1. Call to order
   2:36pm

2. Approval of Agenda
   S. Davis asked why specific items were listed as information items. Filling noted that information items are presented as such to prevent them from being first reading items and going into the abyss over the summer.

   It was noted that item 7b 15/AS/10/SEC Reaffirmation of RPT Policies & Procedures resolution was not sent with the electronic version of the agenda that was distributed but is available on the print version.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 27, 2010
   No changes were suggested. Minutes stand as distributed.

4. Announcements
   Filling made an announcement about the theater production. He attended the Midsummer Night’s Dream performance and it was excellent. There were close to 4,000 people who attended over the four days, and it made a nice impression for the local community. It brought back nostalgia for the fourth of July. Filling thanked Mayer and the Arts community for the activity. Ovation.

   Filling noted that May 22nd is the historic 39th Annual Beer-B-Que. Tickets are available from others throughout the university. This is a great time to chat with colleagues throughout the university before engaging in finals.

   Filling is pleased to introduce Provost James Strong who comes to us from Dominguez Hills. Provost Strong noted that he is extremely pleased to be here. He’s looking forward to attending the Senate meetings. He’s only been here for 7 days and likes his commute from the Village Dorms. He’s moving into a home a few streets away so the commute won’t get much worse. He’s looking forward to working with the Academic Senate, Colleges, and Academic Affairs to advance the mission of the university.
Mayer distributed flyers for Off the Cuff Comedy Improv group from Seaver City Utah. They’re performing on the main stage on Thursday and Friday night. They create their show from audience suggestions and create a whole story in the second half of the show. Please spread the word to students as we’d like to get people to attend. Tickets are $12 advance purchase or $15 at the door.

Petrosky reported that the recent success enjoyed by the students in the Human Resource Management program has resulted in the Student Chapter being one of three chapters to be considered for SHRM national host campus. Results will be communicated by the end of the week.

S. Davis shared on behalf of S. Stryker that the EER Site Visit Team Report is on our reaccreditation website (under “W” for WASC). The commission will be meeting on June 16 to determine the campus’ reaccreditation award. The Commission letter is expected to be received on our campus in July. Upon returning in the fall, the SST/IC Chairs will develop and distribute one centralized document tied to the Crosswalk (Strategic Planning) that contains the four self-study essay recommendations, the site visit team’s recommendations, and the Commission’s recommendations. This document can be used by campus governance groups as they move forward in their planning and decision making.

Grobner read a statement that he will post on Facnet today. He suggested that faculty donate funds to a scholarship fund for Courtney Jespersen. Grobner donated $50 directly from his wallet while at the meeting. He indicated that Courtney was concerned about retribution. Grobner encourages support from all, and he offered yet a second $50 toward the scholarship fund. He would like faculty to help to find funds for Courtney. Some faculty have said that they will continue to contribute to her as long as they are faculty here. The following is the statement that Grobner read out loud.

Colleagues,

Last Thursday night on the 10 o’clock CBS channel 13 news was a story of Courtney, a high school senior who received a letter from Noelia Gonzalez, the Director of Financial Aid at CSU Stanislaus stating that due to the economy, there would be no money available for the President’s and Provost’s Scholarships this coming academic year. Courtney had been told by teachers, high school counselors and her parents that if she dedicates herself to her studies, this would position her for scholarships to help her pay for college. She was also contacted by a CSU Stanislaus recruiter who also encouraged her to apply for the President’s scholarship. Being class valedictorian with a GPA of 4.44 put her in a position for a President’s Scholarship. This letter effectively ensured that she would not be getting a scholarship, a situation that is true for other students who applied.

These scholarships, funded through the CSU Stanislaus Foundation, were developed with the idea of bringing the best and brightest students from the surrounding high schools to CSU Stanislaus. We were fortunate that Courtney chose CSU Stanislaus as her primary college and she is still interested in attending. Of course, now, paying tuition is her greatest concern.

At a meeting of the department chairs on Friday, May 7, talk of Courtney’s case lead to the suggestion of the faculty developing a scholarship program. Since Courtney would be eligible for the $5000 President’s scholarship, I suggest that we offer her that amount from a scholarship fund contributed to by faculty. I have had about 20 faculty and one alumnus pledge $50 each towards this fund. Since Courtney has been
identified, it would be difficult to set up a true scholarship program to award her in this first round, so I suggest that we go ahead and offer her $5000 and any money collected above $5000 go into a scholarship pool to be awarded by a scholarship committee consisting of faculty and students. This fund would be regenerated by faculty, such as those that have already pledged a $50 a year contribution for the remainder of their tenure at CSU Stanislaus. A search for an appropriate nonprofit organization to house this scholarship is ongoing as are faculty to set up the scholarship criteria and review applications.

I have been in contact with Kris Pickel, the reporter who brought us the story, as well as Courtney. I expressed my distress in this development and ensured them both that faculty were appalled. This appears to be a phenomenon restricted to the Stanislaus campus as CSU Sacramento has seen no decline in scholarships, nor have any of the surrounding community colleges. I hope you will see fit to help Courtney and to help in developing a scholarship fund that will only provide money for students to help offset the increase in tuition at CSU Stanislaus.

Besides the donation of funds, Grobner is looking for several faculty to help set up the scholarship fund and put in place criteria with which to evaluate future submissions from students. He will be setting up a private bank account for the current drive to raise funds and hopefully will have that in place very soon.

Marcell asked how soon funds are needed. Grobner said before Courtney’s tuition bill is due. Filling offered $50 as well.

Mayer asked if Grobner knew why we are not funding those scholarships any more. Grobner said that Matt Swanson has indicated that because of the economy they do not have funds for scholarships this year. Littlewood said that Grobner’s suggestion is outstanding and offered $50 as well. Grobner noted a plan for a scholarship is needed. Filling thanked Grobner for initiating this.

Eudey announced that the Faculty Center will continue its tradition of pedagogy, fiction and non-fiction book clubs next year and will continue to hold the fiction and non-fiction meetings immediately after the Academic Senate meetings every two weeks. We will begin in fall with non-fiction and the book shall be The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks.

Eudey announced that the campus won an award from the Chancellor’s Office in August and this week they received notification that our campus has the largest use of the Merlot database. The award is $10K for faculty development technology. These funds are to be used to reduce the cost of courses, and need to be used during the summer and by May 2011. She’s trying to find out more details on this grant. There will be ways you can partake in these funds so keep this in mind if you are interested in enhancing components of your course. You should contact Eudey directly for more information.

Provost Strong noted that he’s talked with Russ Giambelluca about the scholarships, and they will fund 2 Presidential and 1 Provost Scholarships. He noted that these are not endowed scholarships as they raise the money on a yearly basis which makes the cash flow situation more problematic. He said that Courtney will be considered for the Presidential scholarship. He noted that it’s great to establish a scholarship and provide support to a student, but he suggested that Grobner look into the procedures for handling scholarships on campus as you can’t set one up for one specific person. You could provide support for them and that might have some tax implications, maybe or maybe not. He will ask Susana Gajic-Bruyca to talk to Mark Grobner to make sure the dimensions are understood and how to serve the students.
Filling said there are no tax consequences for giving a gift, but there are some consequences to those who don’t get to claim it as a tax deduction.

Manrique said that the Emeritus Faculty Association have for many years provided funds for three scholarships for $800 each per year, and quite a few people donate for this.

R. Floyd said that there is a task force addressing mental health issues in the CSU system. The CSU Select Committee on Mental Health report addresses some of the challenges counseling faculty members face on a daily basis. This is tied to a suicide that occurred at another campus. Floyd will send the report to Isabel for distribution. If you have questions, please contact R. Floyd. It’s a good summary of issues that are facing us.

Helzer announced that tomorrow from 9:30 - 10:30am, in L110G, Cameron Pallotta will demonstrate how different disciplines can use geospatial technologies. If you want to learn more please stop by.

Filling asked all to attend the Spring General Faculty meeting this Thursday, May 13 in this room, from 2:30-4:30pm. In the fall, the general faculty meeting had a different format than previously and this will occur in spring as well. This is an opportunity to hear about continuing and ongoing concerns going into the year. It’s critical that members of the SEC hear from you to understand what you’re dealing with and what your notion of responses will be. President Shirvani and Provost Strong are scheduled to speak early in the meeting. They and the Speaker have been asked to keep remarks to 10 minutes.

Filling recognized the guests present as Deans McNeil, Moore, Nowak and Stefanco. Also present is C. Whitman, B. Duggan, J. Sarraille, M. Grobner, J. Helzer, L. Byerly, T. Wendt, and Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias.

5. Committee Reports

Eudey noted that there is an expectation that the VP of Faculty Affairs position is going to be eliminated with the Faculty Affairs being assigned to the VP of Human Resources. Personally, she hopes that there is a decision to retain this position in Faculty Affairs. SEC wants to take a moment to thank Ted Wendt before he is no longer in that position. Eudey moved 16/AS/10/AS Resolution of Appreciation for Associate Vice President Ted Wendt. Seconded by K. Schoenly. Eudey read the resolution out loud.

**16/AS/10/AS Resolution of Appreciation for Associate Vice President Ted Wendt**

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus acknowledges and celebrates Ted Wendt for his tireless work as Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs over the last seven years, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate recognizes Associate Vice President Wendt for assisting the faculty and administration in the recruitment and retention of a high quality faculty; promoting and ensuring access to faculty development activities; and for working to ensure that all parties “honor the contract,” and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate celebrates Associate Vice President Wendt for encouraging cooperative, proactive, and mutually-respectful relationships between the university administration, the California Faculty Association, faculty governance, and individual faculty, and be it further.
Resolved: That the Academic Senate thanks Associate Vice President Wendt for improving the quality of work life for faculty, and by extension the quality of the educational experience provided, at California State University Stanislaus.

The resolution passed by acclamation. Standing ovation.

Wendt indicated that this has been a hell of a run. He said this resolution was unexpected because he knows it was undeserved, but he sees this as a sign of respect by the faculty. He hopes that the faculty know that the respect is reciprocated. Wendt has a tremendous respect for the profession and August 18 will be a happy day because he will be returning to his home in the Theatre department as a full time faculty member. It will be one of the happiest days of his life. He again thanked the Senate. Ovation.

Filling reported on SWAS. They had their last meeting last week. Because of the tenseness of the past year and because we had shared with SWAS actions from the year, he gave SWAS an end of the year report as follows:

One of my colleagues, the chair of our Educational Policies Committee, started his annual report with the phrase - It has been a dark and stormy year at Stanislaus.

As I reported to this body in December, the faculty at CSU Stanislaus voted no confidence in President Ham Shirvani by a margin of 90%. This vote was based on Shirvani’s lack of respect for faculty, his unwillingness to engage in open and shared governance, and his demonstrated inability to effectively lead the university. In January I reported the censure of our interim provost for a derogatory and factually incorrect editorial published in our local newspaper.

I feel obligated, on behalf of my colleagues at Stanislaus, to provide an update on the state of affairs at Stanislaus.

For the balance of the year after the vote of no confidence, we have struggled mightily to work with a president who patently ignores the mandate for shared governance embedded in the enabling statues of the CSU and in HEERA. President Shirvani has flouted long-established campus policies, indeed he refuses even to follow the policies he has instituted at our campus.

President Shirvani refused to thank our WASC site visit team for their work, and did not respond to invitations to meet with our NCATE accreditation site visit team.

Most recently, our Interim Provost, in admitted consultation with the President, issued letters to candidates in our RPT process, letters that distort the efforts and successes of the candidates, in some cases letters that contain gross factual errors. The Interim Provost differs with all previous levels of review on approximately 40% of the candidates, and as you might suspect, those differences are denial of tenure and/or promotion.

Clearly, Houston, we have a problem. Equally clearly, the problem starts at the top, as Senator O’Brien and I reported to Chancellor Reed last September. We have had multiple consultants on our campus this year attempting to develop our President’s ability to work with his executive officers and others, we have had Trustee Carter visit to explore the situation - none of this has been effective in reducing the level of
administrative dysfunction. As several faculty told Trustee Carter, simply finding a "strong provost" is not a solution, as long as that provost serves at the pleasure of the president.

From our WASC site visit team’s report:

-----------------

Recommendation 5 -

With full appreciation for the fact that the state’s current financial crisis has intensified at a time of increased demand and higher expectations, CSU Stanislaus can fulfill its mission and ensure a sustainable, high-quality university only if it engages in collaborative and inclusive, faculty-engaged planning processes that are fact-based, values-oriented, and aligned in all aspects with the primacy of the academic mission. Accountable, responsible, high-performing, and effective administrative and faculty leadership alike require nothing less. An organization committed to learning and improvement demands a well-understood process for making hard, immediate decisions in the context of long-term (strategic) improvement, sustainability, and fulfillment of mission.

Accordingly, CSU Stanislaus should:

a. Clarify the respective responsibilities of the administration and the faculty in decision-making with a reciprocal appreciation for the necessary role of each;
b. Commit to open, direct, and timely communication of essential information and data relevant to decision-making to deans, chairs, and faculty leadership;
c. Ensure fulfillment of educational effectiveness and institutional integrity by truthful representations of consequences of decision-making to students and the public; and
d. Fill senior administrative positions as quickly and effectively as possible with qualified persons who share the University’s academic values through consultative processes appropriate to institutional integrity and educational effectiveness, with a recognition of the delegated authority of defined roles, including but not limited to the provost.

The importance of acting on this recommendation in a timely and open manner cannot be overstated. In taking concrete steps to address these specific concerns, CSU Stanislaus should also be mindful of the importance of trust among the constituents who clearly share a commitment to the success of the University in serving its students and community. An atmosphere of trust enables different perspectives to be considered and final actions to be taken without rending the character, values and purpose of CSU Stanislaus, which have been built deliberately, carefully, and patiently for over half a century.

-----------------

I herewith ask your support in our continued struggle to survive the fifth year of a failing presidency at Stanislaus. As my colleagues, as our WASC visit team, I fear for the character, values and purpose of CSU Stanislaus which have been built deliberately, carefully, and patiently for over half a century.

Help us. Please.

Steven Filling
ASCSU Senator and Speaker of the Faculty
CSU Stanislaus
Regarding Board of Trustees and Chancellor’s Office Response to Faculty Vote of No Confidence in President Shirvani of CSU Stanislaus

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its support for AS-2305-96/FA “Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence,” and AS-2819-07/FA “Board of Trustees and Chancellor Office Attention and Response to Faculty Votes of No Confidence;” and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to further investigate the circumstances surrounding the faculty vote of no confidence in the president at California State University Stanislaus using the processes, and in the spirit of, the two above-referenced resolutions; and be it further and

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to share the results of that investigation with the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate and notify the ASCSU upon completion of that investigation; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to work actively, and on an ongoing basis, with campus constituencies to resolve the problems giving rise to the faculty vote of no confidence in President Shirvani at CSU Stanislaus; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the 2010-2011 ASCSU Executive Committee to provide whatever support possible to our faculty colleagues at CSU Stanislaus during the Summer 2010; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor of the CSU, the President of CSU Stanislaus and the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate and campus senate chairs.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU has consistently urged the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to investigate faculty votes of no confidence in campus presidents. This resolution continues that tradition, and reaffirms the principles and processes in its previous resolutions on the subject.

AS/2963/10/EX
Approved unanimously.

May 6-7, 2010

Filling noted that this is an unprecedented step, SWAS taking a resolution about a situation at a specific campus. Read and think about it. If there are ways colleagues at other campuses that can help us, please let Filling and SWAS know. They are incredibly supportive and know that things need to change.

6. Action Items
   a. Second Reading of 10/AS/10/FBAC—Budget Priorities Resolution

Garcia said given what Filling just read and the current campus issues with various groups considering budget reduction scenarios; it’s important for faculty to make it clear what we deem the budget priorities to be. FBAC greatly appreciates the Academic Senate discussion at the last meeting. FBAC took some of the suggestions offered and overlaid them on the current document. The second resolved was adjusted to be clearer, and the discussion of instruction and teaching was added to the fifth bullet in the second resolved. FBAC revised the last Resolved to apply to all budgetary decisions, noting it effective immediately to keep the timeline current. The following is the revised resolution.

10/AS/10/FBAC--Budget Priorities Resolution

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty of California State University, Stanislaus affirm the commitment of the CSU to public access to affordable high-quality instruction, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty’s major priorities are the following mutually dependent items, equally
essential to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus:

- maintain access for qualified students, including admission to campus and access to courses;
- retain and appoint sufficient numbers of qualified non-faculty staff to effectively support the core instructional mission;
- maintain or reduce the student/faculty ratio;
- maintain or increase the number of tenure track faculty;
- maintain resources for effective instruction and for fostering research, scholarship, creative activity, professional development and community engagement;

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate, the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee, and the faculty members of the University Budget Advisory Committee should serve as the Faculty’s representatives in the budget planning process and should participate in all budgetary discussions and decisions through the entire process of budget planning, allocation, and re-allocation of the university budget, including the apportioning of its budget among specific university divisions, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the University Budget Advisory Committee should continue to function to advise the administration on fiscal decisions, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any major change affecting the instructional mission be made only after consultation with appropriate faculty governance committees and include open and consensual processes that consider the viewpoints of all affected parties, an analysis of the costs and benefits, and the effects on CSU Stanislaus as a whole, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the priorities above shall apply to all budgetary decisions, effective immediately.

RATIONALE: The faculty of CSU, Stanislaus want to affirm our budget priorities, which can contribute to strategic planning and everyday budget decisions. The first two resolved clauses deal with priorities for the institution, and the next three involve procedures to ensure faculty input in decisions related to the budget.

Eudey encouraged that copies of this budget priorities resolution to be distributed at the UBAC open forum should this pass.

By voice vote unanimously passed.
7. First Reading Items
   1. 11/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution Academic Calendar Policy
Littlewood moved the resolution, seconded by R. Floyd. Littlewood read the resolution aloud and referred Senators to copies of the Academic Calendar Policy.

11/AS/10/SEC/UEPC – Academic Calendar Policy

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves the attached Academic Calendar Policy; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy be effective beginning with the 2010-2011 Academic Year.

Rationale: Revision of the Academic Calendar Policy is necessary following the change from the 4-1-4 calendar to the extended two-semester calendar.

11/AS/10/UEPC
Academic Calendar Policy
California State University, Stanislaus


The annual academic calendar for the University shall be drafted by the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), and forwarded to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs for adoption. Each fall the UEPC shall prepare a draft of the calendar for the next academic year and calendars for the ensuing two years. Prior to UEPC recommendation, the draft calendars shall be communicated to the campus community for commentary. UEPC shall forward its recommended calendars to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than November 15. Academic calendars shall adhere to CSU guidelines and, where possible, local University custom.

Procedures and Principles
I. CSU and other Agency Requirements
   1. 145-149 instructional and 170-180 academic workdays (normally Monday through Friday, although Saturday may be an academic workday) shall be scheduled. Academic workdays include instructional days, advising and examination days, grade reporting days, Commencement, etc.

   2. The following holidays shall be taken on the days they occur (or on Friday if the actual holiday occurs on Saturday; or Monday if the actual holiday occurs on a Sunday): the first Monday in September (Labor Day), November 11 (Veteran’s Day), the fourth Thursday in November (Thanksgiving), December 25, January 1, the third Monday in January (Martin Luther King, Jr’s Birthday), and March 31 (Cesar Chavez Day).
3. The following holidays shall be observed on the actual day designed or they may, at the discretion of the President of the University, be rescheduled to other days: September 4 (Admission Day), the second Monday in October (Columbus Day), February 12 (Lincoln’s Birthday), the third Monday in February (President’s Day), and the last Monday in May (Memorial Day).

II. Local Custom, Normally to be Observed

1. The academic calendar shall consist of two 15-week semesters and a finals week. Fall and spring semesters shall have approximately the same number of instructional days. Within fall semester and within spring semester the number of instructional Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays shall be as nearly equal as possible.

2. Fall and spring semesters shall each be preceded by at least two academic workdays for advising and followed by five days for final examinations and at least one grade reporting day. The grade reporting day shall be at least three week days after the last day of finals.

3. Fall and spring instruction shall commence when practical on the earliest permissible start date as stated in the annual CSU Coded Memorandum regarding Academic Pay Period Certification and Enrollment Planning and Reporting Calendars. Fifteen (non-academic) weekdays between the fall and spring term shall normally be available for a non state-supported intercession. Spring instruction shall conclude when practical before Memorial Day but no later than the end of the first week in June.

4. Warrior Day shall normally occur on the second Friday in May and shall be a half-day academic holiday.

5. The Friday following Thanksgiving shall be an academic holiday.

6. During spring term there shall be a one-week holiday – spring break. Best efforts shall be made to align spring break to coincide with Turlock Unified School District’s spring break.

7. Instructional time per course credit is defined to provide a consistent expectation for students and faculty. Class meeting times shall adhere to the classical Carnegie definition of a semester credit hour. One semester credit hour shall be awarded for 1 instructional hour (50-minutes in duration) per week for 15 weeks, or its equivalent, and shall also include a two-clock hour final examination for lecture-recitation-discussion courses. The total instructional time for a semester course equates to 870 minutes per unit of instruction, including a final. Other courses shall require additional instructional hours in accordance with CSU system course classification system, commonly referred to as C or S factor courses. The equivalent instructional time shall occur for courses offered in alternative or compressed timeframes, such as summer term, or alternative modes of instruction such as those offered via mediated technology.

8. Classes shall meet university requirements for class duration, and faculty shall adhere to scheduling parameters and class scheduling options when planning the schedule of classes and in
delivering instruction. Midterm examinations shall be administered only during the regular course meeting times. (Take-home and make-up exams are exempt from this rule.) Final examinations shall be administered only during the designated scheduled final examinations days.

9. Course credit is defined as the distribution of time between class instruction and outside preparation and varies among courses and faculty expectations. Normally, students are expected to be engaged in instructionally related course preparation outside of the classroom for each unit/hour of classroom instructional time: two hours per unit per week for undergraduate students, three hours per unit per week for master’s students, and four hours per unit per week for doctoral students.

10. Activities which require students to devote significant and specified time outside of the scheduled class period (for example, field trips) shall be clearly identified in the class schedule and the course syllabus. Whenever possible such activities shall occur at times when students would not be taking other classes (for example, on weekends).

IL:rl (UEPC approved 4/22/10)

Littlewood indicated that the rationale is the change in the academic calendar to remove reference to winter term. There are guidelines and requirements the Chancellor’s Office has in place so those are included and have been mentioned in the Senate before. The remaining issue was the consideration of spring break. In the agenda packet are the results of the survey, and option 2, the one that aligns spring break with local schools was the preference for students, staff and faculty. UEPC included that recommendation into the policy.

S. Davis said that these are minor changes by which the calendar is developed by UEPC and approved. Littlewood said elimination of winter is fairly major, but with that extraction from the old calendar policy the new one is substantially the same as the old one.

Weikart has a question about 2.3 you might want to spell intersession differently. In that same one, realized the reason for the statement about intersession dates provides a viable reason to have it in the policy. In his department no one will have an intersession course. From what he’s heard that is the case in many departments. One of the things that the schedules are arranged, we end up with a very long December-January break that is longer than most universities, and a shorter summer break. He wonders if that is a disadvantage to students who work in the summer. To have fewer months can make a difference, and could hurt us as well. Do we need to keep that intersession there to maintain a fiction of doing things in winter that aren’t really happening? Instead of mid-January to mid May we go late January to late May.

Littlewood doesn’t disagree, but there are some CSU restrictions from the Chancellor’s Office such as the intersession cannot be eliminated totally but we could start one week earlier. We can’t eliminate the whole 3 weeks. Are many going to use it, perhaps not many will, but there might be some. In Physics/Geology there will be some who might participate in the intersession for field trips; and had we started spring on the earliest possible day these trips would not be possible. Gomula indicated Art will offer intersession courses. Mayer indicated Theatre will as well.

McGhee asked why the system will not allow us to do away with it. Littlewood said that for the benefits package we have to have the academic year go into June by at least one day so we can’t start earlier than January 16th. McGhee indicated that has to do with timing of the semesters, not the winter term.
Littlewood indicated that it’s true and it’s the same for all CSU campuses.

C. Davis indicated that semester campuses start approximately one month after fall ends. What the proposed policy says is what the other campuses are doing.

Filling asked Demetrulias about the start dates. Demetrulias indicated that under the old system we had to have 10 pay periods. We have to use the June dates to get the right number of instruction and work dates. By starting in August we hit the 10 pay periods. It’s tied to an executive order from the Chancellor’s Office.

Sarraille says one can make a request for further examination of this. We now understand it’s an executive order, but we don’t understand why it is an executive order. Maybe someone can look further into it and find a way to explain why this has to be the case. Weikart’s point is well taken. In previous times, it seemed to be possible to have a student work for 3 months between semesters. The question still lingers, why can’t this university system make room for someone to work for three months straight and go to school the other nine months.

Littlewood suggested this could be brought up at the state level, but we have to abide by it at the campus level. Sarraille doesn’t say we should overrule it but look into why it is an executive order. We’d like to know more than the mere fact that it is an executive order.

Weikart said that starting January 16 is earlier than we are actually starting so we could move it up some. Littlewood agreed that we can move it up one week.

Panos asked if FBAC if they could look at this after we move to the new model to see where we stand with our revenue. He would like to request that someone keeps track year after year at what is happening with the finances. Garcia said this is something we have to look at. There was a projection of what the elimination of the winter term would save us, and we need to see what it will save us and what are the consequences.

Eudey clarified that the 2010-11 academic calendar is set, and the first calendar that we could change would be for the 2011-12 calendar. Eudey noted that we could possibly move up the spring break a week earlier for next year 2011/12.

Demetrulias said we could move the start of spring one week earlier, but we’re trying to be responsive to those who had instructional programs that were essential to offer in that January time period. If we make it shorter than 3 weeks, there was a lot of testimony to UEPC about the importance of that time period. This was an attempt to accommodate those who wanted that time period and those who wanted to start spring earlier. There were Financial Aid and Payroll certifications and other issues that also needed to be attended to. The executive order has a certain number of instructional days, academic work days, vacation days, and it’s difficult to create calendars to meet all of the needs. If there is a compelling reason to look at calendars we can do so, but we have draft calendars and we are only one year ahead. People start making plans more than a year ahead and we hope that we conclude this quickly if there is a need to revisit those calendars.

Weikart wasn’t sure how many programs would use the intercession and can benefit from it. He noted that one campus had an intersession after the May graduation date, with a three week intersession before the summer. Filling noted that those in Geography and Geology that have field trips to Death Valley wouldn’t want to do them in May or June.

Eudey moved to go to a second reading. Seconded by S. Davis.
Mayer asked what the plan is for another meeting this year. Filling said we asked people to keep the date on hold because we weren’t sure what would happen today.

By voice vote the resolution was moved to a second reading.

Peterson noted that point 6 was about the Turlock Unified School District and the survey data. It seemed the first choice is to have spring break in the middle of the semester, is that correct? Littlewood said the largest number said they wanted option 2, which is tied to the local school district’s spring break.

McGhee thinks it is admirable to be concerned with student summer earnings, but he doesn’t think we can micromanage summer earnings. Most summer jobs start and end at a particular time. They may need to start or end early or late depending on when we start and end. Some campuses have changed their calendars because of students’ participation in recreational industry, but this is hard to do. We should try to optimize as much as possible, but if we are to have an intersession that would start right after fall finals and end the day before spring semester starts, it puts a tremendous load on faculty and students. This could hurt spring for all those involved.

Eudey indicated that at least one CSU campus offers courses thru all of December and January. Personally, she prefers it being a week later in January as it’s a disservice to students enrolled in those UEE courses offered over winter break as they do not have full access to university resources.

Passed by voice vote as policy.

2. 15/AS/10/SEC Reaffirmation of RPT Policies and Procedures
Moved by Jasek-Rysdahl, seconded by Brown.

15/AS/10/SEC Reaffirmation of RPT Policies & Procedures

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus reaffirms the CSU Stanislaus Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure Review which have been developed in a consultative process to reflect the mission and values of the University; and be it further

Resolved: That individuals and groups at all levels of review should abide by the Principles, Criteria and Procedures when reviewing individuals applying for retention, tenure, and/or promotion; and be it further

Resolved: That all levels of review should pay special attention to the following statements from the document:

I. Principles. Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based on the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exist for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the
The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail. (From AAUP Guidelines.) [emphasis added]

II. Review Criteria. The following four criteria apply to the faculty as a whole, and all criteria must be considered in the review process... Each RPT file must contain copy of the current as well as any applicable prior elaborations. A faculty member has the right to be evaluated according to elaborations in effect when he or she was hired or to which the faculty member subsequently has agreed.

A. Teaching proficiency, including preparation, classroom presentation, student advising, and adherence to departmental guidelines and university wide academic standards. Teaching proficiency is the primary qualification for retention, promotion, and tenure. [emphasis added]

B. Scholarship or other equivalent creative activities.

C. Extent and appropriateness of professional preparation, normally including the doctorate or equivalent attainment (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 42711).

D. Participation in university affairs.

No criteria other than those in the section above may be used in retention, promotion, or tenure considerations.

VI. Preview Principles and Procedures, I. RPT candidates’ files shall be made available simultaneously to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the University RPT Committee. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University RPT Committee shall each conduct an independent review. For each candidate, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the University RPT Committee shall provide written comments for each of the four criteria and summary recommendation. [emphasis added]

VI. Review Principles and Procedures, K. In deciding upon retention, promotion or tenure recommendations, the availability of funding shall not be a consideration.

VI. Review Principles and Procedures L. The candidate for any review shall be informed of any tentative recommendation or minority report. Such a recommendation or report shall identify the criteria on which it is based and shall state the reasons for it. The candidate shall be given ten (10) calendar days to forward a written response supporting his/her case before the recommendation or minority report is forwarded to the next level. The candidate shall be informed of the review level’s final decision. Such a decision shall identify the criteria on which it is based and shall state the reasons for it. [emphasis added]

VI. Review Principles and Procedures N. Other Consultation. Nothing in these procedures shall be construed to exclude later levels of review from consulting previous levels of review.

and be it further
Resolved: That this resolution be personally delivered to the President by members of the faculty leadership.

Rationale: In May 2009 the Academic Senate, General Faculty, and President all approved 8/AS/09/FAC-URPTC-Amended to Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review. In part, this revised document reaffirmed that CSU Stanislaus is primarily a teaching institution and identified teaching as the primary qualification for retention, promotion, and tenure even as professional preparation, scholarship or other equivalent creative activities, and participation in university affairs are criteria considered in the review process. There have been no revisions to this policy document since May 2009 so these principles, criteria, and procedures for review are still in effect and should be followed.

This resolution is necessary because there is compelling evidence that has been provided to faculty leadership, department chairs, and departmental colleagues that these principles have been violated during the 2009/2010 review cycle. It is critical that the Academic Senate make it clear that it will not be silent when approved policies of the university are not followed. The Academic Senate needs to make this public statement to support colleagues who have been evaluated in a manner that is inconsistent with this document.

Jasek-Rysdahl highlighted some aspects of the resolution, primarily the bolded sections that came forward as important via conversations with department chairs, RPT committee members and people going through the RPT process. Jasek-Rysdahl said that item VI. Review Principles and Procedures L is in reference to the sudden change in the provost, as the interim provost left before the 10 days was up.

S. Davis has an uncomfortable sense of déjà-vu wondering how often we have reaffirmed RPT procedures in May. Jasek-Rysdahl said this was approved last May. R Floyd noted that the bolded statements are emphasis of what is already there, and Filling clarified that the emphasis is added but these words are already in the current policy. Filling noted that what was passed last year was an amendment to our policy which was in large part tied to recommendations from WASC. We are not in the habit of reissuing proclamations partway thru the process.

Petrosky said that given the issues could impact current processes that we move to a second reading. Seconded by McGhee. Approved by voice vote.

Eudey clarified that some post revisions were tied to some recommendations that came from the WASC site team. The reason that WASC made these recommendations is due to what faculty shared with them about our process in 2008. It’s been reaffirmed in writing that teaching is primary for RPT. WASC reiterated teaching as primary. In 2008 S. Davis talked several times about his concerns of the tenure and promotion review letters. This is not the first time we have shown concern at the RPT decisions, and we need these policies to be followed until they are changed.

If there have been no changes and we feel the need to reaffirm these, Gomula asked if there is a way to make the policy stronger?

Demetrulias said that she will need to work with faulty and administration regarding RPT as we must get this issue in order. The WASC site visit team indicated that we have made progress since the CPR, but when they returned their judgment it was noted that we have not had sufficient evidence that we have levels of expectation or criteria that contain standards of achievement. To paraphrase, too many elaborations give
categories but not enough guidance for all levels that would guide decisions. Their view was that we would have strife and ambiguity until we have more understanding. Our previous review moved us in that direction and FAC will continue the conversation and move us forward. Demetrulias was speaking to why we need to have continuing conversations, and this was a view on why we have a difference of opinion.

Silverman said that two years ago we had a different provost, and the provost said that the elaborations of five different departments were worthless (including English). He wanted to change the elaborations provided by the departments. There should be a language in the resolution to protect the elaborations so they are defined by the people who are most qualified to define them.

Eudey noted that there are some really well written elaborations but there are still things to be done. We need to provide assistance to others. The URPTC tried to encourage each department to strengthen their RPT elaborations. Many depts. made changes to the elaborations and we’re still growing and learning in that process. The issue is related to policies that need to be improved. This past year we didn’t get to it for a variety of reasons, but we need to follow the current policies.

Filling noted that the faculty member has the right to be evaluated by the elaborations that were agreed to when they were hired. The policy indicates that this is not the case and that we can tell people that they must redo the elaborations and apply them to people who are already here. You can’t apply them to people who do not choose to have them applied to them.

Garcia thinks it is a smokescreen to say that it’s due to the elaborations that we have strife. He can’t image that the elaborations will address the items that are in bold. It has very little to do with the elaborations.

Tumolo asked if it needs to be stressed that elaborations need to be established at the departmental level. Filling indicated that the full policy indicates this.

By Voice vote passed unanimously as Sense of the Senate.

8. Information Items:
   a. 12/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution Class Registration Closure Policy

Littlewood noted this is a recommendation to SEC on class closure. The current situation with registration is that any class that is unfilled remains open beyond the beginning of the semester for 5 working days. This means students can come into the class after it has started. The College of Natural Sciences elected last year to change the closure policy for the college courses such that they close at midnight immediately prior to classes opening to control student adds by the instructor and not the students. This is especially needed in lab classes after the safety lecture is given. Since then there have been requests from other depts. to see if they can do the same. UEPC makes a recommendation that the default is for classes to close across the campus immediately prior to the class beginning, and if a college wanted to keep it open they could do so. So now classes close by default.

The following resolution has been recommend to SEC, and we expect to see this item as an action item at the Academic Senate in the fall.

12/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution 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 11:59 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 each College shall have the option of not closing classes to open registration the day before classes are scheduled to begin, but instead keep unfilled classes open for the duration of one week; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy be effective beginning with the Spring 2011 semester.

Rationale: At present, unfilled classes remain open for a period of one week (5 instructional days), except for classes in the College of Natural Sciences which has elected to have its classes closed on the first day of instruction. Numerous instructors have expressed similar interest in having their classes closed in order to control additions to their classes. If enacted, this policy change would change the default option from having unfilled classes remain open for 5 instructional days to having open registration close at 11:59 p.m. the day prior to the first day of instruction.
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This resolution was an information item and was deferred to fall 2010.

McGhee said this closes at midnight before the day of the first class. Is this rolling for the first class meeting or of the week of starting classes? That could have some impact from a computer standpoint it could be set up to give students the most opportunity without students missing classes. Since all classes don’t start on the same day there could be a delay for closing some out.

Littlewood talked to Bernardo about this last year, and her request was to not do this class by class because that’s a lot of work for their office. She requests that we do it so they can handle it efficiently college by college regardless of what week the class starts. Filling said colleges could choose to do this for fall whether or not we pass this policy now. Littlewood said that is true, we could make it happen for fall.

Marcell supports this resolution because this semester there were many faculty in his department who experienced uncertainty with courses that were filled up and had a wait list. Some students dropped the class but before he could assign permission numbers to students the system had allowed other students to enroll in his class. This caused an unfair advantage for these students.

Sarraille speaks in defense of the computer as it’s the programmer that did that.

McGhee can understand people not wanting to take on more work but would like the computer people to say how much harder it is to have a program that sets it to close on the day it starts as opposed to first day of the semester. It may not be a significant workload issue, and we should try to accommodate student needs. Letting students in ahead of students on the waitlist is something we should try to take care of. Once it’s done properly, the program should handle it every semester. In the long run it could be less work and provide more flexibility to the students. Otherwise, students will need to try to contact faculty even before classes have started, and that can cause problems for students as they try to work around multiple schedules.
Let’s look at the amount of work it will take over time.

Littlewood can’t speak to the details of PeopleSoft, but in workings with it whatever seems to be easy is harder than you think. Because CNS has already done this, CNS has not had problems arise from closing at midnight even when many students had to be added via permission numbers.

B. Fair asked if there are courses other than labs that are affected by the late registration. He wonders what the reasons are for doing this. Littlewood said this was because of issues brought forward by Marcell which are more common.

Marcell supports this resolution because this semester there were many faculty in his department who experienced uncertainty with courses that were filled up and had a wait list. Some students dropped the class but before he could assign permission numbers to students the system had allowed other students to enroll in his class. This caused an unfair advantage for these students.

b. 13/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs

Littlewood said this resolution was approved by UEPC and forwarded to SEC, and should come thru in due course. This is the culmination of a review of policies. If you look at the resolution the rationale in error indicates a new policy; this supersedes an old policy.

13/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves the attached Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy be effective beginning with the 2010-2011 Academic Year.

Rationale: As CSU Stanislaus moves towards more online course and program offerings, a policy regarding such offerings is needed. None exists at the present time.
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This resolution was an information item and was deferred to fall 2010.

c. Spring Break Survey Results

Littlewood noted that last time he indicated there would be a survey sent to the campus community about the spring break schedule. The results of the survey, was option 2, the one that aligns spring break with local schools was the preference for students, staff and faculty.

9. Open Forum

Mayer moved a resolution for priority registration for student athletes, seconded by Mulder. Mayer read the resolution.

Resolution submitted by Dr. John Mayer, Faculty Athletic Representative
California State University, Stanislaus
May 4, 2010
Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus enacts a policy that grants student-athletes the opportunity to apply for up to 8 units of credit towards their degree prior to the registration of the general student population; and be it further

Resolved: That this policy be effective beginning with the Fall 2010 semester.

Rationale: Student-athletes need to have specific schedules that provide the flexibility to work around their practice and competition schedules.

Rationale: Student-athletes must meet strict NCAA guidelines to be eligible to compete.

Rationale: Student-athletes put in untold hours in service directly to the University.

Mayer introduced soccer coach Taylor and said that they met twice with UEPC who have been sympathetic to the request and they appreciate their efforts. The urgency given the budget situation is to address this concern. Initially a few years ago they came forth with an attendance policy as students missed class because of competition. The original reason for talking about priority registration was to address problems with regard to getting schedules that fit with their practice and competition schedules. That’s still a viable reason for the policy. Now there is an immediate concern as students were challenged and were it not for stimulus money would have lost eligibility to perform and some teams would have been unable to compete. Our university has made a commitment to NCAA Division II sports and by doing so we have to support our student athletes. We have to give them what they need. In 2009/10 schools have a policy for student athletes, and we need to support our student athletes.

Littlewood will speak because SEC forwarded this to UEPC. Littlewood spoke against it, not because he is not in support of student athletes, but because it is with UEPC. UEPC has approved its own policy for registration priority to come to SEC for consideration in the fall. It’s more appropriate for the Senate to consider it all in fall and we can talk about the student athlete registration then. He understands why Mayer sees this as a priority, but we won’t address registration for next spring until November, so it would give us time in September to discuss this issue fully. Finally, Mayer came to UEPC last week when we talked about this and one important issue is to work with hard data and not anecdotes. Should the UEPC plan be approved, we’ll see how well that might address the student athlete problems. When this came to UEPC it wasn’t athletes who initiated it, it was related to the order in which class ranks registered. UEPC would like us to wait until fall to talk about the UEPC plan and if appropriate add the athlete issue to it.

Weikart moved to refer this to UEPC to be tabled indefinitely. Seconded by Petrosky.

Mayer noted that this is potentially our last meeting and given we already started registration he is willing to defer this to the fall. Although, the “tabled indefinitely” bothers him and he feels this should be addressed in fall to be in place before spring 2011 registration.
Bender said we now have three motions. Filling noted that referring this to the appropriate committee is sufficient to allow UEPC to review removing reference to “tabling indefinitely”. It was agreed that the intent is to refer this item to UEPC for their consideration.

Black supports referring this to UEPC because it is the process we have in place for addressing such issues and there is no urgency to do this now. We have complained about others not following policy, and we should follow this. Nagel thinks this is a complicated issue, and knowing the NCAA guidelines and such makes this something UEPC can weigh in on.

Mayer agrees with moving this to UEPC in fall as long as the urgency is known. He did try to work thru the appropriate channels and did not circumvent the system. He wants to get all on board. He supports moving this to UEPC.

Andrews supports athletes but from a data perspective that if we move to fall for spring registration that we look at roadblocks. Which sports are on the line because of this? He thinks we need to be working together to collect the data. He’s not sure who would be in charge. Mayer will work with Richards to involve all in the process.

Voice vote to move this item to UEPC for their fall agenda. Unanimous.

Filling affirmed that Chad Stessman is the incoming UEPC Chair.

McGhee is in support of Mayer’s resolution. Even given the new priority system, we may need to give them priority above the priority because the revised system could still prevent them from getting classes. The added expectations for the students put pressure on them. It’s a small thing that can make sure they have a schedule that benefits their performance and competition.

Brown says he may not be in the Senate next fall, and speaks in support of it. Among learning outcomes are work habits and practices and skills and there is little doubt that those in college sports build up tenacity, perseverance, and delayed gratification. Others do too, but student athletes do this above and beyond the requirements for their degree. Giving them 8 units of priority registration is just a small token of recognition.

Colnic said in terms of the resolution, while he has no problem giving student athletes priority registration, there are others taking university sanctioned events that demand flexible work schedules such as ASI, HR, Model Arab League etc. He hopes that UEPC would look at all sorts of organizations and not simply student athletes.

Jaydeep Bhatia is a student athlete who runs track and puts in extra effort with practice and classes. He noted that athletes do put in extra effort, and he’s heard stories about student athletes not being able to be on roster because they can’t enroll in enough units. When they perform they put on their jerseys for the university, and they want to see the university excel by putting in efforts for sports. It would be greatly appreciated by student athletes if this resolution is passed.

Garcia spoke on behalf of the Social Work Department. In their discussions we were split on this issue, but we were united in our lack of depth of understanding of what is occurring and the need for more information. For example, how many students are affected, what are the consequences of having and not having units for athletes and others? We need more information to make a more informed decision.

Marcell hopes UEPC thinks the key is that student athletes are under NCAA regulations that if they don’t meet a certain enrollment they are ineligible to play. In other activities, unless he is misinformed, there is
not an ineligibility clause tied to units. While he support all projects the athletes are in a unique situation because of NCAA regulations.

Mayer said when he first brought this to UEPC they were building a policy off of Sonoma State which included students involved in university sanctioned activities. Any student who is involved should be addressed. His particular interest is in student athletes. He’s appreciative that the discussion is more inclusive than it was on Facnet and hopes it stays that way.

Weikart understands there is a uniqueness of NCAA rules, but there are many students under other rules that also present them with problems. There are students who must have a certain numbers of units to receive Financial Aid. He realizes that NCAA is more stringent, but we do have other students with needs that make it not as unique as people are portraying it.

Bender wishes we could visit the issue of student athletes having to take a PE class for graduation requirements. He doesn’t know what that is and it may have a historical basis, but a student who has been on a team for several semesters shouldn’t need to take another PE class. Marcell said it is related to the health issue in society and the need to be involved in physical activity. There is a way to use the unit for their sport to satisfy this requirement.

It was decided not to hold another Senate meeting this year. Filling thanked all and indicated how honored he was for the work this year. Take some time to reflect on what we have done this year.

10. Adjournment
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