**For**

Second reading item: 2/AS/14/UEPC Syllabus Requirements. Will return as a second reading item at the next Senate meeting. Passed.

Second reading item: 3/AS/14/FBAC Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of the Senate). Will return as a second reading item as the next Senate meeting. Passed.

First reading of 4/AS/14/GC Resolution for Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Project Units Policy. Will return as a second reading item.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

April 29, 2014

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 1, 2013

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

Academic Senate

April 8, 2014

**Present:** Bell, Bice, , Carroll, Crayton, Espinoza, Eudey, R. Floyd, Garcia, Ghuman, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Hooker, Huang, Kohlhaas, Lindsay, Littlewood, Lore, Manrique, Mulder. Nagel, O’Brien, Olivant, Park, Perrello, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Powell, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Schoenly, Sims, C. Stessman, Strong, Thompson, Wisniewski , and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Eric Broadwater, Elizabeth Breshears and Noelle Won.

**Proxies:** Eudey for Filling.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: The following guests were welcomed: Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Annie Hor, Dennis Shimek, John Tillman, Annie Hor, Chuck Gonzalez, Ron Nobel, Linda Nowak, Oddmund Myhre, Students from Student Excellence and Lauren Byerly.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:04 pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved as distributed.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of March 25, 2014 (distributed electronically)**

Approved as amended to reflect Duggan’s announcement as “To help spread awareness of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the CSU Accessible Technology Initiative, Tawn Gillihan has put together an informational bulletin board about accessibility issues for both faculty and students. It is located outside the Open Computing Lab in L –145.”

1. **Introductions**

The following guests were welcomed: Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Annie Hor, Dennis Shimek, John Tillman, Annie Hor, Chuck Gonzalez, Ron Nobel, Linda Nowak, Oddmund Myhre, Jesse Armando from Student Excellence and Lauren Byerly.

1. **Announcements**

Gonzalez: Summer session registration opened yesterday with1500 enrollment for summer session classes per chuck

Regalado: Five history students have been accepted to doctoral programs in the last two years..

Armando: From Career Excellence, announced that the canned food drives on campus are occurring in the month of April. There is a challenge from the Feinstein Foundation who is providing $1 Million among non-profit organization around the country to fight hunger. All monetary contributions and food donations received between now and April 30th will help the United Samaritans qualify for a portion of these funds. No donation is too small and all are greatly appreciated.

Salameh: ASI elections are ongoing; please encourage students to vote on Monday and Tuesday the 28th and the 29th  of April from 8:30-6pm in the Student Union.

Jaasma: WASC thanks all who participated in surveys; a final report will be available in May.  
  
Byerly: Brahms Requiem on May 9th and 10th at the Gallo Center. The program is being directed Daniel Afonso and involves music students and faculty who are in orchestra.

Speaker Garcia: The COC is putting together a ballot for next year’s position. Please consider participating in faculty governance as it is a very important process.

1. **Committee Reports/Question**

UEPC: (Schoenly) At UEPC’s March 27 meeting:

Erin Hall and Brent Powell (Kinesiology) joined UEPC the proposed concentration in Health Promotion, which would emphasize health education as well as promotion. The concentration will to offer “pre-nursing” majors who were not admitted to the Nursing program an alternative major in the Health field. The School of Nursing does not support of the proposed concentration. Mechelle Perea-Ryan from Nursing will join UEPC to discuss these concerns. In response to a query, Schoenly and Powell noted that Sociology Psychology, and Communications have been included in consultation.

SEC proposed further revisions to the Instructor Withdrawal Policy which UEPC will discuss this week before consideration by AS. This policy change was originally prompted by faculty who requested that UEPC look into requiring a deadline for students in online courses to login shortly after classes begin and to disseminate this change to students.

UEPC is awaiting a decision from the Academic Affairs Office following discussions with Dennis Shimek and John Sarraille on why the optimal and maximum class size information was deleted from the course proposal form that specifies the faculty member’s mode of instruction. The current form only includes the SFR which is not part of the C&S section. Although course maxima are decided (in consultation) between the dean, chair and faculty member, UEPC expressed concern that contingent and tenure-track faculty may feel compelled to go along with an increase in class size that they are not comfortable with. Shimek agreed that this is an issue that needs to be brought to the attention of chairs and deans. AVP Jaasma will take the concerns, comments, and suggestions under advisement before finalizing the implementation of this form. In response to a query, Schoenly expressed hopes that the Office of Academic Programs will respond before the end of the term.

UEPC reviewed several suggestions by senators to add to the list of required elements on the Syllabus Requirements Policy. In general, UPEC was not inclined to add items that are not relevant for every course or that could not be found elsewhere among our various policies. The version you have before you today (under the 2nd reading heading) is the result of those discussions.

Discussion will continue regarding the Repeat Courses Policy and Priority Registration for Super Seniors who have 150 or more units. Lisa Bernardo will provide UEPC with Fall 2013 data on course repeats, and Miriam Salameh will report to UEPC on ASI discussions they have had on super seniors. In response to a query, Schoenly noted that IW’s will not appear on students’ transcripts.

FBAC (Lindsay) The committee discussed the feedback and modified the draft of the Budget Priorities Resolution. Also Provost Strong presented the Academic Affairs budget priorities previously presented to UBAC; similarities were noted.

SWAS: Eudey noted that there will be some virtual committee meetings this Friday. At the last Senate meeting she shared several resolutions; there will be an opportunity to provide feedback to Eudey and Filling.

1. **Information Items:** 
   1. **Disruptive Student Policy (Ron Noble)**

Speaker Garcia noted that we asked Ron Noble to present on this. Noble has met with various groups and prepared a pamphlet which he thinks has been mistaken for a policy document. It is not; rather, it is information regarding managing interactions and managing difficult students. He may have said that they’re doing some updates. There is an EO that has been rewritten in the past year on how to handle discipline and handle process. Those things have been updated on the A-Z directory under Judicial Affairs. The “helpful hints” are on the website under publications/forms. <https://stanislaus.prod.acquia-sites.com/JudicialAffairs/resources-forms-publications>

*Points of discussion:*

The catalog addresses inappropriate behavior and that information may be included in syllabi.

Specific information previously on the site has been removed. Was it too non-specific? Do faculty have latitude to interpret what is appropriate? Noble: The easy answer is “yes.” If we asked 50 different people what is disruptive behavior we would get 47 different interpretations. Reading the newspaper in class doesn’t violate the student violation of conduct.

Does the faculty member determine what is not disruptive of faculty? Noble: You have the right to define what is disruptive.

If a faculty determined newspaper reading was disruptive could he address it with the student after the class and if the student wouldn’t agree to it could the faculty member contact Judicial Affairs? Yes, per Noble. Often they get calls to help intervene.

How much coverage is provided on about student misconduct policies at New-Student Orientations? Noble: Classroom rights and responsibilities were provided in the past but not recently. They found that it was more effective when it comes from faculty member.

Why isn’t there clear protocol or policy for professors who encounter a difficult student? There was a recent case which involved a deeply disturbed student who threatened another student in class. When the instructor contacted Noble, the response was that the student must be allowed to return to class. Who is the right person to speak to if the student may not be disruptive but has problems? Noble: Maybe the police will be involved. In many cases you can suggest that the student go to the Counseling Center. We can’t keep students out of class without an immediate remedy. If it is threatening we call the Public Safety. We deal with these on a case by case basis.

You can’t permanently drop a student until a disciplinary process occurs. The refusal to leave can become the discipline issue. Usually when the professor asks the student to leave it’s the last straw. They will be angry and then if brought back to the classroom they are 10 times more angry and can cause a major havoc to the university. Noble: We try to evaluate those situations. It is not the last straw. It depends on whether the faculty member is satisfied and does the student get due process. He hopes that in many cases the student understands they’ve done something and are willing to cooperate. If not it’s a different scenario, and we may have to come up with alternate solution.

In reference to language about meeting with the student to discuss the misconduct. There are a number of faculty that may be reluctant to meet with the student. There is suggestion in the language that the faculty member has met with the student. Noble: You are not required to meet if you’re not comfortable. Sometimes the behavior is just immature or annoying. Whatever is the safest environment is what Judicial Affairs suggests.

Are these determinations made by faculty or is the decision made by someone else outside of the classroom? The discretion of the faculty member can be undermined by someone who hasn’t got any experience with that situation. Noble: It may come to a hearing: Certain behaviors have resulted in expulsion.

Speaker Garcia noted that the FAC is working on this issue, but Chair Sims is not here today.

1. **First Reading Items:** 
   1. **4/AS/14/GC – Resolution for Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Project Units Policy**

It was M/S Perrello/ Eudey

California State University, Stanislaus

4/AS/14/GC – Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Project Unit Policy

**~~Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Projects Units~~**

To maintain standing in a graduate program, graduate students who have completed all registrations for their graduate coursework, and who have registered for the maximum number of thesis or project ~~per semester~~ units required by the program, ~~be~~ are required to enroll ~~for one unit of thesis or project, effective Winter Term, 1998.~~ In the appropriate Continuing Thesis or Project course (7005 course number – zero units) during each regular semester of the academic year (spring or fall); in any case, students must be enrolled during the term they are approved for graduation, whether that term is spring, summer, or fall.

Note: This requirement is applicable to those students who have completed all registration for graduate course work and who have registered for the maximum number of thesis or project units required by their program. Students must register each semester ~~or term~~ of the academic year to maintain continuous enrollment until they have secured faculty approval for their theses or projects. Students must maintain their Graduate Standing: Classified status and be enrolled in graduate course work in order to apply for graduation. If the program is interrupted, reapplication to the Graduate School and program is necessary. **15/AS/97/GC Approved January 9, 1998, editorially amended August 12, 2004.**  XX/AS/14/GC Amended and Approved February 20, 2014. [END]

Perrello noted that the amended policyis necessary in the name of fairness to students and is in keeping with the original justification for offering a Continuous Enrollment Policy in the first place (policy signed by Provost Dauwalder in 2003 with the allowance that “Some details of the process may be refined . . .”). The Graduate Council recommends that the policy be changed so that students do not have to register for the continuing thesis or project course (7005) during summer unless they are planning to graduate during that term. Having to enroll in 7005 during summer is a hardship for students, especially if they fail to enroll and their enrollment lapses.

Eudey: Thinks it’s a reasonable policy and will not remove much money from the university but saves lots of money for the students and is a smart choice.

*Points of discussion:*

The second sentence is unclear.

Is the fee paid for the 7005 course number is a university fee? Perrello: Yes. Hidalgo: A portion does trickle down to the depts. and there is a waiver available to the student at the discretion of the program in the dept.

Will removing the fee remove an incentive toward timely graduation?

The rationale of the resolution states that “there would not be a draw on university or library services during the weeks of the summer commensurate with such a fee.” Perrello: The sentence could be struck.

Do Students have access during the summer if they are not registered? Garcia: Yes students registered fall and spring you can still access these services in summer.

1. **Second Reading Item:** 
   1. **3/AS/14/FBAC – Budget Priorities Resolution (Sense of the Senate)**

Lindsay noted the resolution was revised to alter the second resolved, second bullet to include Stanislaus’ current percent of FTES instruction delivered by tenure-track faculty (64.6)

*Points of discussion:*

The ASL Subcommittee would like to restore funding for Program Assessment Coordinators to better support program assessment efforts and faculty's ability to make substantive progress on assessment plans.  This issue was raised in the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, chaired by Keith Nainby, and he could perhaps provide more information if needed.

What does the second bullet mean? Lindsay: Originally there were 3 different bullets. The first bullet addressed raising the number of TT faculty and the 2nd to lower the SFR.

What is the intention? What is wrong with our current SFR? Lindsay: The belief of the committee for lowering the SFR is that it will drive more interactions between faculty and students and would have a number of positive affects in the classroom.

Since the measurement of numbers mentioned in ACR73 may be interpreted differently, CFA should be consulted concurrently with administration.

Results of the vote: 38 yes, 1 no. Resolution passes.

* 1. **2/AS/14/UEPC Syllabus Requirements**

Schoenly noted that the committee reviewed suggestions and concerns item by item. The committee was loth to add items not relevant to all courses or covered in other policies and procedures.

**2/AS/14/UEPC – Syllabus Requirements**

1. All courses shall have a syllabus.
2. The syllabus shall include, but not be limited, to the following:

a. Student learning outcomes or learning goals;

b. The instructor's grading policy;

c. Attendance information;

d. Policy on assignments, due dates, and make-up work;

e. Required texts and other materials;

f. Faculty contact information

12/AS/82/EX, Approved November 5, 1982

UEPC revised and approved March27, 2014 [END]

*Points of discussion:*   
What about students in field work or Individual Study? Schoenly: If a course template is on file, that will qualify as a syllabus.

What does “attendance information” mean? Schoenly: Some suggested that we add participation as well as attendance. Some may not have an attendance policy.

Is there a specific time by which the instructor must provide a syllabus? Schoenly: This was not a part of the UEPC discussion.   
  
It was M/S/P to waive the rules and amend the attachment to the resolution to include: “That the syllabus be made available to students at or near the start date of the course.”

Resolution: 36 yes, 2 no. Resolution passed.

1. **Open Forum**

*Spring Break*

Salameh: wanted to address the body about spring break on the 12th week of the semester. It is ridiculous and she wanted more clarification as to why.

Littlewood: A few years ago this question came up and they had a survey of faculty, staff and students and they wanted the spring break at the same time as the local schools.

R. Floyd: She remembers the discussion in UEPC. The thing she doesn’t recall is was there discussions over the years that stated: If Easter and the week after Easter that the spring break would move to the middle of the semester. Having spring break this late is very stressful for students. Our schedules at Psychological Counseling Services at this time of the AY are truly a testimony to this fact.

Petrosky: We’ve been living a charade that the policy fixing our Spring break to the week following Easter is normal and appropriate, and distributed item which demonstrated that no other CSU campus follows that policy, and only 0.9% of colleges and universities in the U.S. celebrated the break as late as our campus; he noted that the University of Notre Dame celebrated spring break March 9th this year.  He knows that taking a survey will always favor the majority, but this is creating a tier of second class citizens comprised of Jews, atheists, agnostics, Muslims.

C. Stessman: Addressed Floyds question and recalls that what Renae stated and it should have been written down.

Salameh: If UEPC is interested in revising this then ASI would like to address it.

Littlewood: They didn’t make the decision based on religion at all. It is being done for the convenience for the majority of us on this campus.

Floyd: It would be useful to revisit the policy. Possible clause to be added “Where possible the spring break be held during the spring break in the school districts.”

Bice: Whenever he sees statistics he looks at it with a critical eye. Are these semesters or quarter systems that Petrosky mentioned? If quarters are included it would skew the data.

Petrosky: To say that our policy doesn’t include Easter is hollow. The statistics included both quarters and semesters.

Littlewood: Then this suggests we move Thanksgiving. We had a memo from the President giving us Dec. 24th as an extra holiday. It was a Christian activity and we still go along with that. Thinks it’s cultural and that’s when our staff, students and faculty found it most useful so they don’t have to find a sitter for their kids. In the Academic Calendar policy it states: During spring term it states that best efforts shall be made to align with TUSD. The last time we amended this was 10/12/12 and we had very lively conversations and we were aware of the policy and the senators approved it. Part of the conversation included an opportunity to see how it goes and maybe we can see if we want to rethink this. We can consider that many folks involved with family members in TUSD but many have kids at other schools. May need to consider how to address the faculty/staff etc. that have children in TUSD to better manage this.

Regalado: Thanksgiving is a federal holiday but at Easter we have a lot more discretion.

Petrosky: Those holidays are pretty much fixed. Maybe ask TUSD to call the Vatican. At least ask the Senate to address their discriminatory policy.

Sarraille: Maybe some of us can go to the school board and appeal to them to review their spring break. Maybe apply it to the spring equinox.

Schoenly: Next year’s calendar will be two weeks earlier. Schoenly does think we need to revisit it and add it to the New Business items for next year.

*Graduation Ceremonies*

Thompson: During Dr. Shirvani’s tenure, faculty were moved the off the stage, to the side facing west. For afternoon/evening graduation ceremonies, faculty face directly into the sun. The only benefit of being shunted to the side was that faculty could go to the banister to greet students after they received their diplomas. Now half of the students are on the other side of the stage, and you can’t greet them etc. These changes have given faculty poor seating and less access to students.

*Course Proposal Form*

Sarraille: Request that all senators consult with department about the pending revision of course proposal forms which omits class size. It’s a very serious issue. If the maximum listed on the course proposal forms is changed, it has to go thru the curriculum committees to be discussed. If the space for maximums are omitted, curriculum committees will not have recourse to the form, and that can have effects on all other parameters, including the modality. Review this issue and take it to your program for serious discussions. Have the program directors discuss it with the deans and pass it up the administration chain.

Littlewood: Echoes what Sarraille said. We do have courses that were approved in early day of the university without class sizes.

Thompson: This is a consultative process. Is there some assumption that the office of Academic Affairs owns that form and can alter it?

Schoenly: UEPC was simply consulted on this and is not approving a form which became a red flag later. He did ask the reasons for the omissions. He got mixed set of responses form Esau and Jaasma. UEPC discussed this extensively and all faculty on the committee agrees that the form should retain the optimum and maximum slots.

Jaasma was asked who owns the document, was UEPC being consulted on this, does she foresee it coming to the Senate, and why it changed in the first place?

Jaasma: This form traditionally was with the AVP and is not policy or procedure and not voted on. When they received a faculty request to change the form, it went thru a consultation process with UEPC and GC and was brought back this year. This year responses differed, so it hasn’t moved forward yet. The reason that enrollment optimum and maximum were deleted is that there is one no slot for that information in PeopleSoft. They left only the items that work with PeopleSoft. The only way your class maximum is noted is when the chair inputs it. It is not input by Esau. The other concern is to not to use the term “maximum.” We don’t use the word “maximum” anymore. If anyone has questions, contact her.

Sarraille: Has been following this and has been reading the UEPC minutes. To the best of his recollection this was never acted on and was deferred all year long last year, so he is having trouble with what occurred last year and this year in UEPC. The bottom line is that we as faculty have to determine that the curriculum is designed appropriately for our students. We as faculty have to retain control on how our courses are designed. Otherwise we’re not the faculty anymore.

Schoenly: Confirmed that this was an old business item and carried over from last year, and that he does not recall much discussion about this issue last year.

Thompson: The argument that the faculty voice in curriculum design should be reduced because it will not fit in PeopleSoft is ridiculous. The Senate needs to be forceful in protecting faculty authority in curricular design.

Carroll: Vigorously agrees that the idea of PeopleSoft governing our curriculum is ridiculous.

Jaasma: It’s the CNS section of the document that was following PeopleSoft. Right now that is determined between consultation between the chair, and faculty member. At any point they can have that number changed.

Shimek: Attended the meeting with UEPC. Real concern for the UEPC was reservations with regard to the process. He will meet with deans and department chairs soon.

*“Parents” Link on Campus Website*

Regalado: Prominently posted on the front page was a link for Parents: Curious about that. Likes that it provides information to help navigate thru the process but it may hurt the university’s academic image. Thinks that 98% of the parents are responsible but that gives a much greater idea of their standing than they do. The handbook may need a code of conduct for parents. Are they getting the message that they’re involved, especially in the classroom, to a greater degree than is appropriate? There are lines that they should not be crossing in respect to their own behavior.

1. **Adjournment:**

3:50 pm