

<p><b>Academic Senate</b>  <b>March 8, 2016</b>  <b>Present:</b> Alvim, Azevedo, Bell, Cooper, Crayton, Dorsey, Eastham, Espinoza, Garcia, Regalado, Gonzales, Guichard, Hauselt, Hoover, Huang, Larson, Loza, McCulley, Nagel, Odeh, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Ringstad, Sims, Strangfeld, Strickland, Provost Strong, Stone, Strahm, Taylor, Thompson, Vang, Wagner, Wellman, Wood and Zhang.</p> <p><b>Excused:</b> Advanced Studies, Broadwater, and Bernard.</p> <p><b>Proxies:</b> R. Floyd for Bettencourt and Manrique, Sarraillé for Silverman, Strahm for Filling.</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Dennis Shimek, Ron Gonzalez, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Nancy Burroughs, Mark Grobner, Diana Bowman, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Paula Barrington-Schmidt, Marcy Chvasta, Glenn Pillsbury, Betsy Eudey, Diana Bowman, Scott Davis, and Lauren Byerly</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Discussed: Definition of "Faculty" &amp; Voting Rights and Presidential Search</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:  March 22, 2016  2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room 118</p> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Chris Nagel Clerk</p>
---	--

**1. Call to order**

2:04pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Alter to change item 8a from first reading to information/discussion item and leave it in place at request of VP Shimek.

- 3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 23, 2016** (distributed electronically)  
Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Guests: Dennis Shimek, Ron Gonzalez, Marge Jaasma, Helene Caudill, Nancy Burroughs, Mark Grobner, Diana Bowman, James Tuedio, David Lindsay, Paula Barrington-Schmidt, Marcy Chvasta, Glenn Pillsbury, Betsy Eudey, Diana Bowman, Scott Davis, and Lauren Byerly

**5. Announcements**

Sarraillé announced CFA is planning a strike to begin on 13-19 April, minus the weekend. They expect to be picketing all entrances to campuses. CFA also welcome staff to join, when they are not working, and students, members of the community, and retired CSU Faculty as well.

Pillsbury announced a series of presentations with Gerson on academic integrity in online or hybrid classrooms, 18 March 9:30am to 1:30pm. This will include demos from vendors who offer online property services. The CO has made a deal for special pricing with those vendors. The presentations include a faculty panel featuring an all-star cast presenting thoughts on academic integrity in the classroom. Lunch will be provided, so RSVP to Emy.

Floyd reminded all that there are twice weekly meditation groups on Monday and Thursday from 12:15 to 1pm in FDC 118. If you need instructions, you can contact her or April Hejka-Ekins. Your presence will be honored and you will leave refreshed.

Espinoza provided an enrollment update: headcount for spring 2016 compared to 2015 is up 2.9%. Enrollment is 1.4% above the CSU CO target.

Strong explained that the university had robust increases in enrollment in Stockton that had a positive effect here on the Turlock campus. 564 headcount in Stockton is an increase of 251 taking at least one WTU in Stockton. Stockton FTES is up 93 which is 96%. That group of students at Stockton has a positive impact on our campus. Instead of FTES taken from Turlock, the overall increase in Stockton represents 3% of our target. Without a robust increase in Stockton it would have been a different situation regarding the enrollment target. Growth in Stockton helps the university overall.

### **1. Committee Reports/Questions (FAC, FBAC, GC, SWAS, UEPC, other)**

FAC (Sims): FAC are reviewing the draft of the Power Disparity Policy which will incorporate some language from EO 1096, and will move forward to this body. They are finally considering options for a faculty forum to replace Facnet. They continue to investigate options to make it easier for faculty to update information on department websites. Lastly, they are continuing to review campus wide procedures, timelines, etc. for contracts and agreements with outside parties for performances, lecturers, etc. They are currently awaiting Shimek's part of this process.

FBAC (Peterson): FBAC continued to discuss costs of the goals approved by the senate. They looked at reports from S. Young on resources needed to continue programs related to the CEGE grant. They considered the need for graduate school leadership in order to win more grants for support of graduate students. Shimek has been asked to provide an equity comparison for psychological counselors. Remaining on their agenda are carryover items including TT counseling positions and research startup funds for new science faculty.

GC (Ringstad): GC hadn't met since the last senate meeting. Ringstad reminded that GC have revised the graduate learning goals, and that item will come to the senate. They continue to discuss strategic moves to centralize graduate education, and hope to advocate for that to be a budget priority. They will also continue to discuss Graduate School fellowships. Finally, they contributed ideas and language to presidential search committee.

SWAS (Strahm): Resolutions that were passed included the following. (1) Resolution reaffirming the principles of shared governance in the CSU, requesting that the Chancellor articulate how his use of the term "shared leadership" conforms to and differs from HEERA. (2) Support for requiring a fourth year of quantitative reasoning to get into the university. CSU currently requires three years. Strahm managed to have them add an amendment recommending that the CSU investigate the potential disparate impact of these requirements on students from historically underserved populations. (3) Resolution on selection of faculty to serve on campus honorary degree committees. The resolution expresses concern about the BoT policy that provides for "consultation" rather than specifying that faculty select their own representatives. (4) Preventing workplace bullying in the CSU, reaffirming that at the university different perspectives can be tolerated and respected, and that members of campus should address one another respectfully, and administration should promote inclusive environments.

SWAS also discussed concerns about communications from campus presidents and administration about stating that faculty should not discuss potential strike action in class. The determination of what is appropriate to discuss in class is a decision for faculty.

UEPC (Stone): UEPC continues to work on course time modules. Stone said she appreciates the feedback already received, and asked for more. The committee is also working on cleaning up the discrepancy between the Individual Study policy and form. They will meet with VP Shimek to discuss. They are working on timeline for academic program review, and reviewing the process for Selected and Special Topics courses.

## **2. Second Reading Item:**

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

Speaker Thompson began by noting the discussion, partly in senate and partly outside of senate, about process. Process is king and long lives the king. We have had a reasonable discussion and when we cast a vote it will be based on our conscience. The process was lengthy to provide time for all to reflect, research, and participate. Thompson lauded the work of the FAC and all committees that have worked on this process. In various venues the motion of 1 AS has been criticized. Thompson could understand that, if the prior senate meeting was the only meeting that one had attended, one might be concerned about the way the item was moved. But no senator has complained about it. Senators have been regularly briefed on it at each meeting. Senate has reached a point where 1 AS is an action item after months of update and discussion.

Sims reviewed changes to the resolution. First, FAC elected to withdraw 2/AS/FAC/16 that concerned voting rights. The intent of FAC in proposing the second resolution was to make the effects of 1/AS/16/FAC clearer. Instead, it confused things. No governance action is needed to update the Faculty Handbook. The handbook is descriptive, not prescriptive: when there are changes to the constitution of the general faculty or in the CBA then it's up to FAC to update the Faculty Handbook in response to those changes. No action of the Senate is required. Hence they withdrew that resolution. The explanation of changes in voting rights, should the proposed amendment to the constitution be ratified and approved, are provided on pgs. 6, 7, 8 in the senate packet as informational items only.

Sims briefly explained how the document was laid out. Section A is the current voting rights as described in the Faculty Handbook. On pg. 5 there is one note about the changes. On pg. 6 the voting rights appear, as they would change following the constitutional amendment, to show what the effect of proposed changes to the constitution would be.

Regarding 1/AS/15 FAC, Sims noted that FAC made a few changes and edits. In the first resolved clause they changed the word below to the word attached. This also clarified the resolution by separating the amendments from the action of the resolution itself. The Senate is not voting on whether to approve these amendments. The constitution can only be amended by a 2/3 vote of the general faculty and approval of the president.

Among the amendments, FAC had proposed, in the interest of clarity, to change the term general faculty to simply faculty throughout the constitution. Again, this apparently caused confusion, so although this was not a substantive change, FAC withdrew it.

Wellman, speaking for Politics/PADM, said that they want to see proportionate representation. If FAC were to pursue that how would that occur?

Sims replied that his first response to that question when he heard it was to review his notes from the 9 February senate meeting, before the resolution was offered. Part B of the discussion information provided explicitly asked all the senators if there should be any restrictions on voting rights, and if so, what would be the preferred way to limit them. Sims read from the minutes of the meeting:

*(Then there is item B, as follows: should there be any restrictions on voting right for faculty? Three potential options were presented: no restrictions (one faculty member, one vote); restrictions based on time in service (e.g., two years); or restrictions based on time base (e.g., 0.4 FTEF—erroneously stated as 0.4 WTU in distributed documents).*

The feedback Sims got from the Senate was, no, there should not be restrictions to voting rights, because investment is reciprocal, and attempting to enforce the restrictions would produce unnecessary workload for staff, since the number of faculty shifts from year to year. At the end of that meeting Sims had said that your homework assignment is to consult with your departments. From that time until just a few days ago he heard no feedback about it. FAC members were all surprised by the recent call for restricted voting.

Speaker Thompson interjected that he wanted to be sure the discussion was on target, and to alert people to a couple of things about the discussion. All senators have a chance to speak, and so do our guests. Our standing rules allow for the privileging of speakers that haven't spoken yet. Also Thompson will set a limit of 2 minutes per speaker. We will require a 2/3 vote to call the question and go to a vote at any time.

Petrosky said that the MOM department values their non-TT faculty, who are for the most part area professionals who give up their time to teach for them. Those who fear this amendment, instead of trying to limit participation of non-TT faculty, might treat them a bit better.

Wellman said his concern was about process. He supports what FAC is trying to do, but some in his department do not. If FAC should decide to revisit the issue of proportionate voting, how could that occur?

Sims replied that at this point, the process is in motion. Once an amendment is proposed and presented to the senate, the senate has three meetings to discuss it, and then FAC has 20 days to send the proposed amendment to a vote of the general faculty. Sims would have to discuss with the FAC whether they would want to change or withdraw the proposed amendment. In the last

couple of meetings there has been consensus in the FAC that they believe in the amendments as proposed.

Wellman asked if the amendments to the constitution was “coupled with” the one-person-one vote model.

Sims explained that the amendment, if passed, would have the effect of extending the right to vote to all faculty.

Sarraillé asked to clarify procedural details. If the amendment is not approved then possibly at another time an amendment could come through that would include proportionate voting.

Regalado reported that the Department of History still has many problems with this proposal. Many are echoed in recent exchange on Facnet. Faculty had a chance to weigh in on this a long time ago, but eleventh hour or not, what if the late statements are viable? What if some of the reactions are contributions to make it better—do we ignore them? To quote Yogi Berra, it’s not over until it’s over. We should value that feedback whenever it comes in the debate. We have heard mainly speculation about what the proposed amendments will achieve. There is a model out there that hasn’t been explored in terms of proportionate votes. One of our sister institutions is working with this model and this has not been explored. What is San Jose University doing? This information could be helpful to make the amendment much better. The History Department encourages that exploration. Regalado said he would like to table the resolution to a date certain, to provide FAC time to look at that model.

Thompson interrupted to inform Regalado his time had expired.

Regalado moved to table. Wagner seconded.

Thompson provided the information that in the standing rules tabling something makes it dead for that college year. He explained what it means to table this resolution. The senate has an opportunity to make a recommendation to the general faculty on whether to vote for the amendments or not. If we table that, it doesn’t function the way tabling often does. It does not kill the amendments. It would mean that the senate is declining to make any statements to general faculty about the amendments; it is not a statement for or against.

Sims said that would have been his first comment. He cited Article 7 of the constitution on the point raised by the Speaker. If the resolution was tabled, the senate would be removing themselves from commenting on this issue. He would be disappointed about that. This body should matter and should have an opportunity to speak to the amendments. Sims expressed his frustration from all the what if’s and the presumption that the FAC hasn’t received a tremendous amount of feedback throughout the year. We have received a lot of feedback. The amendments were constructed very thoughtfully and with a lot of deliberation with a lot of folks, and they reflect the information given to FAC very accurately.

Sarraillé spoke against the motion to table, because he was trying to figure out what the objections are. He could see no scenario or proposed flaw in the proposed amendment. If some do, he said, he hoped that they could state what they are in less than 2 minutes.

Regalado said he was not sure of Sims' position. At one point he was saying we are not engaged and now saying we are engaged. All we are doing at this point is suggesting that there is now a template out there for us. If that was known before, why didn't FAC provide that before, to at least seriously consider. As long as that information is out there, to provide a fact-based basis to consider the amendment, we should pay attention to that, rather than making decisions on purely speculation.

Sims said he will let his previous speech stand.

Strahm spoke against the motion to table. We are competent human beings and we are able to decide what kind of governance structure we have, and that doesn't require us to follow another model. She shared the language from the SWAS resolution on shared governance.

## Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance in the California State University: A Call to Campus Senates

### AS-3199-15/FA (Rev)

**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.

**RATIONALE:** *The resolution is informed by the AAUP statistics from 2009: 75.6% of US faculty appointments were off the tenure track. In responding to this disturbing nationwide trend, ASCSU continues to urge progress toward, and adherence to the goals of ACR 73, and has stated its continued support in several past resolutions (e.g. [AS-3142-13/FA](#) etc.). Additionally, ASCSU has voiced its support for campuses to include non-tenure track faculty in policies concerning eligibility for emeritus status ([AS-3157-13/FA](#)), Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) funding ([AS-3173-14/FA \[Rev\]](#)), and for protections against any deleterious impacts upon non-tenure track faculty related to their participation in shared governance activities ([AS-2931-09/FA \[Rev\]](#)). These resolutions, taken in the ensemble, point toward the recognition of the value of all faculty unit employees including non-tenure track lecturers, coaches, counselors, and librarians in the life of the institution, and lead toward a recommendation for the inclusion of these categories under the campus definition of 'faculty members'. Additionally, such a definition of these categories as 'faculty' conforms to the current CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) definition of the term "Faculty Employees" (2.13) (<http://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2012-2014-0#definitions>). Furthermore, the January, 2013 AAUP policy document on "The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments" refers to the 1970 Interpretive Comment on the 1940 "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," asserting that "both the protection of academic freedom and the requirements of academic responsibility apply not only to the full-time probationary and the tenured teacher, but also to all others, such as part-time faculty" (<http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/F780FD9B-92A4-4D41-B373-18BBEBEE64D3/0/ContingentFacultyAndGovernance.pdf>), and recommends shared governance opportunities for those off the tenure track in order to achieve the desired goal of increased "equity among academic colleagues." NOTE BENE: this resolution in no way holds that an expansion of participation in faculty governance obviates the fundamental and formative value of tenure to the life of the university, and strongly advises against any application of its recommendation as pretext for the erosion or*

*diminution of tenure. Instead, the generative principle of this resolution lies in the belief that in order to strengthen the values of academic freedom, shared governance, and collegiality, the voice of non-tenure track lecturers, coaches, counselors, and librarians, as part of a unified faculty, deserves to be heard through participation in appropriate channels of non-obligatory faculty governance, and encourages campuses to find methods of fair compensation for such non-obligatory service.*

**Approved Unanimously – January 23, 2015**

Regalado said that it would not be precedent setting. We have at this university looked at other models. This is not rocket science. He asked why seeking to look at how San Jose State handled proportionality seemed to be a threat. He expressed hope that faculty members could do such simplistic research.

Byerly said that if she was not mistaken, recently Nagel compiled relevant language from several constitutions and that information is out there. The deliberation is not working on speculation. Several campuses have inclusive definitions of faculty and inclusion of part-time faculty in voting rights, and have not fallen apart. No one is rushing. Frankly if it is voted down then a new version can come back.

Sims said that the characterization of “making it better” is a question of opinion. FAC investigated this question for a couple of months, and concluded for a number of reasons that one person one vote was the best option. The senate should have an opportunity to weigh in whether or not to recommend the faculty vote for the amendment.

Regalado responded that improving an amendment is not just an opinion; it’s what we should be doing. It’s not an opinion, it’s an approach.

Hoover called the question. Nagel seconded. 36 yes, 5 no and 1 abstained.

Motion to table failed. 12 Yes, 29 No, 1 abstained.

Strahm spoke in favor of the resolution, and noted that SWAS has directed campuses to please add non-TT faculty to shared governance. She is loath for a majority to vote for a minority’s right to enfranchisement. She would like us to be able to take this to our colleagues to exercise their franchise to decide whether to allow others’ franchise.

Nagel spoke in favor of the resolution. The amendment expresses change that aligns with equitable treatment for all faculty, and acknowledges the legitimate right to take part in decisions about who would represent faculty to recommend policies that concern all our work. Those who teach have expertise in their own areas expertise. That expertise is what gives them legitimacy in their professions.

Regalado spoke against the resolution. The concerns are legitimate, and nothing to do with the legitimacy of expanded rights of non-TT faculty. He believed that more information is needed and has not been fully vetted, and that doing so is not reasonable.

Sims stated that the senate does not have the authority to move along or not move along with this amendment. The general faculty will be given a lot of information when they vote. There appears to be a presumption that there will be a ballot with no information attached. FAC will contextualize these amendments and will provide a rationale, and the general faculty will have time to review and discuss these and make their decisions.

Sarraillé had a technical question: second resolved says “amendment effective upon approval of GF vote and by the president.” That is true whether or not we approve it, because it’s part of the constitutional process, so he wondered why it was in the resolution.

Thompson said the resolution can only be recommendatory but FAC does have to put an effective date on the amendments when it goes to the GF. That is why it’s included.

Sims explained further that the date was included because faculty constitution includes those steps; it was included in the resolution to make it clear to the senate that for the senate it is a recommendation.

29 yes and 10 no 3 abstained.

### **3. First Reading**

#### **3/AS/16/SEC Time, Manner, and Place of Expression policy**

Shimek noted that this has been an item in a number of meetings. Recently he consulted with a number of groups and met with FAC, which led to some editing. One obligation Shimek has is to share the draft policy with bargaining units. He asked for the policy to be removed as a first reading item pending those consultations, so that the draft policy heard in senate would be finalized.

Thompson explained further that having the consultation with unions first, the resolution if passed will go into effect following the president’s signature, and won’t have to wait on the unions to confer on this. It’s an important policy and will probably come back as a first reading item. Thompson asked for feedback for SEC or Shimek.

Cooper noticed that at the bottom of pg. 15, restrictions on free speech activities that the word union is underlined. She asked if this was purposeful.

Thompson clarified that it was to indicate a change made in the document at some point. Shimek confirmed this.

Wood asked if we are permitted to ask questions about the policy.

Wood asked why camping or lodging on campus was included in the policy.

Sims noted that FAC discussed this. In protests groups will actually camp in places and that is what is being responded to in the policy.

Wood followed up by asking about students emulating homelessness by camping in the quad. Would that be prohibited?

Sims said the interpretation of SEC was through the provision on the next page, pg. 16 referring to outdoor events. We read that as stating there is a mechanism to allow an overnight awareness event, which is different from a spontaneous act.

Petrosky repeated his concern that the only conceivable purpose is to constrain the duration of a protest. Often times the conviction of a protesting group is exhibited by its endurance. The provision in the policy should be removed.

Regalado asked about the top discussion on the top of pg. 15 of the designated area for free speech. There had been traditionally a free speech rock in the quad. Is the area still designated for that? Can the university now suggest where protest takes place?

Thompson attempted to answer. Both he and Peterson have brought up the free speech rock area. Shimek's position was that nobody is prohibited from that area, but that the designation of that area could be misconstrued as being the only place for free speech.

Shimek confirmed that the rock area is available for free speech.

Guichard asked about the second paragraph on pg. 20, which suggests that one may as a public employee be required to sign on to a particular message even if contrary to one's own personal views. Why is this needed?

Shimek replied that it refers to a job someone has been hired to perform. For example, people in advancement who have as part of their job communicating positions of the university and BoT to the legislature. It is not a generic statement that someone who does not have that job would be required to articulate the university's official position.

This will return to the senate as a first reading item.

**4. Information/Discussion Item:**  
**a. Course Scheduling**

Guichard reported Psych/CDEV has a lot of thoughts about course scheduling modules. One faculty member wanted her to say publicly that they want greater flexibility for three unit two-day schedule so that those who teach 2 days could keep MW schedule.

Davis said that was the overwhelming preference of English faculty, and putting to fit 200 classes in a T/R time module is virtually impossible.

Petrosky said it may be useful if we had a document that outlines which programs go outside the current time modules, for public shaming. Secondly, he repeated, perhaps we'll never get everyone to conform, and perhaps the better route would be to decentralize scheduling and assign certain rooms to certain programs.

Cooper reported that most in her department hate the MWF schedule, especially when it involves having to walk across campus. Fifty minute classes are also a poor fit for their teaching, because of time wasted setting up and travel. They are strongly in favor of MW/TR schedule with special classes allotted to Fridays.

Petrosky said that if he remembered correctly, part of the problem was longer classes on one day a week in what is usually a MWF time block. If on the other hand, if we offered only shorter periods of MW/TR and opened Friday to longer sections, perhaps that could accommodate those.

Eudey said that three unit, one day a week classes are very difficult to work around. If someone is taking TR class at 12:30 they will not be able to take a class that overlaps.

Stone replied that is what UEPC are trying to eliminate: three hour classes in the middle of the day.

Thompson asked if anyone has taught a three hour class during the day on Friday.

Guichard said she had, it was a lecture course, and it was great. Attendance was good.

Burroughs said she had as well, and it was enjoyable, and campus was quiet. She didn't have any problems.

Hauselt noted that in Geography it is very important to be able to schedule four-unit courses on Friday afternoons. Their students are still able to take MWF morning classes. The Friday scheduling is important for their field classes.

Strahm remarked that it is actually nice to have three-hour class on Friday. The only problem she finds is that the later in the afternoon the class is set; students begin to get a bit tired by 4pm.

Regalado said his impression from Stones report is that classes at unpopular times were problematic because they weren't being utilized. He suggested that some professors are worried that their classes will be pulled if they don't meet the enrollment. A possibility would be to work with the deans to lower the target numbers for classes scheduled at unpopular times, as an inducement to draw more people into those less popular slots.

Stone said that she believed the provost said that courses haven't been cancelled lately.

Strong replied that the university is not canceling many.

Tuedio said that some classes are being weeded out, and sections shifted to where there's more demand.

Petrosky noted one space utilization issue that hasn't been discussed: if you wander around the campus, the first ten weeks the classes are full, but in the last five weeks they get a little sparser.

Strong said we have to keep in mind that this becomes a bigger problem as the enrollment grows. Our academic mission is most important but our economic situation is also important. Enrollment growth has advantages economically. The problem will get more difficult, so work on the issue is extremely important.

Tuedio raised another topic that he believed would become more relevant every year: the placing of hybrid courses. Already there are many hybrid courses on our schedule. Some are increasingly more like online courses, with few but tactically important face-to-face sessions. We need to figure out how to schedule this to make effective use of classrooms that are vacated much of the time.

Eudey suggested that for flipped classrooms and doing more group based activities, the 75 minute time blocks are very helpful. Trying to have them all on T/R forces a lot of classes to be scheduled on those days. She could not recall when she last taught a 50 minute class, because work in gender studies is very project and group oriented. Prohibiting MW 75 minute classes forces faculty to all work the same schedule, and reduces options and classes available to students.

Nagel asked what mechanisms for enforcing the policy might look like.

Petrosky suggested an incentive to programs: if they follow the procedures in semester N, they could have first priority to the rooms in semester N+1.

Peterson opined that the incentive that had been discussed was that if your class was conformed to the schedule module, it will automatically be placed in a room, and if not, your class would be last on the priority list.

Petratos noted that this is also an opportunity to have more online courses, self-support courses, or utilizing the weekend.

## **5. Open Forum**

Wood said he has been debating for over a year to bring this up. The drought will return and water shortages will continue. If you walk across campus, you will see lots of green lawn which will require lots of water. Meanwhile, trees are being destroyed on a weekly basis. Can't get a

straight answers about planning for campus flora from Facilities has been challenging. Would it be appropriate for them to come to senate to present their vision?

Sarraillé responded that this resonates with him as well. He sent an email and expressed his concern about trees in the courtyard of DBH. They are full of mistletoe and are dying. No one is doing anything about that. Once you notice mistletoe, it has been there for a long time. The trees give us back oxygen. It's probably true that the trees are more important than the lawns. The people that are doing the day-to-day work are not determining priorities—it's not their responsibility. He has suggested numerous times that we go to native plants. Biological Sciences has done some really good things creating pockets of native plants on campus.

The Provost said he and Deans Grobner and Tuedio, among others, heard a presentation from staff in Facilities regarding changes that Facilities have made in use of water. There have been impressive improvements. With an invitation, Facilities would be willing to share that.

Thompson thought that was a good idea and it will go on the SEC agenda for next week.

Alvim said when he comes to his office in Science 1 on weekends; all the lights are on all day long. Could we find ways to save some energy?

Thompson wondered if there is a person in whose university responsibilities these concerns meet.

Wood asked if Facilities comes to talk to SEC, how you will share that conversation.

Thompson said he did not intend that; SEC will begin discussing the issue, but it will be coming back to senate. Hopefully a person or persons that can address both these together will be identified.

## **6. Adjournment**

3:40pm