Stanislaus faculty, students and staff are eligible for door-prize drawings.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

6. CONSENT ITEM

a. 10/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, Article VI, Section 2.3 University Writing Committee

Johnson advised the change is to add the Faculty Coordinator for the Writing Proficiency Screening Test as an ex officio, nonvoting member of the committee. This requires an amendment to the General Faculty Constitution.

The following resolution was accepted by the body:

**Be it Resolved:** that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the approval of the following proposed amendment to the Constitution of the General Faculty:

**University Writing SubCommittee:** Seven members from the faculty; two faculty from the English Department, five additional faculty with no more than one from any college. The Faculty Coordinator for the Writing Proficiency Screening Test shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the committee; and be it further

**Resolved:** That the revised membership take affect upon approval by the General Faculty and the President.

**Rationale:** The University Educational Policies Committee recommends the addition of the Faculty Coordinator for the Writing Proficiency Screening Test as an ex-officio member of the University Writing Committee.

This will be submitted to the General Faculty for a vote.

7. INFORMATION ITEM

a. eLearning Task Force Report

Johnson advised that about two years ago a committee of faculty members, the Provost and some members from OIT was formed to look at various platforms for online education. The committee has given UEPC its report. It recommended discontinuing use of eCollege, migrating to Blackboard, and some use of Moodle. Cost is the primary reason. Little difference was found among the platforms in terms of satisfaction or features.
8. ACTION ITEMS

a. 5/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution, Article VI, Section 2.3 ASL Subcommittee/GE Subcommittee

Filling advised that the change from the last Senate meeting was adding the GE Director as ex officio non-voting member to the ASL Subcommittee and the GE Subcommittee.

There being no discussion, the question was called. A vote was taken and the resolution approved unanimously.

This will be submitted to the General Faculty for a vote.

b. 6/AS/08/FAC—Amendment to Support Unit Review Policy

Filling stated that there has been no change in the resolution since the last Senate meeting. The purpose of the proposed amendment is to clarify how the faculty members are selected. Covino remarked that in at least one of the colleges (HSS), there is a committee on committees and there is similar functionality in other colleges. He asked if it would be constitutionally possible to designate college committees to do nominations. R. Floyd asked if the Provost was thinking that the college COC might advance names to the university COC. Covino replied no, but acknowledged that doing things that way could be considered. Floyd indicated that if such an alternative were to be considered, FAC should discuss it. Not having been aware there were college COC’s, she hadn't considered the role they might play. She would need more information. Thompson asked what the rationale would be. For example, he received a call regarding the Faculty Affairs Support Unit Review. It would seem the University COC would be the appropriate body to designate faculty members rather than a College COC. What is the rationale for using a college COC? Covino stated he was referring to support- unit review of the Colleges only. It was MS O’Brien/Taniguichi to refer to FAC. Approved.

c. 7/AS/08/UEPC—Policy on Unretrieved Student Work

Filling advised UEPC amended the first bullet to read “…must be retained until one month after the start of the subsequent fall or spring semester.” Johnson clarified that material must be retained until the time for grade appeal has expired. Gomula stated that her department (Art) is not equipped to store some material...sculptures, for example. Filling replied there was discussion of such things and it was decided that certain exceptions can be made if proper notice is given. Peterson suggested making it clear in the document that there are exemptions. She said she remained concerned about the possibility of instructors using student work for pedagogical purposes. This issue does not relate to the nominal purpose of the proposed policy and does not need to be addressed there. Filling replied that UEPC discussed that concern, and concluded that the content of the resolution that addresses intellectual property seems to be congruent with the Intellectual Property Rights Policy. He indicated he felt that the wording regarding IP contained in the Policy on Unretrieved Student Work could be beneficial, albeit redundant. The fact that no one picks up the work does not equate to a right to unrestricted use. Thompson said that he was opposed to the resolution because of concerns about fair use of intellectual property. This policy is more restrictive than the Intellectual Property Rights Policy. Sumser agreed with Thompson. He agreed that the IP issue should be addressed separately. Peterson moved to amend the first bullet to read: absent prior written notification …. Take out bullet 4. Nagel seconded. The amendment was accepted as friendly. Kavasch asked what the time frame was for bullet 1. Johnson clarified that it would be one month after the beginning of the semester. Wording that expresses the official policy on grade appeals should be incorporated. This was accepted. The vote on the resolution as amended passed. In summary, the changes were:

Bullet 1 - Absent prior written notification as specified in department/program policies concerning student work, instructors must retain all unretrieved student work [whether, paper, electronic, or online student work] for any given course for at least one academic year following the submission of the final grade for that course until the grade appeal period for that course has expired.

Bullet 2 was amended to make it consistent with the language above: Instructors [such as adjuncts and visiting lecturers] who are uncertain of their continuation through the two semesters following submission of the final grade grade appeal period should submit unretrieved student work to the department chair/program coordinator.
Bullet 3 remains the same - Disposal of unretrieved student work should be carried out in such a manner as to protect the student's confidentiality and intellectual property rights, and to prevent its subsequent use for purposes of academic misrepresentation.

Bullet 4 was struck.

Old Bullet 5, which is the new bullet 4, remains the same: Each individual graduate department will identify in their written comprehensive examination procedures, conditions for availability and the length of time designated for retention of the examination for their respective department. The written procedures will be kept on file in the Graduate School.

d. 8/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Academic Advising Policy

Johnson explained that the changes are as indicated with underscores and strike-outs. UEPC made the changes in response to concerns raised at the last senate meeting. Sarraille spoke in opposition to the resolution. He did not think the overall feeling of the policy was sufficiently protective of faculty rights. Also it could have workload implications. Some of the provisions call for departments to report their advising policy and publish things. The issue of how the need for training is to be determined has not been resolved. There is nothing to prevent the implementation to turn into something like how defensive driving classes are imposed. Training is not characterized in the policy as a dialogue. He suggested that UEPC work to perfect the policy.

Thompson stated when he looks at b) under IV, page 12 “Responsibilities of the Vice President for Student Affairs and c) Responsibilities of College Deans there is administrative oversight. For example, under c) supervising and monitoring the development and implementation of clearly defined advising policies and practices within their colleges and also providing guidance and assistance to academic departments/programs to improve academic advising. These are two different things. He stated the point is when it comes to responsibility of academic departments and programs, it seems like they are in charge for what their advising program looks like. That language could play out in two different ways. Filling replied what you see under d) Responsibilities of Academic Departments and Programs is the driving force. UEPC tried to make it clear advising is driven by academic programs in the departments. In conversations with student service professionals, they have bent over backwards stressing the priority is in academic departments. Eudey stated that information here is helpful for faculty trying to learn their role. This document is an improvement over the current Academic Advising Policy. Even though this may need to be tweaked later, it is better to pass it now. Sarraille stated he would be more comfortable if it were a published set of principles rather than a policy.

Schoenly voiced concern about summer advising without pay. Faculty are asked to voluntarily advise during the summer. It may not be appropriate to discuss now because of the budget, but he would like to eventually discuss this.

Peterson asked Sarraille if there are specific parts in the document that are the problem and Sarraille replied he sent his concerns to Filling. But specifically, Page 11, III. 5) Provide regular training for academic advisors on all relevant issues, provide advisor training on available university and community resources, seems to leave open the possibility people would be dragged into advising training sessions. It is characterized as your responsibility to undergo training. And 6) Recognize and reward faculty for outstanding advising. He stated he is not a big fan of ‘beauty contests’ - things like ‘Outstanding Adviser Award’. And IV. d) page 12 Responsibilities of Academic Departments and Programs, standardize and publicize a comprehensive plan defining the department’s advising policies and procedures. This has some workload implications.

Johnson pointed out this policy can’t be amended here, only the resolution. It could be referred back to UEPC. Colnic asked what the implications are if we make the document a principle document rather than a policy. Sarraille replied that his feeling was it would make it advisory, rather than mandatory. It would give more discretion to faculty. He said it bothers him that people who flout the law won't care whether this is policy, but people who are good citizens may feel hemmed in. Peterson suggested the document could be sent back to committee to review Sarraille’s concerns. O’Brien seconded. Filling said the policy has been around for three years. UEPC has been discussing it for the better part of this year. He did share Sarraille’s comments with UEPC, but he felt if it were referred back, nothing would change.

Morgan-Foster agreed with Filling. Sending it back to UEPC probably won’t change anything. We should respect the work of the committee. They have discussed this for three years. Sumser added that returning it without what
we want changed won’t do any good. Peterson suggested if something is worth three years of your time, maybe it is worth two more weeks to get it better. Furthermore, Filling could ask Sarraille to attend the UEPC meeting to help bring his concerns to their attention.

Kavasch stated that two things disturb her. One is the implications of workload. Who is going to come up with a standardized plan and who will evaluate advising services? This is creating more paperwork. She suggested the document should recommend rather than be a requirement. She questioned whether we are trying to standardize everything. Floyd suggested we need more specifics from those that have objections if changes are to be reconsidered by UEPC. Taniguchi questioned the part about advisor training. page 11. III. 5 a) Provide advisor training .... and page 13 under E. 2 Specific responsibilities of Faculty Advisors are to a) participate in advisor training sessions as needed .... Who will provide training? Sarraille responded on page 13 F. 2. Student Service Professional Advisors will d) provide in-depth, on-going training for faculty and peer advisors.

Filling stated senior colleagues have reminded him it is a good idea to have faith in their colleagues and maybe this is the right place. Lots of bright people have looked at this to help us do better. Tynan called the question. Vote to end debate on the motion to refer. Passed. Vote on the motion to refer. 11 yes. 27 no. Motion failed. Back to the discussion on the main motion. There being no further discussion, question was called. Vote on the motion 26 yes, 8 no. Passed.

Filling stated if you have issues with this document, please forward concerns to UEPC.

e. 9/AS/08/UEPC—Amendment to the Class Attendance Policy

Johnson stated there were no changes from the last meeting. There being no discussion, the question was called. Passed by voice vote.

9. FIRST READING ITEM

a. 11/AS/08/UEPC—Policy Concerning Access to Instructional Materials for Persons with Disabilities

It was MS Filling/Lawson

Resolved: That the attached Instructional Materials Accessibility Policy be adopted by the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus and that upon signature by the President this policy will be in effect for Fall Semester, 2008.

Rationale: Federal law mandates that educational institutions provide access to instructional materials for all students, including those with disabilities. The CSU Chancellor’s Office has directed all campuses to develop procedures and policies for compliance with federal requirements and to have those policies in place no later than Fall, 2008. The attached policy provides structure for those efforts, and sets out interim measures to be used during a transition period for extant courses. This policy seeks to maintain academic freedom while respecting the needs of our students, and is an integral part of our campus-wide response to the Chancellor’s directive.

Discussion:

Eudey questioned under I. A. and B., when talking about course material requirements, how broadly is it defined? Filling replied lots of classes incorporate various materials such as periodicals, citing readings, textbooks. Flores questioned IV., are we talking about the issue of online materials readable. It seems wide open and general. Is this about ADA access? Filling replied yes. It is broad in purpose. OIT is producing a much larger chunk of this. Poole questioned item I. B, “Academic departments will send Disability Resource Services listings of all course materials for each course at least 70 days prior to start of the semester.” Who is responsible from the department to send information to Disability Resource Services? Filling stated it is a department issue. Poole stated under III. A. Disability Resource Services will notify the instructor of record and the relevant department at the start of each semester of all accommodations requested on behalf of students enrolled in that instructor’s/department’s course, there have been students who need changes in the whole delivery method. It may require extensive work. It would be very helpful if instructors know a lot more information before the first day of classes.
Peterson asked for clarification if the Disability Resource Services Office wants information from the instructor of every course and Bettencourt replied yes, we focus on students having special needs and information will have to be put in a different format. We review the courses seeing if there are disabled students in the classes. The more information we get ahead of time, the better. But we contact instructors early on when we know if there are disabled students in their classes. Peterson stated her only disabled student added late, so this could be a problem. She noted it seems overwhelming to have all faculty send all course syllabi of all their classes. Bettencourt stated they would like syllabi for all classes, but the main thing we need to know is textbooks and materials for classes. Filling stated it is important to put in context we are basically mandated to have all our materials accessible by 2012. But right now, we are asking for textbooks and materials.

Morgan-Foster stated regarding the fact that students can add at the last minute, we are obligated to treat disabled students the same way as regular students. The same rules apply. We work with disabled students to encourage them to give us advance notice and it could be a factor if a student decided to sue. Their case is weaker if they don’t give you some notice. On the other hand, the period of time from a Federal perspective to turn around material is getting shorter and shorter each year. By 2012 we will have a very quick turnaround.

Tynan asked for clarification that Bettencourt wants all textbooks, readings, syllabi sent to Disability Services. Bettencourt replied it will help us in the long run. Thompson asked how far down this goes when you say all course materials. Providing assignments in advance, test prompts, are they included in course materials? Bettencourt replied we focus on the courses disabled students are enrolled in. We make sure material and textbooks are assessable. Thompson asked if this is a matter of complying with a court decision or Federal law, because it seems we are doing it backwards. Bettencourt advised we have students making last minute changes, so if everything is accessible from the get go, the process is quicker. Thompson questioned on page 16, I. A. “…Faculty will also query publishers concerning alternative format/medium availability and said availability may influence materials selection decisions…” Why are faculty asked to do that? It seems the bookstore could do that more efficiently. If so, that information could be provided to departments. Filling stated part of the reason we wanted faculty to do it is because publishers respond to the fact that faculty ask these questions. They take them more seriously. With respect to the notion we are doing it backward, we are trying to do two things at once. We are trying to serve our students and again by 2012 all instructional materials have to be accessible. Gomula asked related to I. A. are you saying in 2012 all should be accessible so if you find some are not accessible you don’t include them? Filling stated we are very carefully not to say that.

Bender asked if there is a boiler plate you used from the Chancellor’s Office to develop this. Filling replied it is two-pronged. The genesis of this statement came out of discussions in the committee and we took that and conformed to what came out of the Chancellor’s Office. Nagel stated he is trying to convert one course to on-line. He can change course materials in response to student’s expressed need. Can the policy address this? Filling replied there is wording regarding making every attempt to report, so it leaves Nagel some wiggle room. Morgan-Foster added you don’t have to make sure something is accessible ahead of time. Disability Services will work with you. There are some situations where things can’t be replicated in an accessible way and that can be permitted under the law.

Schulz advised that Duggan and he attended a workshop at San Jose State where the focus was on this issue. It was very instructive to hear from seven San Jose State students with a variety of challenges. There are ways that things can be read to the student when they click on something. Things to do like ordering text books early - using closed captioning - it is not possible for Bettencourt and his group to do everything. ‘Phenomenal’ technology was shown at the conference. Schulz wants the person from San Jose State to come here and do a presentation. It is mandated - we have to do this but there are things out there to support us. Peterson suggested under I. B. to insert the word ‘known’ to read “Academic departments will send Disability Resource Services listings of all known course materials for each course.” Thompson suggested under I. A. he would like UEPC to think about trying to get the bookstore to query publishers. There seems to be a lot of things rolling downhill today. We have training to go to, reports to make, remediation to perform, and now another thing to do. He is asking the bookstore to do one thing for the faculty. C. Davis advised that we have a text reader, something to make text larger, and voice recognition. These are things we can use to ensure that students get a proper start on the first day of class. Kavasch noted that Disability Services contacted the Music Department early when a blind student arrived, and they were able to adapt. Duggan stated he attended a meeting at the Chancellor office and they made it clear we would be audited between 2008 and 2012. So one thing we are doing is providing a paper trail to show we are making a good faith effort. There are lots of guidelines on the Chancellor’s Office website. We are offering workshops on producing acceptable online course documents and materials. Fall 2008 all new courses have to be accessible.
This will be action item at the next AS meeting.

10. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. FBAC’s report on MPPs and ALS Reorganization

Deferred to next AS meeting. FBAC is to provide a resolution.

b. Budget Cuts

Johnson advised this information was provided at the Budget Consultation Committee meeting and brought forward as information and we are asking for feedback from faculty. O’Brien stated the agenda that came out before spring break was daunting. He sent out an email to ASNET. Page 26 attached to the agenda are possible expense mitigation ideas that were originally presented. We are looking at a $386M shortfall for the CSU, but this is not locked in. Interim Vice President Whitfield’s ideas were submitted at the beginning of the process. He calculated a potential budget cut of $2,629,712. This shows implications of the shortfall to all divisions. Total savings of leaving vacant positions is $1,472,712. Below it is shown how $1,157,000 in operating expenses could be cut. There have been Budget Consultation Committee meetings the provost has called. The BCC consists of Thompson, Schoenly, Morgan-Foster, members of UBAC, Covino, Filling, McGee, Tan, Rojas, O’Brien, Janz, Novak and Borrelli. If you go back to page 18, you see what is proposed under Academic Affairs as a budget reduction impact statement. Canceling twenty-two full-time positions, reducing summer program and reducing academic year access. That is why the Speaker wanted this on the agenda. It is troubling and it is being done on spreadsheets, but this will affect our students. They are proposing to offer 63 fewer courses during summer. How will this play out? Temporary faculty will not be hired, students will not be able to get classes they need, full time faculty will do work the temps would have done, and there will be cutbacks on assigned time for things like faculty research. Page 19 shows items OIT says they could cut, page 20 is Student Affairs, page 21 is Business and Finance and page 22 is University Advancement. This basically came from the vice presidents from the various divisions proposing how they will cut back. For him personally, his question is, are there other things we can cut? That is what he put in his email to Senators. Attached on page 23 are tables on determination of actual expenses. He would like very close scrutiny of these columns before any cutbacks of classes are done. Some things can’t be cut, but is there some wiggle room here to save some classes. He is looking at $5,000 per part-timer per class. Supplies and services are $1.2M, which translates into 240 classes. $340K is about 70 classes. The university spends the equivalent of 33 part-time positions on travel. He stated he suggested cutting travel but his dean didn’t like that idea. Johnson asked when the next UBAC meeting is and Provost Covino replied there is no meeting scheduled at this time.

Peterson would like to have a key to explain these items. Johnson stated because we are at the end of the meeting, please review this material for the next Senate meeting. If UBAC is not going to meet before the next AS meeting, we can have a discussion. If not, please forward comments to UBAC members. Covino replied it is unlikely UBAC will meet before the next AS meeting. Johnson stated if any additional information will go to UBAC, we will get it for the next meeting. Please review what has been suggested for reductions also and send comments to any UBAC member.

Sarraille stated his impression these reductions slated for summer and fall are irreversible. Is this true? What is the point of making suggestions if we are locked in? Covino stated we are rolling out summer and fall schedule in a week and have enrollment growth funding that is equivalent to what we received this year with a higher cost in place. We far exceeded our enrollment growth funding for this year, in order to provide student access. What he has done for summer and fall is to bring section offerings in line with our funding. That constitutes reduction of sections. If the money is not needed for budget cuts, they are available to be used for other priorities. But regarding what O’Brien pointed out, we need to be careful not to send the message we can do more and more with less. We did that last year. There was money could have been used to reduce faculty workload. We need to fight to get the budget restored and live within our means. Sarraille asked if part of the plan entails cutting classes, getting rid of temporary faculty, and having the remaining faculty teach more classes? That would be doing more with less. Covino replied that reductions entailing increased teaching loads and reduction of assigned time have not been implemented.

c. Final Exams on Reading Day/Last week of class

Carryover.
d. Workload Carryover.

11. OPEN FORUM

12. ADJOURNMENT at 4:35 pm.