**For**

First and second reading of 9/AS/14/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System. The resolution passed.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

September 23, 2014

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

Minutes submitted by:

Betsy Eudey, Clerk

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

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 1, 2013

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

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

Academic Senate

September 9, 2014

**Present:** Bettencourt, Burroughs, Brodie, Carroll, Crayton, Dorsey, Edwards, Eudey, Foreman, Gerson, Guichard, Hoover, Huang, Johnson, Littlewood, Lore, Manrique, Miller-Antonio, Morris, Mulder, Nagel, Parks, Peterson, Phillips, Strong, Powell, Price, Li, Silverman, Strahm,

Thompson, and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, and Umar Ghuman.

**Proxies:** Eudey for Filling, Strahm for Petrosky, Price for Olivant.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: James Tuedio, Oddmund Myhre, John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, Reza Kamali, David Lindsay, Dennis Shimek, John Sarraille, 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 August 26, 2014 (distributed electronically)** Approved as distributed.
2. **Introductions**

The following guests were welcomed:

James Tuedio, Oddmund Myhre, John Tillman, Brian Duggan, Marge Jaasma, Ron Rodriguez, Reza Kamali, David Lindsay, Dennis Shimek, John Sarraille, and Lauren Byerly.

1. **Announcements**

Bret Carroll noted that a few weeks ago we discussed the merits and demerits of using iClickers. This is still on the SEC agenda, but we didn’t get to it at our last meeting. Regarding the use of microphones during Senate meetings, Isabel and Whitney have looked into this, and it turns out that it is not as easy to get these in the room. There is only one outlet for microphones. Other alternatives are costly and logistically complex. For now, we’ll ask that we use projected voices in the room.

Provost Strong announced that the US News and World Report will be announcing today or tomorrow that CSU Stanislaus is ranked as a top regional university in the West. Stanislaus is one of 15 schools ranked as a top regional public university in the West with the likes of Cal Poly and other CSUs Long Beach, Chico, San Jose, Fullerton, and Fresno. We welcome that and thank everyone for hard work put into making us a top school in the west. Thanks to John Tillman for submitting the information to US News and World Report.

Provost Strong addressed the WASC open forum. He wanted to make a few things clear about the special visit occurring in a few weeks. There will not be an open forum as it’s planned now, although the university asked for one. The university proposes to WASC what the schedule will be, and then WASC makes changes and creates a final schedule. They want some additional time to finish their report and have decided not to have an open forum. Stanislaus is hosting the site visit by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) on October 2-3, 2014.

Jaasma noted that there will be a private email address for people to send information to the WASC team. The email will go out tomorrow. The final schedule has not yet been distributed. Provost Strong said that if the Senate feels strongly that we should have an open forum, we can request it.

Eudey asked for clarification about the meeting. Jaasma said there was an open forum and exit meeting last time WASC visited the campus. The exit meeting will still occur and be held on Friday, October 3rd but you can’t give feedback at the exit meeting. All are invited to this meeting on Friday morning. The team specified very clearly that they want to arrive on Thursday at 8am and have a working lunch, and don’t have time to meet with all the groups they want to meet with. The finalized schedule for the visit will be shared with the campus community as soon as it is available.

Provost Strong clarified that there will be a one-way information meeting at closing, but not a two-way open forum for campus community folks to give input and ask questions and so forth.

Johnson does not support asking WASC to have an open forum. They have expressed an interest to get done quickly. From her perspective, she thinks that it might bode well for the campus that they think they can be in and out of here. She would not want to put that good feeling at risk by rejecting the final schedule. She thinks they have provided an opportunity for us to provide feedback, and she’s against us asking for a revision of the schedule.

O’Brien second’s Johnson’s opinion. We can use the email address if we feel it’s urgent to communicate with them.

Speaker Carroll notes that WASC will be meeting with SEC for 45 minutes or so. In addition to the confidential email, if there are issues you’d like SEC to raise with them you can email him and we can share them.

We held a straw poll to see if there was interest in requesting a revision to the final schedule to include an open forum. Results of the straw poll: 8 yes, 29 against, 8 abstained. We will not make the request.

Provost Strong noted that President Sheley has written a letter to UBAC in response to the UBAC recommendations at this link: <https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/UBAC/ubac_report_2014-2015.pdf>

Provost Strong noted that Dean Lindsay is on UBAC and might want to point out a few highlights of the letter if we’re interested.

Lindsay offered a synopsis. The President expressed caution in making any changes that might ultimately lead to a structural deficit should our funding be cut in the future. He reminded us that Prop 30 only has 2 more years before it expires. That being said, he clearly realizes there is a need to expand our staffing, and in that context spoke to instructional needs, chair release time, advising and counseling, and Public Safety and risk management. We will need to hold the line without expanding our structural deficit and still work on staffing and instructional needs.

Eudey asked if UBAC is continuing to work and responding to the memo. O’Brien said they haven’t heard anything yet. Lindsay attended last year in his role as the FBAC representative. O’Brien and Wooley are continuing UBAC members. No formal notice of a meeting time was set. Tuedio said we will need to rethink the chairing of committee since Carl Whitman is gone. The expectation would be for the committee to start meeting significantly earlier this year to deal with issues with involvement of the campus community that wasn’t as compressed as last year. UBAC would like to arrive at decisions earlier than last year. Provost Strong will ask President Sheley about his thoughts on the next steps for UBAC. He assumes the president will make decisions related to issues that came through the UBAC process.

Provost Strong announced an Advising Task Force that was mentioned recently in a President’s update. The President has asked that VP Espinoza and Provost Strong chair this task force and is proposing it be made up of 3 faculty, 1 Department Chair, 1 Dean, and 3 members from the advising Academic Resource Center recommended by VP Espinoza. He’s asking that the Advising Task Force review and synthesize discussions of advising, review best practices here and elsewhere, and make recommendations for advising. The call for this task force is a result of an ASI resolution submitted to the President at this link: <https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Office%20of%20the%20President/documents/advising_resolution.pdf>

The president is asking for feedback on his thoughts outlined in his Presidential update by email to [president@csustan.edu](mailto:president@csustan.edu) Once he receives feedback he will proceed with a more detailed charge.

Peterson noted that Thursday October 2nd is the Taste of the Valley event at the Stanislaus County Fairgrounds. This event is sponsored by the Ag Studies and you will enjoy wine, cheese, and appetizers. The event is from 6-9pm.

Salameh announced several ASI and USU events of interest. The Stan Fest carnival is based on inviting community members and is a fun, family oriented event on September 21st at 11am in the campus quad area. September 20th is Stan Fest Concert at 6pm in the Amphitheater.

The Associated Students Inc. & University Student Union has recently started a community service project called Warriors Giving Back. Warriors Giving Back will consist of multiple events where students, faculty, and staff will have the opportunity to give back and support our local community.

Salameh noted that Warriors Giving Back: Backpack and School Supply Drive is our first event as part of our community service project. It kicked off on August 26th and will end Friday, September 12th. We are asking the campus community to donate backpacks, school supplies, and money to help prepare local 2nd grade students to succeed this school year. The drop off location for all donations is the Service Desk in the Warrior Activities Center located in the University Student Union, and drop offs can be made Monday-Friday 8-5pm.

Also there will be a Run4U event on Saturday, September 20th at the Ed & Bertha Fitzpatrick Arena. Registration will be at 8am and it’s a 5K Run/Walk on campus. Registration will be available online. CSUS Students pay a $20 fee and non-CSUS students pay $30. Awards will be presented. A Postmaster announcement is coming out soon. It will be a fun atmosphere.

Salameh announced ASI will be holding voter registration for the November elections. September 23rd is national voter registration day. They will have a table on the quad. They will also share information about the candidates. There will be a voter registration campaign throughout the month of October. They will also be addressing this on social media.

Kilolo Brodie noted that the Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee is committed to the action piece of that title. She noted the diversity statement the president endorsed in the fall. They are in the planning stages of numerous events including those addressing Title IX, persons with disabilities, heritages and cultural groups. The committee is open to ideas and would appreciate your support. There is active involvement and they are spreading information on and off campus. There are about 6-7 members of the committee in this room. They are open to your feedback and welcome your support. Contacting any committee members would be appropriate.

Sam Regalado had a question for Salameh. Will ASI be hosting a candidate’s forum sometime this fall and respond to questions at a national or local level? Salameh said that there will be a 2014 candidate’s event with an open forum. She’s invited all the candidates, and is waiting to hear form Olsen and Denham. The event will take place on October 2st in the Carol Burke Lounge. They’re looking into partnering with the Rotary Club for that event. The event will include a Q&A session.

Regalado noted that some may have seen the Ray Rice football player scenes with him knocking his girlfriend unconscious. It was a sobering scene and he has been released from the Baltimore Ravens team. This overshadows similar issues at the college level. There was a FSU quarterback charged with rape a year ago, and Title IX is obliged to look into this. Unfortunately, they waited until after the national championship to address this. The History Department has invited Professor Sarah K. Fields, a national expert on Title IX, in the arena of sports and beyond. She will be a guest of the History Department. She will be discussing Title IX and its provisions. She will also speak to implications of the term student-athlete. They’re still figuring out the logistics for her visit. Regalado is glad she’ll be talking about their history and implications of Title IX.

Salameh asked for clarification about the use of the term student-athletes. Regalado noted that it came from the NCAA and was used to not advance the noble warrior-like activities of the athlete, but to protect the NCAA from litigation when athletes were injured. It had nothing to do with creating an image of a scholar-athlete, but to prevent athletes who were injured from getting help.

O’Brien sent an email on Facnet on June 19th with the subject of discussion about international education. He’s getting a group of faculty interested in international education to see how they want to promote it on campus. He will try to have a lunch at the beginning of October. A Postmaster notification will go out soon.

Espinoza asked about the forum in which Dr. Sara K. Fields will speak. Regalado said that they wanted to schedule it at a time when most could show up so likely it will be in the evening. They will make Dr. Fields available for other events as well. He thinks it’s an issue for which she could be available on a number of different fronts.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

Speaker Carroll noted that when available the committee reports will be circulated prior to the meeting.

Eudey announced that SWAS met last Wednesday thru Friday and there is no formal report yet. Filling is at the Trustees meeting. They had an opportunity to provide feedback for the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs role. A headhunter firm coordinated this search. Filling is on this search committee so the SWAS was able to ask questions and get feedback.

They passed on the floor a vote for opposition to Assembly Bill 46. Earlier in the spring they had shown support for the assembly bill. This was an attempt to get information from online course management companies like Pearson who were hosting courses on campus but not releasing data to the faculty when requested. The bill requires third-party companies and campuses to give SWAS and campus academic senates access to requested data on online courses/programs. The discussion was contentious in SWAS. The Government Affairs Committee believed that there is a potential to infringe on student rights, and that it could be costly and time consuming to create the data, and there was concern about who would access the data. The legislation says we have to follow all laws related to student privacy, only SWAS and academic senates are named as having access, and anticipated costs were negligible since it was limited to “available data.” The resolution to oppose the bill did pass and they are sending a recommendation to the Governor asking him to Veto the bill. Eudey voted against sending a letter for opposition, as this was something that we had asked for earlier, and this was a bill co-sponsored by CFA responding to the problem at San Jose State, where a freedom of information act request was needed to get data from Udacity.

Eudey noted that the ASCSU is working on a resolution addressing the prevention of sexual violence on campus, and political attacks on faculty and issues of academic freedom. They’re asking for campus Presidents, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to provide open support to faculty when we’re being attacked by outside groups. The draft language is being cleaned up and will be shared later with Asnet.

Eudey noted that in the Chancellor’s visit to SWAS a senator indicated that there were rumors that there will not be any financial penalty if going over the target if the FTES generated by a campus was under 8000 FTES. The senator asked if this was true could the Chancellor affirm this in writing. The Chancellor said “yes,” but left it unclear if this meant that there would be no penalty if or it meant he would send a memo if it were true.

1. **First Reading Item**

**a. 9/AS/14/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System**

Speaker Carroll noted an email from Isabel Pierce about this item and what we hope to accomplish today. We were talking about the possibility of moving this to a second reading.

Strahm hopes we will vote on this today. Strahm moved 9/AS/14/UEPC Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System, Seconded by Eudey.

California State University, Stanislaus

9/AS/14/UEPC – Two-Pass Registration System

The two-pass priority registration allows students to register for 12 units during the first round of registration, which will include appointment times for individual students. During the first pass, all eligible students will be given an appointment to register for classes. The first-pass priority registration will be followed by a second-pass priority registration period, to be followed by an open registration period. The two-pass registration system will apply to 2014-15 and 2015-16 Academic Years. Prior to registration for fall term 2016, a joint review will be conducted by the UEPC and Vice President of Enrollment and Student Affairs.

**9/AS/14/UEPC Approved xxxxx.** This policy replaces the previously approved 35/AS/13/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one-year pilot).

Approved by UEPC 8/28/14

This is related to the resolution that the Senate voted on last academic year on the two-pass registration system that was rejected by President Sheley. It’s not because he disagreed with the process, but because he thought there was nothing in place for an examination as to whether it is working. He returned it to UEPC and they have changed some wording and added that this two-pass system will apply to the 2014-15 and 2015-16 years and a joint review will occur with UEPC and the VP of Enrollment and Student Affairs.

O’Brien says we might see complexity come out of this discussion but it seems straightforward to do. The president is trying to be cautious and this seems to be judicious of him. O’Brien would like to move this to a second reading, Johnson seconded.

Littlewood said we have the new and old resolution. Do the old resolves carry forward unless overwritten by the old one? Speaker Carroll noted that this is not a time to question the whole policy; it’s to tweak the resolution that passed the Senate last year with the hope to have it approved by the president and implemented. The new resolution is a revised version of the previous one. Littlewood said that this is exactly the time to discuss it if it is a new policy.

Johnson noted 9/AS/14/UEPC is replacing 35/AS/13/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot) which is the current policy. The 7/AS/14/UEPC resolution no longer is active because it was not approved. We approved 7/AS/14/UEPC which was rejected by the president on 8/21/14. The new policy is updating the non-approved 7/AS/14/UEPC.

Foreman noted there is some time pressure because it needs to be implemented prior to spring registration. The more quickly we pass this through, the more quickly it can be implemented.

The Senate was reminded about the timeline for processing resolutions. The resolution is forwarded to the president 10 days after the minutes are distributed to the Senate. Then the president has up to 30 days to act on the resolution.

Salameh asked if 12 units are in the policy and can it be changed in the second reading? No, the policy can’t be changed; just the resolution can be amended in the second reading. Thompson noted that we don’t amend the policy unless it’s part of a resolution. Even if we move to a second reading we won’t be adjusting the policy. In first reading discussions we can recommend to UEPC that they take the policy language and move to resolution so it can be amended in a second reading.

Nagel said we could vote to amend the rules to amend the underlying document, but it’s rarely done.

Strahm said that this is virtually the policy that the Senate voted on and the president would have approved it but for the ability to do some research on it. Speaker Carroll noted that there considerable discussion about the number of units in the spring and the Senate went with 12 units. Although, this is a different Senate membership.

Results of the vote to move to a second reading: 32 yes, 11 no, and 1 abstention. Moved to a

Second reading.

Nagel noted that the third resolved of 9/AS/14/UEPC contains a rationale that mentions *“ due to the constantly changing conditions in both enrollment and budget”* He raises this because it could be in the rationale but also because the rationale itself suggests the reason for the two-pass is because of the rejection of the prior resolution, and doesn’t speak to the president’s reasons for rejecting it. The third resolved clause does speak to the president’s reasons. As alluded to before, the president in his memo gives good reasons to ask for the sunset clause in the resolution, but as written by UEPC it suggests the rationale for the sunset clause is because the president asked for it. He asks that the rationale in the resolved clause be shifted. UEPC does not intend to simply do what the president asks, but agrees with the president that this is a good reason to change the resolution.

Strahm suggested language for the third resolved but it was not approved. Foreman suggest that the “That” in the resolved remains “Their”

Johnson wonders if we should remove mention of President Sheley from the rationale. She appreciates the role he played in pointing out the importance of reviewing it, but having the rejection in there makes it seem that we are doing it because he rejected it.

Espinoza mentioned that we have her title miswritten as VPEFA and it should be VPESA.

Hoover agrees with Johnson that we should take out the reference to President Sheley in the rationale. He recommends ending the statement after “2016 Registration Cycle,” then include some new language “because conditions effecting enrollment growth and budget are ever changing, the merits of the two-pass registration system will be reviewed to see if student needs are being met.”

Thompson is neutral on the idea about striking the mention of the president in the rationale, but he thinks there was some difficulty with the resolution, with process and communication, and what we are doing right now does demonstrate the way shared governance should work. President Sheley didn’t want to reject it, but it had to happen. Last year’s Senate agreed on the policy and now we are changing it because it was rejected for a good reason. We altered the resolution and that language could show the magnanimity of the Senate if we left it in there.

Littlewood said that if you read the last line in the 9/AS/14/UEPC policy it states: *This resolution replaces the previously approved 35/AS/13/UEPC – Resolution for Two-Pass Registration System (one year pilot)* Then then all of the other resolved in 35/AS/13/UEPC no longer applies, and there is a lot there that we need. If that’s a right reference, we will overwrite some useful information from the current policy. Everything except the sunset clause would go away.

Foreman notes that the new policy is what was included in the prior resolution.

Littlewood would like to include the 2nd, 3rd and 4th resolved in the 35/AS/13/UEPC policy as follows:

**Resolved:** That the two--‐‑pass registration system allow students to register for 12 units

during the first round of registration, which shall include appointment times for

individual students and last for approximately 10 days; and be it further

**Resolved:** That this first--‐‑pass priority registration be followed immediately by a

second--‐‑pass priority registration period, to be followed by an open registration period

that shall continue for at least 15 business days and should continue until 12:00

midnight of the first day of instruction; and be it further

**Resolved:** That the registration priority reflects order by class level. Priority of

registration will be determined by units completed within class level in the following

order: seniors, master’s and credential students, juniors, sophomores, freshmen, and

unclassified post baccalaureate students; and be it further

Littlewood wants the 15 business days noted in this new policy. It’s an important clause that should be included. Eudey noted that registration policy indicates that courses cannot be added without instructor permission beginning on the first day of instruction.

Strahm said that the 15 day portion is constraining, as it is not always 15 days. The registrar’s office decides number of days for open registration based on FTES, registrations, etc. and within that they decide how many days they hold enrollment, it’s not necessarily 15 days. Littlewood said that it’s important to finish on the day immediately preceding classes. If we don’t have that last date for open registration, it causes problems for others. You cannot continue beyond 11:59pm on the day before classes start. We need that.

Johnson noted that if we don’t get something passed, we go back to the one-pass system. If we don’t want that to happen, what is our timeline? What is the latest we can have it replaced? We cannot make the enrollment changes until after the president approves the policy. Bernardo would like the information by October 1, 2014 for inputting into the system. If we don’t pass this for the fall registration, we go back to the one-pass system.

Thompson noted Littlewood’s resolution is to have it go back to UEPC. If we have to go back to UEPC it’s not the end of the world. Doing things expeditiously is not substitute for doing them right. Thompson says the date of October 1 is a statement, but how realistic a deadline is it? Is it a preference of the registrar or does a switch has to be thrown? We moved to second reading, but the discussion is a first reading with ideas for amendments, whether to go into policy. We are not headed to a good end if amending policy and the resolution is on the floor. He hopes there are good notes, and these concerns are addressed if this is referred back to UEPC.

Salameh is concerned because of deadlines that need to be met. We need a good registration process for fall and the future. The student’s perspective is lost if it goes back to the one-pass system. We need to keep consistency on what we want and deadlines need to be met.

O’Brien wonders if there is language to fix the situation. Littlewood noted the language in the third resolved.

Strahm said that this body approved a resolution, rejected because it didn’t have a means to examine the veracity of the policy. We removed things that the registrar said didn’t need to be in the policy because they were already policy. We can take what was passed last year, with those numbers in it, and simply add the language we went over in UEPC to that. This is the same thing this body approved last year, both the policy and resolution which would resolve some of the issues that some of the folks have.

Peterson noted that would be 7/AS/14/UEPC from the last page of the packet. She suggests we use the policy from 7/AS/14/UEPC and the resolution from 9/AS/14/UEPC.

Tuedio noted that the 35/AS/13/UEPC does not exist anymore. We are back to the one-pass system if we don’t reengage. The new resolution affirms the two-pass system but doesn’t define it the way it did in the pilot. If it is not a question of prior one, embed three resolved clauses from 35/AS/13/UEPC.

Hoover keeps hearing that this body passed something already. As a point of order, this body didn’t pass a resolution, this is a new body. It might be unpopular to hash through it again, but it’s appropriate if there are new senators in the room who want to address it.

Foreman noted that there is a flaw in the last page because that policy says students are given 8-10 days to register. You can’t just take that language and have to change it? He likes the idea that Tuedio suggested to put in the resolved from the 2013 version, but he does have concerns that this is directive to those running the system. This is very specific and limits their freedom of action depending on the circumstances they find themselves in. If we put them in is it likely after some consideration that this will be rejected again because we’ve made those changes and they’d like to see more freedom to act in the moment.

Result of the vote 18 yes, 24 no, 2 abstained.

Johnson voted to suspend the rules to allow for policy modification. Hoover seconded. Foreman calls the question. Seconded by Gerson.

Result of the vote, 41 Yes, 2 no, 0 abstentions.

Hoover suggests the phrase “that will continue for at least 15 business days….” Be inserted into the policy “to be followed by an open registration period “That will continue for at least 15 business days until 12 midnight on the first day of instruction.” Thompson objects for two reasons. One is that UEPC has done its due diligence on this and not having the language of 15 days is not problematic. Inserting it into the policy may set us up for problems in having this accepted which could put us in even more of a bind timeline wise. Suggested that we go back to the policy as it stands. Provost Strong thinks it’s problematic to combine policy and procedure, and 15 days is procedural and not a policy issue.

Price said it sounds like one registration till first day of instruction, but not what Eudey read. One is saying we’re mandating open registration, and the other says the registrar is saying when. The temporary policy said “should” not “shall” so it allowed some flexibility.

Johnson asked how this policy was difficult for the Sciences. Littlewood said for labs if students could register without a permission number after classes started they could miss the safety lab, and that could be a dangerous situation. He didn’t want them in the lab without safety lecture.

Strahm notes that the registration policy states students need permission numbers on or after the first day of classes and continues on. Does that policy not speak to your concern? Littlewood says it does. The concern was that this first page didn’t spell it out. He thinks it needs to be spelled out. In his mind, the second-fourth resolves from the prior policy could be moved and fix it.

Littlewood suggests from 35/AS/13/UEPC moving resolved clauses 2-4, changing the time to 11:59pm of the day before classes. Littlewood is concerned that it is clarified in all locations.

Littlewood said students can only do things that PeopleSoft allows them to. Why have the PeopleSoft rules reflect what we want and only those setting up the rules can do it.

Bettencourt moves to close debate. Seconded by Morris.

Result of the vote 33 Yes, 11 No, 1 abstention, debate is closed.

Voting on the original resolution . Result of the vote, 37 yes 8 no. The resolution passes.

Speaker Carroll noted that those who had objections, there is a sunset clause and time to reconsider changes the next time around.

1. **Open Forum**

O’Brien moved to adjourn, Crayton seconds. Sarraille congratulated Bettencourt for his perspicacious grasp of group dynamics.

1. **Adjournment**

4pm