

<p>Academic Senate April 12, 2016 Present: Alvim, Azevedo, Bell, Bernard, Bettencourt, Cooper, Crayton, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Garcia, Regalado, Gonzales, Guichard, Hauselt, Huang, Larson, Loza, Nagel, Odeh, Park, Peterson, Petrosky, Petrosky, Ringstad, Sims, Strangfeld, Strickland, Stone, Provost Strong, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wellman, Wood and Zhang.</p> <p>Excused: Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Filling, Hoover, Wagner and Vang.</p> <p>Proxies: R. Floyd for Manrique, Sarraillé for Silverman, and Geer for McCulley.</p> <p>Guests: Guests: Helene Caudill, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, David Lindsay, Betsy Eudey, James Tuedio, John Tillman, Scott Davis, Bret Carroll, Lauren Byerly, Marge Jaasma, Melody Maffei, Louie Oliveira and Hugo Hernandez.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second reading items: 5/AS/16/GC Graduate Learning Goals, Passed, Unanimous.</p> <p>6/AS/16/UEPC Resolution to Modify the Individual Study Policy. Did Not Pass.</p> <p>7/AS/16/UEPC Resolution Live Sound and Recording Arts Technician Certificate Program. Passed, Unanimous.</p> <p>Use of Unmanned Aircraft Policy was removed from the agenda and will return at a later date as a first reading item.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: April 26, 2016 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Chris Nagel Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order

2:07pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Remove 8. B from agenda. Due to regulations there are substantive changes to be made to the policy. Approved as revised.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 22, 2016 (distributed electronically)
Approved.

4. Introductions

Guests: Helene Caudill, Mark Grobner, Oddmund Myhre, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Betsy Eudey, John Tillman, Scott Davis, Bret Carroll, Marge Jaasma, Lauren Byerly, Doug Dawes, Dennis Shimek, Melody Maffei, Louie Oliveira and Hugo Hernandez.

5. Announcements

Petrosky invited the senate to observe a moment of silence for the tragedy that has befallen Briar Cliff University. They hired Hamid Shirvani as President. A moment of chatter followed.

<https://www.briarcliff.edu/news/campus/160407-new-president-shirvani/#.VxA-bEwrIdU>

Strangfeld announced a food drive by the Sociology Club for CSU Stanislaus food pantry, currently held by Hunger Network. This was in response to the report published by the CO regarding food insecurity among CSU students. During the food drive boxes will be in MSR, Bizinni entry way, the Library, MSW office and Main Dining, until 22 April. Strangfeld also announced the Love Evolution Day of Silence on Friday, and asked faculty with students in class participating in the day of silence to not penalize them for lack of verbal contribution to class.

Chan announced Opera Scenes this week, of the opera *Die Fledermaus*.

Sarraillé alerted the senate to CFA information sessions Wednesday/Thursday 13/14 April 11-1 about the tentative agreement between the CFA and CSU Administration.

Nagel announced a similar session for Lecturers only 14 April 1-3pm.

Regalado thanked Sarraillé and CFA leaders for their work to get us to this point. He expressed gratitude that we are not striking, as that is good for everybody. He noted this was particularly good news for assistant professors, because of the terms of the Agreement. Applause.

Sarraillé expressed appreciation, but responded that it was *us* together with our allies that made this happen. We did it before and may have to do it again.

Thompson reported that the presidential search is proceeding apace. The committee has received application materials; the next stage is a meeting on 21 April on campus with the goal of reducing the number of applications to about 6 for interviews.

Thompson announced the results of Ballot #2, proposed amendment to the constitution, was 64% for and 36% against. It did not reach the 2/3rd needed so it will not be forwarded to President Sheley.

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

FAC (Sims): FAC is working on a draft of the Power Disparity policy, which will be forwarded to SEC and Senate. FAC continued to review the process, procedures, timelines, signature authority for contracts and guest speakers, artists, and other paid guests of the university, and other contracts and agreements with outside parties. They are also pursuing faculty control on updating information on their department's websites, and sent a memo to the provost regarding college organizational structure and the issue of authority and responsibility of program directors. Progress is being made on all of those and these items will probably carryover to next year.

FBAC (Peterson): FBAC has discussed the costs of different FBAC priorities and tomorrow Tillman will join us with some information on raising tenure density to 75% to conform with the goal of ACR 73.

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/ACR73_07222002.pdf.

GC (Ringstad): GC have two meetings left with a number of items still on their agenda. First, they will be reviewing guidelines for Graduate Fellowships, for which there is a small pot of money. They are discussing coverage of graduate admissions workshops previously under the auspices of CEGE, now being phased into a new centralized unit for graduate education. They will continue discussing strategic planning activities and a 2 year document relating to graduate education.; culminating experience guidelines, grade assessment and assignment when culminating activities are ongoing over multiple semesters; clearance processes; and co-authorship—which will continue into next year's discussions.

SWAS (Strahm): No report.

UEPC (Stone): Will defer to the two items on the agenda today.

7. Second Reading Items

a. 5/AS/16/GC Graduate Learning Goals

Ringstad updated: the only change since last time was the correction of a typo. Graduate council is in full support of this and appreciates the Senate taking a look at it.

No debate. Results of the vote: 38 yes, recorded as unanimous.

b. 6/AS/16/UEPC Resolution to Modify the Individual Study Policy

Stone said that UEPC discussed and remained in favor of including the dean in the process so that all players are involved in the decision making process. They added the Doctoral Research course number and that is the only change.

Peterson stated that in FBAC it was pointed out that actually this is an increase in power of deans: departments had been making decisions on Individual Study being worthwhile. FBAC became concerned that in tough budgetary times deans might be tempted to eliminate IS, despite their importance for students to do projects. Deans already set enrollment targets for departments; FBAC believes departments should have some flexibility in how they meet them. This was FBAC's stance against the policy revision. In fact, FBAC would like to send this back to UEPC to consider eliminating the dean's signature.

Regalado spoke on behalf of the Department of History against the resolution. The dean's role under the proposed policy is increased, and this is not a good idea. Part of the rationale states that instructional assignments "will be determined by the appropriate administrator in consultation with department chair or designee and/or individual faculty member." That's fair game: there is already a process whereby we can examine whether a course should go forward.

Regalado quoted from 1/AS/14/SEC Resolution on a Policy Regarding Flexibility in Teaching Assignments to Full-Time Faculty.

https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/u5556/1-as-14-sec_policy_regarding_flexibility_in_teaching_assignments_for_full-time_faculty.pdf

It is the departments' responsibility to know what is in the best interest for their curriculum and their students as well. Research assignments in IS are sometimes used directly for advancing their careers. To squash that would be extremely detrimental. The Department of History thinks it moves in a bad direction to allow budgetary concerns to impact this. This would not undermine the deans' power but, the resolution would get the flexibility resolution.

Stone responded that there have been instances in which a faculty had a number of IS students sign up, and then went to the dean for course release in the next term, and that came as a surprise to the dean. If you want to get credit for IS then the deans should be in the loop to make those decisions.

Guichard spoke against the resolution on behalf of the Department of Psychology. Faculty who have been around raised concern about the legitimacy of the signature line being there to begin with. They couldn't recall a rationale for it or a policy change regarding it. There may have been a couple of instances of deans wanting to know about IS work by faculty, but there should not be a permanent change to policy without first establishing that adding the dean's signature line was legitimate in the first place.

Carroll spoke against the proposed resolution. This is an assault on IS. It would have a powerful dampening effect on it. This began six years ago, and was then squashed by UEPC. Peterson said that we were in tough budgetary times then. But what is motivating this right now? If this is about quality control, faculty expertise should be trusted; if it is about workload, then let the departments handle their own. Carroll urged voting against, to safeguard faculty authority over curriculum.

Speaker Thompson interjected that the issue arose because he was asked a question about the form, and SEC referred it to UEPC to resolve conflict between the form and policy.

Provost said his understanding was that in the situation Stone alluded to, the faculty member took on IS, and then asked for workload compensation/credit. The IS happened in semester 1, the workload request in semester 2, which required adjusting schedule and even canceling courses, which caused difficulty with the schedule and for students.

Grobner said that this was what happened: the chair approved IS by the faculty, with no input from the dean. The next semester the faculty member asked for the workload adjustment, and this led to require a course to be canceled.

Regalado insisted that his opposition to the resolution was not meant to propose the dean not be in the loop at all, but that the workload flexibility agreement did keep deans in the loop. We have heard of one example of a misuse of IS policy, but that one instance does not give a good reason to change the policy.

Strahm asserted that she doesn't like to create a university wide policy if there isn't a university wide problem. Deans are capable people and able to say no to workload adjustments when it is appropriate to do so, for instance in cases like the instance discussed. There are things in place to respond to that. If this is a small problem, she is not sure it warrants a university wide policy.

Carroll agreed with Strahm and Regalado, and said that the resolution was like a huge dose of antibiotics for a sneeze.

Tuedio stated that when he was first interim dean in 2010, there was a push toward 24 WTU teaching workload for TT faculty. In some departments it wasn't happening and may have been due to workload credit. We have an ambiguous 24 WTU workload expectation, which doesn't mean 24 WTUS all have to be instruction, but faculty should be answerable to that expectation in some way. It can also include some assigned time. Discussions of workload between faculty and

chairs typically take place in spring for the coming Academic Year, and in fall for spring, but that conversation will not include any reference to these IS that will appear near the start of or even after a term begins. Normally IS arrive just before the census date. It will show up on their workload report. What Grobner is saying is that he'd have to assign a faculty member, say 27 WTUs, which would set in motion a grievance. The resolution is not about squashing the IS but understanding what the workload is going to mean and the discussions between faculty and chairs and deans.

Regalado said that it was not a question of competency. We have a great relationship with our dean. This should be negotiated with the chairs themselves. We have to come up with the right numbers (to meet enrollment targets). Department faculty understand their departments best, and this modification will take that away from the departments' flexibility, which will be problematic.

Carroll responded to Tuedio that it is not clear that a blanket policy as proposed is required to solve the kinds of problems being presented. In History, 3 unit and 4 unit courses sometimes end up with faculty members reaching 22 WTU, and IS makes it possible to get closer to the 24 WTU expectations.

Sarraillé expressed alarm at Tuedio's analysis. We have established with some finality that there is no 24 WTU minimum workload. There is no responsibility on anyone's part to assure that a faculty member is teaching or working 24 WTU or any other particular number. We have some precedent that in effect gives us a good case to demonstrate that units beyond 24 WTU are excessive, and win that argument and lead to a remedy for that faculty member. There is no rule that TT faculty have to have 24 WTU. Secondly, whether a faculty member conducts an IS tends to be basically the same kind of decision as any other assignment of classes. This is the department's decision and shouldn't have to go to the dean to get approval. The contract between the CSU and CFA does say that when people are assigned work, an administrator approves the workload. A distinction has to be made between what will be taught, and who will teach what. Classes can be assigned late for many reasons. This problem should be taken care of the way we assign other work and there should not be any special permission.

Strangfeld said that based on what Tuedio is saying, what we need is a policy regarding what IS means in terms of workload. If the concern is about faculty asking for IS compensation and this is surprising the deans, changing this policy may not be the best approach. Instead, we may need a policy regarding this specific issue.

Petratos averred that this is a scheduling issue and a workload issue. He suggested that if IS could be scheduled a semester ahead, then no dean signatures would be required. He does not see a difference between IS and special topics courses in that respect.

Tuedio said he was not talking about a minimum of 24 WTU, but of cases when an IS leads to a load in excess of 24 WTU. What happens when a faculty member's IS in fall, added to normal spring load, would lead to an excess. When we add courses late, the courses do get the dean's

approval, partly because we need to know who is paying for it. In some low budgetary times we need to be aware of this. The Catalog makes it clear what the course requirements are, and an IS is a course. There are additional implications if they have to hire part time faculty to teach the course. Full-time lecturers have a 30 WTU cap and cannot exceed that cap; there needs to be an understanding of the workload and compensation issues. These are reasons for deans to have the authority.

Thompson asked a point of information: does the university receive any money for IS?

Strong replied that IS generate FTES so, yes, IS generates money.

Thompson polled asked how many people have earned a course release for doing IS.

2 senators raised hands.

Stone asked how many had taught overloads.

Many senators raised hands.

Stone said that this was the problem. If a faculty member wants workload credit for it, it has to go through the administrator responsible for assigning workload.

Strahm said that the policy before us isn't dealing with that. Instead we should look into a policy that directly addresses that issue instead of changing this policy as an end run around the issue.

Carroll said that he suspected that if the policy passes, it will be harder for faculty to get IS workload credit, especially in tough budget times.

Result of the vote: 15 yes, 20 no. Motion fails.

Thompson summarized the significance of the vote: we have in place a policy that does not include a signature of the dean so the form should be altered to conform to the policy, as well as any language in the catalog.

- c. 7/AS/16/UEPC Resolution Live Sound and Recording Arts Technician Certificate Program

Stone announced that no changes were made and UEPC is fully in support of it.

Wood pointed out a typo: the word Justification in the resolution.

Sarraillé asked, how prevalent are such programs, and are these offered at similar institutions now?

Chan explained that the music department wants to expand the program's reach across the university utilizing their equipment, faculty, and courses. MJC has minimal recording, no certificate program, and no pre-BA program in music recording. Other colleges do have such.

Huang: Will this benefit the program or faculty financially?

Chan explained that the West Coast has a traditional approach to teaching music, compared to East Coast. The program will extend community outreach in Music, and of the program into music technology. Training people in a musical approach to recording will help them to be prepared to enter those fields.

Provost explained the students would come through open enrollment, and would pay tuition. They would not take preference over regular matriculated students.

Tuedio explained that these courses tend to be very low enrolled, and the program was hoping to build the enrollment by making this available. This relates to music technology. Having connection to UEE would allow funds to return to us for equipment.

Strangfeld asked if students in this certificate program who would then enroll could count courses in the cert program toward their degrees.

Tuedio replied that there is a limit, but they can apply to degrees.

Sims stated that the certificate program would actually move the Music program ahead of the curve. There is a challenge facing most Music departments, as they demand many skills as pre-requisites, for instance, experience on an instrument. That has created a great gap between those coming from traditional performance backgrounds, and those coming from non-traditional music backgrounds. Department of Music has been trying to integrate those and this is a way to start to expand this part of the program and help to give us information on how to create new kinds of degrees.

Larson said this was an opportunity for students to broaden their horizons and have something to show for it in the form of the certificate. In comparison to a music minor, which would deal with traditional musical instrument performance, it would provide a way for a student interested in music to enter into music instruction.

Result of the vote: 38 yes, recorded as unanimous.

8. First Reading Items

- a. 3/AS/16/UEPC Change in Time Modules for Course Scheduling
Moved Stone/Strahm.

Stone said UEPC made a couple of changes since this was last discussed, GC and some grad programs gave feedback. UEPC added 4-unit night timeslot. Made this effective Fall 2018 because 2017-18 schedule has already been submitted. Otherwise, much the same.

3/AS/16/UEPC Change in Time Modules for Course Scheduling

Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus recommend the attached time modules for course scheduling, and be it further

Resolved: that the attached policy for using these time modules be approved and be it further

Resolved: that this policy and the time modules be in effect for the Fall 2018 registration.

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 these time modules. Exceptions to these time modules will be approved by each college dean.

Course Module Scheduling Policy

1. The following course time modules will be used, see attached grid.
2. Courses within the time modules will be placed first. Exceptions must be requested using an Exception Request Form submitted to the college dean, and will be considered after all courses in approved time modules have been scheduled.
3. Hybrid classes must indicate which days/times they will meet.
4. Normally, no more than 80% of a department schedule shall have start times between 9 and 2 on M-R, unless rooms are available after normal scheduling. Rooms outfitted with specialized equipment i.e. fume hoods, pianos, etc., shall be exempt from the 80% requirement.

Eudey noted that is someone is teaching a hybrid class that meets half face-to-face and half are online. There is no block here for a 1 day a week.

Stone said that this was beyond what UEPC was attempting to accomplish with the policy, but if they knew when hybrid courses are going to meet face-to-face then another hybrid class could be matched with that. Right now there is no indication of when the class is actually meeting.

Eudey said that by policy, all hybrid classes must indicate in the schedule the days/times meeting face-to-face. How will these get prioritized, if, e.g., it meets three times a semester, does it get prioritized lower?

Stone said that was not UEPC's intent: it was to put puzzle pieces together.

Regalado confirmed that Stone had said UEPC had heard and included 4-unit 1 night course slots, to start at 6pm.

Petrosky said that, going back to 2005, this has come up many times. We cannot truly fix space utilization problems without partially decentralizing scheduling by assigning classrooms to

programs. There is a lot of competition for classrooms, and it is frustrating to walk through buildings and see maybe 1/3 of classes have stopped meeting by week 10 of a semester.

Guichard stated that the Department of Psychology and Child Development felt that this policy was a bit too restrictive on teaching needs overall.

Will return as second reading.

b. 8/AS/16/SEC Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems and Aerial Vehicles
Item was removed from the agenda and will return at a future date as a first reading item.

9. Information/Discussion Items:

a. Report from Facilities on Cutting of Trees, Grass, and Water Use (Hernandez and Oliveira) Time certain: 3:30pm
Hernandez provided a map which lists all the trees on campus, and highlighted the increase of trees on campus.

Cooper stated that when planning replacement plants, you've chosen non-native trees. Have you considered native grasses that wouldn't require any water at all?

Hernandez replied that there is a misconception, as there isn't anything "native." Their goal is to base planting decisions on the zone we live in, and use plants from areas that mimic these conditions, for instance, Australia. We are blessed in Central California to have a Mediterranean climate that allows for plant diversity. The only thing in this region that is considered native is grass. Some of the native species of grass are planted on the north side of Naraghi Hall.

Cooper said she was thinking of species of plants that co-evolved with animals.

Hernandez works with Stuart Wooley, and he understands that we are pushing the limits but are trying to mimic the Sierras. Some of these plants were difficult to obtain. The Sierras were easier. He had to bring plants from L.A. and San Diego to work well with local climate.

Strahm noted that Garone wrote a book on the transformation of the Central Valley from a wetlands that was destroyed for agricultural purposes. Hernandez' point that there isn't anything really native anymore is correct. Strahm noted that eucalyptus is from Australia, and asked whether they were planting them.

Hernandez noted that eucalyptus was introduced for timber, but it was not suitable, and is a known fire hazard. It is not being planted.

Wood noted that he sees the destruction of trees on a weekly basis, so he would guess that the number of trees from 2011 to today dropped dramatically.

Hernandez agreed and offered that in his 5 years working on campus; we have been eliminating many trees, partly due to the state mandate to cut back 25% on water usage. Many trees have been removed due to death or disease. Many trees were planted too close together, as the original

planners were trying to create an urban forest. They were supposed to remove some of these trees, but didn't. When they die, we have to remove them.

Wood asked about colored dots on the liquidambar trees, and asked about their meaning.

Hernandez noted the dots are codes for trees with problem. Red are trees that need to be removed. Green dots indicate trees that need to be pruned. White dots indicate trees planted in poor locations, where the gumballs cause hazards. Those trees will be sprayed with a growth regulator to retard fruiting and therefore the gumballs. The intent is not to remove those trees.

Petratos asked if it was true that anytime you cut down a mature tree, for instance a redwood, to replace the oxygen produced we'd have to replace many small trees, and it takes years to recover.

Hernandez replied that they never want to remove a tree that is healthy. If a tree is declining they need to find out what the problem is and do what they can to bring it back to life. We have a chipper on campus and all the wood from removed redwoods is utilized in our landscaping.

Sarraillé stated that the dried seed pods of liquidambars are dangerous, for instance if you slip driving a motorcycle. He also asked if the grounds crews try to remove the mistletoe early.

Hernandez noted that treating mistletoe infestation is a priority. Drought makes this more difficult because it weakens the trees. The intent is also not to plant trees susceptible any more.

Oliveira introduced himself, as Chief Engineer for Facilities, and explained he was responsible for water conservation. We have a unique system for reclaiming rainwater. The system was originally built for flood control, because the campus was outside of the city water system. All areas of the campus are involved, including lakes. Culverts collect all rainwater that falls on campus.

Water from the culverts is stored in the reflection pond. From this, it can be pumped to lakes for storage. This weekend 4 million gallons stored and pumped. This is used for watering and other non-potable uses. Reclaimed water is used for cooling. Control system installed in the last year that is web based, that also provides data on water collection and usage. When campus system is at peak, there is a pump to pump off campus. In summer, we pump from underground to control lake levels, including controlling in response to weather forecasting 10 days ahead.

Excess irrigation water is also collected, and this is also tracked by the system. Cooling tower was converted to reclaimed water. This reduced potable water consumption 20%. In one particular day last summer it was over 23% that day. Tower has a sensor to "blowdown" sediment/turbidity of water, around 8-10,000 gallons per day – and this water is also reclaimed. Future possibilities: recycling waste water – that's 55-60,000 gallons per day. One possibility is self-contained waste-water systems. Another possibility is recharging the aquifer.

This reduced potable water consumption 20%. In one particular day last summer it was over 23% that day. Tower has a sensor to "blowdown" sediment/turbidity of water, around 8-10,000 gallons per day – and this water is also reclaimed. Future possibilities: recycling waste water –

that's 55-60,000 gallons per day. One possibility is self-contained waste-water systems. Another possibility is recharging the aquifer.

Morris asked, in terms of ground water only, over the past couple of years, how many gallons being used per day to water the grass.

Oliveira clarified that no potable water is used for irrigation. We do use ground water, pumped from our well. We use a little over 90 million gallons of water per year, in addition to all the water we collect from the rain.

Maffei commented that in October we were pretty golden. The grass gets the minimum amount of water without losing it completely. They're taking out lawn areas that are smaller and trying to replace the lawn area, but only have 4 staff. Because of the irrigation systems in some areas, if we don't water the lawns, we'll lose the trees. Slowly but surely there will be less lawn on campus.

10. Open Forum

None.

11. Adjournment

4pm