

<p>Academic Senate March 24, 2015</p> <p>Present: Bettencourt, Brodie, Carroll, Colnic, Crayton, Edwards, Foreman, Gerson, Ghuman, Guichard, Hoover, Hauselt, Johnson, Littlewood, Mulder, Nagel, Olivant, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Provost Strong, Regalado, Salameh, Silverman, Stone, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Tzu-Man-Huang, Wisniewski, and Wood.</p> <p>Excused: Advanced Studies, Broadwater, Steven Filling, Barbara Manrique, and Noelle Won.</p> <p>Proxies: William Foreman for Andrew Dorsey, Koni Stone for Chad Stessman, Jeff Bernard for Brent Powell, Ann Strahm for Paul O'Brien, Tzu-Man Huang for Petrosky, Michael Tumolo for Nancy Burroughs, Ron Noble for Suzanne Espinoza</p> <p>Guests: The following guests were welcomed: John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, Lauren Byerly, Reza Kamali and James Tuedio.</p> <p>Whitney Placido, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First Reading of 7/AS/15/UEPC – Class Registration Closure Policy. Returned to UEPC for further discussion.</p> <p>Second Reading of 4/AS/15/SEC Policy for Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students. Passed.</p> <p>Second Reading of 6/AS/15/FAC/SEC Article VI. Section 3.1 & 3.2 Leaves & Awards Charge. Passed. Will go to a vote of the general faculty and then to the President for approval.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: April 21, 2015 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Koni Stone, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order
2:05PM

2. Approval of Agenda
Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 10, 2015 (distributed electronically)

Approved with slight revisions from Lynn Johnson on the discussion of the second reading item 3/AS/15/FAC-- Charge for the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate 27/AS/13/FAC Resolution on Increased Student Evaluation of Courses which revised 33/AS/13/FAC – Amendment to 9/AS/93/FAC- Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching (Previously 3/AS/89/FAC).

4. Introductions

The following guests were welcomed: John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, David Lindsay, Lauren Byerly, Reza Kamali and James Tuedio.

5. Announcements

Speaker Carroll congratulated the outstanding faculty award winners; Lynn Johnson was recognized as the outstanding faculty governance award recipient. Lynn is an excellent role model for the rest of us. For the senators who teach in Bizzini hall, there is a noise policy forth coming. There is still an issue about noise. It can be disruptive to people in adjoining rooms, so please be courteous to your fellow faculty in adjoining rooms.

Gerson announced that there is a reception to honor the faculty who were awarded promotion and or tenure in 2014. The reception will be in the FDC at 4 pm tomorrow. Dates for the RPT

workshops have been determined: Monday, May 4th, 1:00-2:30pm, and Tuesday, May 5th, 12-1:30pm in FDC 118.

Strahm stated that the CFA has a white paper about administrator salaries, and Colnic added that senators could get the paper and other CFA information at <http://www.calfac.org/cfa-headlines>

Byerly announced that the Hildegard Festival includes a concert sponsored by the Turlock Concert Association (it is their 75th year). The concert will be performed by CSU, Stanislaus faculty and students. Cookies will be served. Season subscribers to the Turlock Concert Association for next year will get to attend this concert for free.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Strahm reported that SWA passed a resolution to send to Wiley and Sons. This resolution requests that they cease bundling journals that institutions don't want.

Regalado inquired about the vacancy for the Sacramento State presidency. The hiring process is underway. Does our president have any designs on that position? Carroll had heard that interviews were conducted yesterday. Our president was in Long Beach yesterday. The Provost added that there is a BOT meeting today and tomorrow in Long Beach.

7. First Reading Item:

a. 7/AS/15/UEPC – Class Registration Closure Policy

Moved by Strahm, seconded by Foreman. This resolution reduces workload on Enrollment services and it provides clarity by replacing conflicting policies. They received 209 petitions for adding before census but after the last day to add (without a petition). This policy extends the time to add without penalty (no petition, no fee) to 14 days. Permission numbers are required to add classes after 9:59 pm before the first instructional day.

California State University Stanislaus

7/AS/15/UEPC – Class Registration Closure Policy

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves a policy that all classes shall be closed to open registration at 9:59 p.m. the day before classes are scheduled to begin; and be it further

Resolved: That the addition of students following the beginning of instruction shall be at the discretion of the instructor by the use of permission numbers, or their equivalent; and be it further

Resolved: That students may add a course section without penalty through the Last Day to Add; for Fall and Spring, the Last Day to Add is 14 calendar days from the day that classes begin; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy be effective beginning with the Fall 2015 semester; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy supersedes **4/AS/05/UEPC Adding a Course Policy** (Amended and Approved May 19, 2005) and revises the **12/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Class Registration Closure Policy** (Approved by President Shirvani on October 25, 2010).

Rationale: There has been inconsistency between the two policies. This revision clarifies expected practice. The 14 days were chosen to allow for two class meetings. Faculty retain responsibility for allowing students to enter their course via permission number.

AS:rlc UEPC approved 3/12/15

Littlewood suggested that the 2nd and 3rd resolves be reversed. State last date to add, and then add that permission numbers are required. Jaasma added that we have Saturday classes, so we need to consider Saturday as an instructional day. Nagel asked what “no penalty” meant in the current 3rd resolved. Does no penalty mean no fee, or does it mean the faculty member does not penalize the student for adding the class late. Foreman clarified that no penalty meant no financial penalty. The word financial should be added.

Tuedio queried about a scenario involving pressure to keep enrollment under the enrollment cap. Faculty are under pressure to add students to classes during this period. What if we can’t enroll students in such an open way? How do we put limits on faculty handing out permission numbers?

Strahm added that this policy does not preclude administration from shortening enrollment. In UEPC, we understand that faculty add students when there are open seats. This policy allows for students to sort themselves into classes that they are prepared to take. Provost Strong stated that administration could waive the policy due to current conditions as far in advance as possible. Policy does not preclude administration from closing registration. Next year will be very challenging. We are projected to be 107% of our target next year. We are working on remedies, and trying to get some additional FTES added to our target. This last year was the most challenging.

Wisniewski needed clarification, how are students helped to exit the class? Strahm responded that there are a variety of scenarios that lead to students dropping a course. The faculty can add students to a course when enrolled students drop. Students drop if the pre-requisites are not met or the student is enrolled in the wrong course for their major. Wisniewski has an issue with faculty who will not add students who struggled in the first week. Colnic stated that this resolution has nothing to do with the instructor dropping students. Speaker Carroll concurred with Senator Colnic. This resolution was returned to UEPC for further discussion.

8. Second Reading Items

a. 4/AS/15/SEC Policy for Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

Speaker Carroll summarized the changes:

3.1 Eligibility and restrictions, removed the 3 WTU ceiling as per Nagel's suggestion
4.2 Application procedures: exchanged two pages for 500 word limit
Review Criteria: Per Gerson, changed "ranked" to "evaluate". Took language directly from the CBA, and removed "assessment" and added "service" as per Nagel's concerns.
Conditions of Assigned time: Concern for the report to address whether the activity was completed and whether it accomplished its intended goals (as best could be determined.)
If the policy is approved it will be put in place in fall 2015.

Gerson is in favor of the changes and LAC can work with this. Thompson clarified that there may be some people who do assessment and accreditation which could be considered service to students. Even with the specific language removed, these activities could still be awarded. Foreman called the question, Strahm seconded. Vote: 36 Yes, 0 No, 2 Abstained. This approved resolution will be sent to the President.

b. 6/AS/15/FAC/SEC Article VI. Section 3.1 & 3.2 Leaves & Awards Charge

This is a slight change in the LAC charge; no changes were made after the first reading. This requires a constitutional amendment. Instead of LAC members recusing themselves for the year, they just recuse themselves from the term that they have a conflict. Emeritus status is awarded automatically after 15 years of service. There was no discussion. Speaker Carroll called the vote. Vote: 36 Yes, 0 No, 2 Abstained. The amendment passed and will go to a vote of the general faculty and then forwarded to the President for approval.

9. Discussion Item:

a. Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty on Campus, Speaker Carroll: SWAS passed a resolution acknowledging the contributions of non-tenured faculty and encouraging campuses to include non-tenured faculty in faculty governance.

FAC has been considering this resolution and believes that we need a broader discussion across departments before we can decide what to do as a campus. She noted that the SWAS resolution was unanimously approved. She then read all five of the resolved statements:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge the contributions of lecturers and non-tenure track librarians, coaches and counselors to the value of the Constitution; and be it further

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); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU, while maintaining its strong resolve to increase the percentage of tenure-track positions per ACR73 recommendation, and in deference to campus and departmental autonomy, encourage campus senates to review or revise policies in order to encourage the participation of all faculty unit employees in governance matters, wherever appropriate. Participation of non-tenure track faculty in shared governance in the CSU should not supplant the purview of tenured and probationary faculty and should be fairly compensated; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association, and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

Johnson then referred to the AAUP document. This is the body (AAUP) that we cite in support of faculty governance.

FAC recommends that the Senate examine the following recommendations in the AAUP document:

RECOMMENDATION 1: 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.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Eligibility for voting and holding office in institutional governance bodies should be the same for all faculty regardless of full- or part-time status. Institutions may wish to establish time-in-service- eligibility requirements; if the eligibility requirement for full-time faculty is expressed in calendar time (for instance, a year), it would have to be translated into terms (for instance, two semesters) applicable to part-time faculty in order to accommodate those who teach intermittently.

RECOMMENDATION 3: While reserving a specified number of seats for contingent faculty may be adopted as a transitional mechanism to ensure at least some contingent faculty representation in institutional governance bodies, ideally there should be no minimum or maximum number of seats reserved in institutional governance bodies where representation of contingent faculty is appropriate, as described elsewhere in this report.

RECOMMENDATION 4: 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.

Johnson explained that our constitution limits membership of the general faculty to all full time academic and closely related employees. Part time faculty members have privilege of debate, but no vote. This is at odds with AAUP recommendations. This is an important nationwide discussion. We need to rethink the role that a large number of our faculty play and consider what they could contribute to governance. We need to discuss voting rights and committee membership. What will be the implications? There could be changes to our constitution. FAC thinks we need to have a serious, thoughtful conversation about the role of our part time colleagues in faculty governance. Do we want to become more inclusive or stay exclusive? The bargaining unit is more inclusive. There's very little in governance that contingent faculty can participate in. We should consider: What kind of voting rights should part-time faculty have? What qualifications for voting rights? Those parts of our constitution that require a certain percentage of votes in order to bring a petition forward might need to be changed. We recommend that as a starting point the Senate have a conversation and take the issues back to their departments.

Foreman had three comments:

1. There is a gap between the SWAS resolution and AAUP. The AAUP document does not mention coaches, the SWAS resolution does.
2. The SWAS resolution specifically states in the 4th resolved "shall not supplant the purview of tenured faculty". What is our purview?
3. This will significantly increase the number of voters.

Ghuman: Are the motivations different for tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty? How do we reconcile different motivations? The trend is to hire more and more part time instructors and lecturers. Would we be giving in to that trend, or would we be bucking the trend?

Johnson responded that these are valid questions. The last concern Ghuman raised is certainly something FAC is concerned about. SWAS and AAUP state that the movement should be towards more tenure track faculty, and also recognizes the need for more collegiality and inclusivity of those who are not.

This is not meant to replace tenure track faculty, but to be more inclusive. The motivation for all of us is different. Even among tenure track faculty. Regalado stated that there are two tiers of faculty and the system is based on the conditions of service. For lecturers, there is no expectation of scholarship and no expectation of a full time workload. The part time faculty may have other interests and work at other places as well. There is a two tier system for a reason, as other factors are considered with respect to voting rights.

Johnson was speaking for herself in advocating for a more inclusive role for part-timers, not FAC. FAC has not arrived at a consensus and is not making any recommendation other than that the general faculty should begin discussions of this topic. She, as FAC chair, will not be

directing this discussion. Colnic added that this is a provocative change. We have multiple tiers in the faculty ranks. A potential positive would be the gain in expertise from having increased participation. When the part time faculty chooses to serve we could gain from their expertise.

Thompson added that motivation comes from expectation. RPT for tenure track faculty includes the expectation of service. This is evidenced by the large number of junior faculty who want to serve on FDC for RPT purposes. Strahm responded to Mark and Ghuman, she is in favor of adding voting rights, but she is concerned about the ability of tenure track faculty to get on to committees for RPT. Would opening up membership to part time faculty create too much competition and prevent tenure track faculty from serving on committees?

Ghuman was told that he would be a Senator. He had motivation to be a senator to complete what his department told him to do. Eventually, he got some internal motivation. The Senate is so much fun. How does service become part of the part time faculty's motivation?

Johnson responded that providing an opportunity does not equate to forming an expectation that they will serve. Is it appropriate to find a place for them to contribute? For non-tenure-track faculty teaching multiple classes, this is a large part of who they are. We want to be careful not to create an expectation that is not compensated. If they are not motivated, they would not participate and there would be no expectation that they would. Regalado asked if this discussion would continue or are we moving towards policy?

Speaker Carroll clarified that FAC wanted to get a discussion started. Johnson added that FAC would like to have a sense of what the issues are, to what extent does this make sense for us? We want to encourage faculty to begin having discussions. FAC did not arrive at any conclusions. FAC decided that the best step before going further was to open up the discussion on a wider basis.

Regalado is the History Department senator and he is echoing their concerns. At this time, Johnson personally thinks that we should be more inclusive. Nagel stated that the AAUP, in this document and others, draws a line between governance and academic freedom. The position argued there, as he sees it, is that without the capacity to act academically freely, the phrase 'academic freedom' is a set of empty words. Shared governance is fundamental to the exercise of academic freedom. Excluding non-tenure-track faculty from shared governance is excluding non-tenure-track faculty from exercising academic freedom.

Thompson asked what is available to members of the general faculty. What committees, what offices, what voting responsibilities? Nagel responded, just the Clerk position. Nagel informed us that on April 18th, there will be a lecturer conference to discuss the role of non-tenure track full time faculty. They hope to find out the roles of contingent faculty in faculty governance across the system. For example how many Academic Senate seats are available at each campus? 15 campuses have dedicated seats. There are 9 dedicated seats at one campus. For more information about lecturers please visit the CFA link: <http://www.calfac.org/lecturers-council>

Regalado was concerned that part time non-tenured faculty will have the ability to vote on matters that they may not be involved in later. Speaker Carroll encouraged all senators to read the documents provided and to read our constitution at this link:

<https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/FacultyHandbook/GeneralFaculty/genfaconstitution.pdf>

10. Open Forum

Nagel moved to adjourn.

11. Adjournment

4pm