

<p>Academic Senate February 23, 2016 Present: Alvim, Azevedo, Bell, Bernard, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Cooper, Crayton, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Garcia, Hoover, Regalado, Gonzales, Guichard, Hauselt, Huang, Loza, McCulley, Nagel, Oluwarotimi, Park, Peterson, Petrosky, Ringstad, Sims, Strangfeld, Strickland, Petratos, Provost Strong, Stone, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wellman, Wood and Zhang.</p> <p>Excused: Advanced Studies and Larson.</p> <p>Proxies: Sarraillé for Silverman, Strahm for Filling, C. Floyd for Manrique.</p> <p>Guests: John Tillman, Doug Dawes, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Dennis Shimek, Marcy Chvasta, Scott Davis, Sandra Garcia Sanborn, Stan Trevena, Nancy Burroughs, Glenn Pillsbury, Martyn Gunn, Lauren Byerly, James Tuedio and Dennis Shimek.</p>	<p>First Reading Items: 1/AS/16/FAC Amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty. Will return as a second reading item.</p> <p>2/AS/16/FAC Amendments to the Faculty Handbook Voting Rights. Will return as a second reading item.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: March 8, 2016 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Chris Nagel Clerk</p>
--	--

1. Call to order

2:00pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 9, 2016 (distributed electronically)

Approved.

4. Introductions

John Tillman, Doug Dawes, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Ron Rodriguez, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Dennis Shimek, Marcy Chvasta, Scott Davis, Sandra Garcia Sanborn, Stan Trevena, Nancy Burroughs, Glenn Pillsbury, Martyn Gunn, Lauren Byerly, James Tuedio and Dennis Shimek.

5. Announcements

Strahm announced the 100th birthday of the Carnegie library in Turlock, which is now the home of the Carnegie Arts Center. This Saturday, February 27, is the celebration kick off. Please attend. Strahm also mentioned the upcoming diversity films: Sikhs in America Mon. 29 Feb. 6-8:30 in Snider, Delano Manongs Tues. 1 March also 6-8:30 in Snider Hall.

Espinoza provided an update for enrollments as of Spring census 8,776 students headcount, 2.9% above this time last year; 7,408 FTES 2.9% over last year, and 1.5% above CO appropriation for us. Also at a recent Deans and Chairs meeting the staffing levels in Psychological Counseling was discussed. They currently have 4.3 FTE counselors. 1 is temporary and the position is being advertised for “permanent.” Two positions are already in HR and when filled we will have 5.0 FTE; Espinoza hopes that will happen in April. Also, when Lee Bettencourt retreats back to Counseling, we will have 6 counselors. That number would reach the recommended ratio for

counseling of 1500 students to 1 counselor. In addition, they are working on a plan to meet accreditation standards.

They experience fluctuating demand and created a list of counselors in our community that are available during peak demand times. They will be appointed as university employees. Currently, we are not at that peak demand period. Students that enter in non-crisis are seen within 8 days. To address that delay Bettencourt has agreed to provide half of his time to the Counseling Center. She's very grateful because it is important to identify students in crises. Currently, all those in crisis are seen immediately.

Strahm requested Espinoza speak to the use of community-based counselors. Is there research that supports this as effective counseling? She is struggling to see how someone that the student doesn't know and who is not affiliated with the university can help our students. Will the student open up to that person? Do we have research that shows this is an effective tool?

Espinoza repeated that the Counseling Center has fluctuating demand. Present staff are sufficient, until "bombarded" in the later part of the semester. Community-based counselors will be able to see new students requesting services. They will see them for the duration of that student's need.

Strangfeld asked if the 5.0 FTES projected faculty in PCS would all be permanent.

Espinoza replied that they would have 3-year appointments. Bettencourt is permanent and R. Floyd is FERP and will be half time.

Peterson stated she was glad to hear this as they have been worried in FBAC. Discussion at FBAC related to their concern that people are leaving because the university isn't competitive in terms of what we are able to offer them.

Espinoza declined to speculate about what reasons PCS left, but admitted that salary is always an issue.

Sims thanked Espinoza for responding to the urgent necessity for PCS staffing to meet student needs.

Thompson recalled Espinoza's assertion that we are moving towards the recommended ratio, and asked what the current ratio is.

Espinoza estimated that it was approximately 2000:1.

Nagel noted that a 3-year appointment is not a permanent appointment. Only tenure-track employees have permanent status; all other unit 3 employees are temporary.

Peterson asked if the FTES would be the correct number for calculating the ratio, instead of headcount. The impact on PCS work would be the same whether or not the student was full time.

Espinoza reported that she calculated this at 8776 divided by 4.8 FTES counselors which puts us at 1828 per counselor.

Pillsbury announced **introductory online training sessions for using Zoom:**

Thursday, February 25 @ 1pm

Friday, March 4 @ 12 pm

Tuesday, March 8 @ 12 pm

Join one of these web trainings to learn more about **Zoom**, a new web conferencing tool that is free for use by all Stanislaus State faculty, staff, and students. With Zoom, you can easily host and attend state-of-the-art video meetings of up to 200 users right from your desktop, tablet, or smartphone. Use Zoom to give a presentation, hold a class meeting (with polls, breakout rooms, Q&A), demonstrate software, draw on a virtual whiteboard, or just meet virtually using a web cam. Zoom meetings can be accessed via desktop client or Zoom's tablet/smartphone app (iOS and Android). Meetings can also be recorded easily.

These initial introductory sessions last approximately one hour and will be delivered by Zoom representatives. Additional training sessions will be announced once dates have been confirmed.

Attendance at training is not required to use Zoom!

To get started on your own, visit the [Zoom information page](#) on the university website for quick-start instructions and additional resources!

Contact Glenn Pillsbury (gpillsbury@csustan.edu) for more information about using Zoom.

Oluwarotimi announced the campus produce market, an event organized by the Stanislaus State Agricultural Studies Program, in the quad 11am – 1pm on 24 February, 24 March 24 and 4 May. See what's new in the garden.

Sarraillé announced CFA will be hosting a lunch meeting in, 8 March from 11am to 1pm in South Dining. CFA leadership will answer questions about the potential strike.

6. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)

FAC (Sims): They have a draft of a policy statement based on EO 1096 but are holding off as they are expecting a revision from the CO. They sent a memo to the Provost to request review of college organizational structures, especially related to program chairs, directors, and coordinators and their respective duties.

FAC will get into discussing the possible replacement for Facnet. They are looking at procedures for updating department Websites. Most department faculty information pages contain just an email address and no information on the faculty member. Their aim is making this more accessible for faculty to add their own information.

FBAC (Peterson): FBAC discussed concerns about the loss of counseling faculty. They considered asking D. Shimek to conduct an equity analysis regarding compensation for the counseling faculty. They also discussed the advising software that is being looked at and whether more faculty input into budgeting for such items would be useful. They reviewed 2015/16 budget data in comparison to other years, with a focus on the cost of priorities FBAC has suggested, in particular the student success funds, and how they can't be used for some goals, e.g., CEGE. They requested reports from Shawna Young regarding CEGE. Finally, they also discussed startup funds for science faculty, and whether the university is competitive in that regard.

GC (Ringstad): GC completed recommended revisions to Graduate Learning Goals that will come to senate for feedback. They reviewed graduate admission status in particular classified and conditional, or provisional, and recommendation to shelve the term as it is no longer applicable. They discussed the look and feel of the reestablishment of a Graduate School with personnel, and the transition plan to institutionalize some of the CEGE activities. They will look at updating guidelines on graduate fellowship dollars. Lastly, they are considering input and questions for the presidential search.

SWAS (Strahm): SWAS Chair, Steven Filling, sent information regarding RSCA funding. They are in the process of determining the amount for each campus, to be shared in March. A SWAS committee is considering a resolution to support a requirement of four years of math to qualify for admission to CSU. California High schools require two years of math for graduation. Strahm is not opposed to students taking more math, but given that currently high schools only require two years, is this an opportunity for CSU to discriminate against those that didn't have a counselor tell them they would need to take four years to qualify? She believed that the CSU is required to accept the top 10% of high school graduates, but what if they don't have the math requirements? Strahm asked for comments.

Sarraillé noted that the CSU is required to admit the top 1/3rd not 10%. He asked further whose brainchild this is.

Strahm replied that it is coming out of academic preparedness committee. The problem as she sees it is that their approach is not to tell the K-12 system what they need to do, just to change admissions requirements.

Guichard asked if all schools offer 4 years of math.

UEPC (Stone): Deferred to the presentation on course time modules.

7. First Reading Items:

a. 1/AS/16/FAC Amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty

Sims moved/Nagel seconded.

1/AS/16/FAC Amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommends that the below amendments to the Constitution of the General Faculty be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the approved amendments be added to the Constitution of the General Faculty upon approval by the General Faculty and the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That those amendments made to the Constitution of the General Faculty are as follows:

1. Amend Article III, Section 1.0 to eliminate the distinction between “General Faculty” and “Associate membership in the General Faculty,” and to align the definition of “Faculty” with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, as follows:

a. ARTICLE III. ORGANIZATION OF THE FACULTY

Section 1.0 Membership of the Faculty of California State University, Stanislaus, is defined to include **any Faculty Unit Employee classified as a probationary, tenured, coaching, counseling, library, full-time, or part-time faculty unit employee.**

2. Eliminate Article III., Section 1.1, which defines “Associate membership in the General Faculty.”
3. Throughout the Constitution of the General Faculty, replace the term “General Faculty” with the term “Faculty,” as defined above; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, upon adoption by faculty vote, this resolution shall be shared with all campuses in the CSU system.

RATIONALE:

The Constitution of the General Faculty should recognize that all faculty members engaged in teaching and learning make valuable contributions to the University, and should be amended to formally recognize that the status of all faculty should be inclusive, and to support and reflect the definition of “Faculty” found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

This change supports the American Association of University Professors position on the inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments, which recommends, in part, that:

Institutional policies should define as “faculty” and include in governance bodies at all levels individuals whose appointments consist primarily of teaching or research activities conducted at a professional level. These include (1) tenured faculty, (2) tenure-track faculty, (3) full- and part-time non-tenure-track teachers and researchers, (4) graduate-student employees and postdoctoral fellows who are primarily teachers or researchers, and (5) librarians who participate substantially in the process of teaching or

research. Those individuals whose primary duties are administrative should not be defined as faculty.

This resolution is also further supported by the CSU Statewide Academic Senate Resolution AS-3199-15/FA (1/23/15), which states, in part:

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU affirm that opportunities for democratic participation, for all faculty unit employees including voting eligibility, leadership opportunities, campus and Statewide Senate representation, and inclusion at college, division, and departmental meetings are essential components of shared governance, and collegiality; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage campus senates to review or revise their constitutions and policies in order to include lecturers, non-tenure track librarians, coaches, and counselors, in the term “faculty” in a manner consistent with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 2.1

Sims: FAC provided a resolution asking faculty to vote on an amendment to eliminate the distinction of associate faculty, which will align the constitutional definition of faculty with the definition in the CBA. It would also eliminate the term “general faculty” from all locations in the constitution. The new definition of faculty would include any faculty unit employee.

Section 1.0 Membership of the Faculty of California State University, Stanislaus, is defined to include **any Faculty Unit Employee classified as a probationary, tenured, coaching, counseling, library, full-time, or part-time faculty unit employee.**

Thompson reminded that this is a first reading item for discussion/questions/advice session, and that if it moves forward, it will be move to a ratification vote by the general faculty, and not a decision of the Senate.

Garcia asked to clarify the new definition, if grant-funded faculty would fit into this definition.

Sims asked if they were unit 3, assumed that if so then they would fit into the definition, and will follow up to be sure.

Strahm moved to second reading. Sarraillé seconded.

Strahm said the reason she suggested this is that it has been discussed widely, ever since it had started percolating. SWAS has resolved to support it, and many campuses have already made this move. She was not sure how much two more weeks of discussion would add, given that there appears to be almost unanimous acceptance if not approval of the change.

Sarraillé added that most have had discussions and know where our departments stand.

Thompson handed over the gavel to Sims in order to speak against going to second reading. Thompson said he has “dragged this out,” and it has been a long conversation, there have been surveys of faculty. But, it is now on the senate agenda. Sometimes an issue doesn’t get on people’s radar until something is on the senate agenda. We’re not in a time crunch, and we should allow time to have further discussions with our departments. He clarified that he was speaking only against moving to a second reading, not about the underlying resolution itself.

Regalado asked if anything short of tabling will prevent more discussion at FAC. Part of his concern is the second item on voting rights. He’d like to go back to discuss this with his department, especially alongside the voting rights.

Sims said that there is no time crunch, but FAC has responded to feedback they have received, and while any new questions would be considered, it’s in the hands of the senate now. These resolutions are to submit to the general faculty. If they are approved they are simply moving these forward they would have to be ratified by a 2/3 majority of votes cast by the general faculty.

Regalado said he was hesitant to move to a second reading before discussion of the second item.

R. Savini stated he was concerned about the move to second reading because then it’s an action item. There are deep implications regarding how the constitution distinguishes faculty. AAUP reports and recommendations have profound contradictions. There are issues involved that require careful analysis. There are reasons why the language is the way it is, involving governance responsibilities and voting rights. The first reading is when debate should take place about these issues. The momentum of the national issue about working conditions of part-time faculty could mislead discussion because of the overlap with governance structure and language. If that is not well understood, the urge to do something right for beleaguered temporary faculty could be confounded with governance. What is at risk in all-inclusive voting rights? These are ways to seriously undermine faculty governance.

Sims replied that the issues Savini was raising was not on point. The amendment under discussion is not talking about voting rights.

Savini replied that the faculty constitution concerned “governance faculty” as opposed to teaching faculty. We are all teaching faculty, and the division of responsibility built into the constitution is based on that distinction. When that distinction is lost, it seriously affects policy development. Separation of responsibilities needs to be clearly understood. Those distinctions are being lost, including in the AAUP recommendations. This affects the entire senate-administration structural responsibility. A full first reading and second reading would reveal those consequences.

Nagel stated that FAC has been discussing this for 3 years. It has been discussed in senate for 2 years. FAC has the responsibility to investigate those repercussions, and they have been discussed at length. This is not a debate; the purpose of a first reading is to offer advice. There is no division of those eligible and ineligible to participate in governance a priori to the current constitution. No such distinction that exists before there is a constitution. Many CSU's constitutions have included part-time faculty in the definition of faculty, and they haven't fallen down.

Regalado asked whether the discussion of the constitution was parallel with voting rights. If not, the issue of voting rights, with regard to the issue discussed right now, would be a very recently raised issue. If so, faculty members will want to make a decision based on that.

Nagel replied that the definition of faculty has been discussed all along with voting rights. That was one reason he first brought up that the constitution is out of line with the CBA. He brought that issue to FAC 10 years ago. It's been discussed at FAC for many years.

Thompson said that, as far as he is concerned, the definition in the contract is not required in the faculty constitution. We can have a different definition of faculty or general faculty than the contract. We are putting it forward based on discussions in governance committees about the best definition of faculty. Thompson reminded the senate that the issue on the table was whether to move to a second reading. It is a strategic question to get the resolution passed or to not get it passed. It will take 66% of current general faculty voting in favor to make a change. Taking time for a first and second reading will improve the chance of passing these resolutions and changes to the constitution.

Sarraillé/Strahm called the question. 9 yes, 32 no. Return to first reading status.

Petrosky noted that in previous sessions of the senate, in discussions of particularly emotional issues, the speaker has limited speakers to two minutes.

Sims accepted this advice.

Strahm said the lack of discussion says a lot.

Savini suggested that we begin with analyzing why the language is in the constitution.

Nagel pointed out that one implication of the language now is that half the faculty are relegated to second class status regardless of their contributions to the university. If the language is changed to define faculty inclusively, the definition will no longer be discriminatory.

Strahm pointed out that we have faculty who have come here as tenure-track faculty and have gone out the door with no kind of tie to this institution and yet they have more rights to vote than someone who's been here much longer in a different status. How is that helping us?

Savini said there's been a fundamental problem using the language loosely. He acknowledged that faculty working part time is a crisis in the country. Part time faculty are not assigned responsibility for governance. "Second class status" is not accurate. There is representation and governance representation that is valid and fair for part time and full time temporary faculty. The assigned responsibility that is built into the structure is by viability.

Sarraillé asked what the term "assigned" meant in Savini's discussion. It is not accurate to say that full time faculty are assigned to serve on faculty governance. We are judged on service and are given choices of things to do that qualify. It is inaccurate to say that one group of faculty are assigned and the other is not. It is also pretty clear that all faculty can participate in governance already, to some extent. It does not seem to be an important issue to worry about whether this group is assigned the responsibility.

Sims handed the gavel back to Speaker to speak as FAC chair. He emphasized that in the last few years and since September, FAC has solicited information, and they did not hear any rationale for maintaining the distinction of associate faculty. No one from the campus or at FAC made that argument. There is a difference in the US of who is eligible to vote and who is eligible to participate. As labor, in the contract, all are defined as faculty. The amendments at issue would redefine all as faculty and extend voting rights regarding who is to represent them. It does not address the question of what committees are open to what persons among the faculty. It is important to not confuse the two.

Savini said that term general faculty really means "governance faculty." That implies how the governance structure is set up. In all these prior discussions, how could it not come up? There are duties that are assigned and duties that are not assigned.

Sims asked Savini to point out in the constitution where it says that general faculty is "governance faculty."

Thompson asked for further input on this resolution to be sent to FAC or to Sims.

b. 2/AS/16/FAC Amendments to the Faculty Handbook Voting Rights

Moved by Sims/Nagel seconded.

2/AS/16/FAC Amendments to Faculty Handbook Voting Rights

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus recommends that the below amendments to the Faculty Handbook Voting Rights be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the approved amendments be added to the Faculty Handbook upon approval by the General Faculty and the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That those amendments made to the Faculty Handbook are as follows:

1. Amend item 1. to read **“Positions and issues for which all members of the Faculty may vote:”**

2. Combine items 1. and 3. so that item 1. includes the following positions and issues:
 - Speaker elect
 - Clerk of the Faculty
 - Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
 - Members of the Faculty Affairs Committee
 - Members of the Committee on Committees
 - Chair of the University Educational Policy Committee
 - Members of the University Educational Policy Committee
 - Amendments to the University and appropriate School/College constitutions
 - Chair of the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Policy Committee
 - Members of the Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Policy Committee
 - Department Academic Senate representatives
 - Chair of the Graduate Council
 - Graduate Council representative from departments with graduate programs
 - All other University, School, or Departmental committees for which the franchise is not restricted by the collective bargaining agreement or the constitution.
 - Chair of the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee
 - Members of the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee
 - Statewide Academic Senators
 - Members of the Faculty Development Committee
 - Department search committees for recommending the appointment of probationary faculty (MOU Article 12. 21.A, 2.12, 2.13);and be it further

RESOLVED: That, upon adoption by faculty vote, this resolution shall be shared with all campuses in the CSU system.

RATIONALE:

The Voting Rights defined in the Faculty Handbook should reflect the inclusion of all Faculty, as defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Voting Rights as detailed in sections 2 and 4-7 shall remain unchanged.

This change supports the American Association of University Professors position on the inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments, which recommends, in part, that:

All members of the faculty, defined on the basis of their primary function as teachers or researchers and assuming that they meet any time-in-service requirements, should be eligible to vote in all elections for institutional governance bodies on the basis of one person, one vote.

This resolution is also further supported by the CSU Statewide Academic Senate Resolution AS-3199-15/FA (1/23/15), which states, in part:

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU affirm that opportunities for democratic participation, for all faculty unit employees including voting eligibility, leadership opportunities, campus and Statewide Senate representation, and inclusion at college, division, and departmental meetings are essential components of shared governance, and collegiality; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage campus senates to review or revise their constitutions and policies in order to include lecturers, non-tenure track librarians, coaches, and counselors, in the term "faculty" in a manner consistent with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 2.13)

Sims stated he has received the most questions on this resolution. This proposes an amendment to the faculty handbook that lists seven categories of service, and who may vote for offices. It does not address who is eligible to serve on those committees. It is about who may vote on membership. Section 1 and 3 involve implications of the change to the constitutional definition of faculty. Regarding search committees for tenure-track faculty, there is no real change. The rest are currently voted on by full-time faculty only at present. FAC proposes to change those eligible to vote on candidates for governance positions or membership in governance committees. The rationale cites both AAUP and the SWAS resolution of January 2015.

Nagel underlined that what this change suggests is extending the right to vote for representatives on these committees and says nothing about who may serve on those committees. There are restrictions in the constitution and in the CBA on who can participate on those committees.

Nagel stated that he believes this is a change to the faculty handbook, and not an amendment to the constitution, and therefore would not require a 2/3 ratification vote by the faculty. It should only take a senate vote and approval by the President. Sims will review this.

Savini asked Sims to clarify committee process. His concern was departmental structures that are increasingly complex, even legal issues.

Sims explained that the two ways this would change department voting rights is that it would open to all faculty to vote for senate reps, and to vote for all committee memberships that are not restricted by the CBA or constitution. The resolution is agnostic on departmental governance.

Savini said that departmental decisions involve program areas, budgeting, staffing, that can be very touchy and open to factional differences. Informed voting and commitments are unfair to ask of faculty asked to fulfill only teaching responsibilities. It is completely unfair to expect from people coming in. It's not that they have to vote, but the responsibilities of voting in an informed way. It is not reasonable to expect that from people who are not involved.

Regalado agreed with much of what Savini said. Despite the protections of autonomy of departments, there are still gray areas that affect autonomy of departments and their governance. For instance, there may be departments with majority part-time faculty. In that case they could select a representative or senator that would have a voice over matters that could affect a department. It could restrict department autonomy. There will be times where the university will be undergoing budgetary constraints, where we may be enforced to hire more part-time faculty, and this will invite a majority of part-time faculty to have a say in direction of governance. One of his colleagues mentioned with all due respect, often you have cases that you have part-time faculty are less qualified. They do not compete in national searches. This may end up dictating in the long run the direction of the university as a whole. Much stronger language is needed to protect departments from that. They do not feel part time faculty should be allowed to vote on senate reps or search committees for recommendations for tenure-track faculty.

Petratos pointed out that some departments have 40 to 50% part-time faculty. If they could vote, they could essentially decide who will be hired for tenure-track positions.

Sims pointed out that this is about department search committees involves voting on who is a member of the committee, not voting on candidates. It's membership of search committees. All faculty already vote on this; this is not a change and it has not collapsed our system. They have had this voting right for years and these nightmare scenarios haven't occurred on our campus in his 15 years. He said that he hears the fears, but when you enfranchise people with the right to vote, then indeed conversations become more multi-faceted. His personal opinion is s that it is good to enfranchise our colleagues and to vote for at least representation.

Garcia suggested there was a mistake in the listed positions voted on. Graduate Council reps fare selected from departments with graduate programs, they are not voted on. He would like to see these positions voted on, but that is not current practice.

- Graduate Council representative from departments with graduate programs

Sims noted that if it is a mistake, this is a current mistake, and the handbook states that graduate council representatives are voted for.

Thompson acknowledged there may be some disagreement between the constitution and voting rights as they are listed, and was glad that Garcia pointed this out. If there's more input on this, FAC could use it.

Regalado responded to Sims that of seven faculty members in History, five have been here longer than Sims, and when they first arrived, there were no part-time faculty. Economic times do dictate the hiring practice. The ramifications of the change would be very real for departments. Given the dynamics, there is cause for concern.

Strahm said she was thinking during the discussion about how difficult the struggle is around enfranchising the unfranchised. There is some relation to the debate about the women in suffrage. She quoted from comments made during the Minnesota assembly debate (<http://edsitement.neh.gov/lesson-plan/voting-rights-women-pro-and-anti-suffrage>): "When the Senate took up the bill, one member asserted that 'disaster and ruin would overtake the nation.' Suffrage would lead inevitably to 'government by females' because 'men could never resist the blandishments of women.' Instead, he recommended that women 'attach themselves to some man who will represent them in public affairs.'"

Byerly spoke to a couple points. First, if you have a lot of part time faculty, tenure-track faculty would be selecting them. She hoped that the tenure-track faculty would be hiring qualified and rational people capable of making rational people who can make decisions. There is a bill to push toward 75% tenure-track. She has been holding back on saying this: voting has been considered a human right. Arguments have been made that those who are seeking representation have less of a stake, and those who are less committed, less concerned, less able. If the Kardashians can vote for the President, our part-time faculty should have vote. To say that tenure-track faculty necessarily have more commitment is not accurate. Many that are here for a while apply for other positions. We had 2 tenure-track faculty leave because they had that opportunity. They had the money to do research and no commitment to this university. Many part-time faculty have settled in and have purchased homes and they are just as or more engaged in their departments. There is no promising that a position will make someone less or more able to be committed. People who engage will be self-selecting. Hire good colleagues and we will all be fine.

Thompson pointed out that approving this resolution as currently written would not enfranchise the Kardashians.

Sims responded that he mentioned he was here 15 years not to start a measuring contest but to say he has a large sample size. Second, he is not arguing his own position, but the position arrived at by FAC, outside of the senate structure, who have solicited a lot of feedback and had forthright discussions. His role is to represent the feedback they received and the consensus arrived at by FAC. He is the face of a process that FAC began in late August/early September.

Will return as a second reading item.

8. Information/Discussion Items:

a. Presidential Search

Thompson noted that we are now in the midst of the search. He reminded the senate of email sent that listed topics that arose during the open forum, and would like the senate to respond to the ACTCSP.

Nagel made a point that he would want a new president who would be committed to find ways to move qualified, proven, able temporary faculty into positions that are permanent. There is no reason why it can't be done.

Wellman asked, on behalf of the department of Politics/PPA, for the committee to grill candidates on their views and plans for graduate education on this campus.

Cooper said her department would like to forward idea that the new president understand the need for financial support for technological research and STEM.

C Floyd suggested in addition to item #2 about meeting with union representatives, that the new president should be willing to meet with faculty governance.

Guichard asked that during the search process probe the committee probe candidates for their response to having an open-door policy and transparency in decision-making. Decision-making about several of the other items listed depends on having a good relationship to the new president, to be able to make a case for them.

Gonzalez commented on items 3 5, 7 10, 13 that it would be good to press further and to continue to build good will, somewhat following Dr. Sheley.

Petratos suggested adding "with FBAC" to the item on local equity pay program.

Hoover asked for clarification of #8: "not obsessed with accountability."

Strahm replied that her meaning was accountability schemes that involve student outcomes that are quantifiable only, rather than different kinds of understandings of student outcomes.

Regalado noted the shared governance and transparency item, and said that he and Carroll left not very impressed with the forum. They asked if any faculty member on the committee made a dent, or if it is just posturing by the Chancellor.

Thompson said he could say without fear of being fired, yes to the former, that it did make a dent.

Burroughs said that a lot of people were taking notes and summarizing what we thought was important, but in terms of changing the process, that doesn't seem likely. The other feedback the committee will take seriously, in her impression.

b. Course Scheduling

Stone shared a PowerPoint slide show and discussed the following information.

Student Success:

1. Access is the first step to success.
2. We need an adequate number and variety of classes to ensure student success.
3. All courses cannot be offered during prime time (M-R 9-5)
4. There are not enough classrooms.
5. Students cannot take more than one class during the same space-time coordinates.

Some History:

19/AS/OS/SEC Change in Time Modules for Course Scheduling
Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the attached modifications of current time modules for course scheduling. The Academic Senate further encourages campus administration to recognize the broader impact of these changes and support them through actions such as - but not limited to - the following:

1. Provide resources for alterations of the course delivery for those departments and/or instructors who demonstrate such need.
2. Extend campus support services to complement the extended hours of the new schedule, including access to classroom technology support, cafeteria and bookstore.
3. Ascertain potential student acceptance of the proposed schedule.

Rationale: The attached time modules will provide more efficient use of classroom space and better serve students. It is expected that course scheduling will adhere to the modified time modules as closely as possible, but it is also recognized that reasonable exceptions will be required.

Approved by the Academic Senate on 11/8/05

Approved by President Hamid Shirvani on 12/5/05

PROPOSED SCHEDULING PARAMETERS
California State University, Stanislaus
Effective Fall 2006 for Fall and Spring Semester Scheduling
November 7, 2005

1. Daytime--Courses with the following combinations of units and days per week that use the time modules on the attached sheet will receive equal preference for classrooms in schedule planning for daytime classes that begin prior to 4:00 p.m. in fall and spring semesters:

- 1-unit courses meeting 1 day per week
- 2-unit courses meeting 1 day per week
- 2-unit courses meeting 2 days per week
- 3-unit courses meeting 1 day per week
- 3-unit courses meeting 2 days per week
- 3-unit courses meeting 3 days per week
- 4-unit courses meeting 1 day per week
- 4-unit courses meeting 2 days per week

2. Evening--For evening courses (courses that begin at 4:00 p.m. or later), the Director of Admissions and Records will give priority to up to 1/3 of the available classrooms (17 of 51) to courses paired by each college filling the 4:00-7:04 p.m. and the 7:10-10:14 p.m. time blocks.

The Director of Admissions and Records will give equal priority for up to 213 of the available classrooms (34 of 51) to schedule (a) 3-credit courses that run from 6:00 to 9:04 p.m., (b) 3-credit courses that run from 5:00 to 8:04 p.m., (c) 3-credit courses that run from 4:30 to 7:34 p.m., and (d) 4-credit courses meeting one day per week from 6:00 p.m. to 10:02 p.m., providing a three-year history of past scheduling patterns shows evidence of the use of similar time blocks and starting times.

One-, Two-, and Five-credit courses will be scheduled within the remaining time slots available.

Courses that cannot be accommodated within the initial scheduling period will then be handled on a case-by-case basis by the staff in the Director of Admissions and Records, as is currently the case.

Departments and deans are encouraged to make use of the evening time blocks identified on the accompanying sheet to the extent possible. This effort should include for 3-unit courses consideration of scheduling courses (a) from 7: 10-10: 14 p.m. one day per week, (b) from 5:35-7:02 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays, and (c) from 5:35-7:02 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

3. Three- and Four-Units, Four Days per Week Daytime classes scheduled for 3 or 4 units that meet 4 days per week will continue to be scheduled by the Director of Admissions & Records following the same special treatment they have received over the past few years. These courses are typically in Mathematics, Modern Languages, Special Education, Chemistry, and other sciences.

4. Laboratories--The scheduling of laboratories does not need to follow the times specified on the attached list. Start times may be identified to meet the needs of the lecture courses they serve.

5. Exceptions--Other exceptions may also be addressed with the support of the college dean and in cooperation with the Director of Admissions & Records.

6. Additional Space--The Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management will identify additional regular space for evening classes through Modesto Junior College, at the CSU Stanislaus office location in downtown Modesto, or in other area locations.

Please share with your colleagues:

Discuss ways to improve scheduling to increase student access. Consider the following ideas for schedule improvement.

Preliminary Scheduling Suggestions from UEPC:

1. No 50 minute time block on Tuesdays and Thursdays before 4pm.
2. No 75-minute time blocks on the Monday/Wednesday schedule before 4 pm.
3. Add 6-8:40pm to the grid.
4. Restrict use of 150 and 200 minute mid-day time blocks on M-F to cohort programs; this will minimize scheduling issues for the general population of students.

Petrosky recalled he was in the Senate in 2005 when then Provost Dawaulder brought in 3 ft. stacks of schedule alternatives. Problem then as now is that we don't stick to the schedule grid. When looking across the colleges, there are many discrepancies on who uses Fridays and evenings. He stated that we will never get away from those sacred cows, except perhaps if scheduling is decentralized, and perhaps ownership of some rooms given to colleges.

Guichard asked simply whether Stone was the person to whom to address questions. Stone replied yes.

Sarraillé asked, regarding the 20% "wastage" of class time, whether other campuses utilize theirs more than we do.

Stone said that Ad Astra analyzed usage that we're in the 19th percentile compared to other universities.

Sarraillé said that being in the 19th percentile doesn't address how much more utilization. He'd like to know if someone is getting 90%.

Wood asked if there's been consideration for twice a week MW, TR classes, and have one-day F classes. He wasn't sure how it would impact spaces.

Wellman asked (1) are we constrained on space at downtown Modesto? and (2) coming from a graduate program catering to full time workers, would we be stuck into 7-10?

Stone replied that that was the purpose for recommending the 6:00-8:40 time block.

Regalado opined that the reason that departments don't schedule classes in those non popular hours is that they're worried that the classes won't be filled. All the hard work of putting together

a schedule will be wasted. UEPC might explore ways to have better relationship between deans and chairs to allow more latitude for enrollment numbers for classes in off-peak hours.

Nagel suggested San Jose State as a model for classes on MW and TR schedules.

Dorsey asked if consideration was given to prioritizing those willing to schedule on Friday, for instance to get rooms or times during another semester?

Huang said that 50 vs 75 minutes could be better for different programs or different classes. Perhaps some departments would prefer one sort of time module or another.

Garcia asked if UEPC and GC have discussed this conjointly. The grid appears to be seen through an undergraduate education lens. Most graduate classes are three or four hours, and conforming to a grid could be onerous to grad programs.

Thompson noted that there had been a good conversation of the graduate program needs at the last SEC meeting and that SEC and UEPC are aware of this.

This will return as a discussion item.

9. Open Forum

None.

10. Adjournment

4pm