**For**

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

First 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.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

April 8, 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

March 25, 2014

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

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Ian Littlewood, and Kathleen Hidalgo.

**Proxies:** Panos for Petrosky, Schoenly for Kohlhaas, John Mayer for Broadwater, and Eudey for Filling.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Annie Hor, Dennis Shimek, John Tillman, Annie Hor, Coach Michael Matoso, Raichelle Grays, and Lauren Byerly.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:03 pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved as distributed.

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

Approved as distributed.

1. **Introductions**

The following guests were welcomed: Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Annie Hor, Dennis Shimek, John Tillman, Annie Hor, Coach Michael Matoso, Raichelle Grays, and Lauren Byerly.

1. **Announcements**

Carroll: Check your department/personal page on the new iteration of the website.

Nagel: Music and Theatre are staging an opera *Dido and Aeneas* on Friday.

Breshears: Attended the US Dept. of labor conference on Trauma and Foreign care of women veterans, there are 175 of which 33 are dependents on our campus. Veterans can provide benefits to spouses and or adult children. The group committed to gather a faculty group to discuss and have done so. Faculty veterans please say so on your department website and send a brief bio to the Veterans’ Affairs coordinators. Also, please use your syllabus to welcome veterans to the classroom and provides information about veteran-related concerns.

Duggan: The Chancellors put together a bulletin board addressing information for faculty. There is more information on a flyer outside L155 in the Library.

Eudey: The Summer School schedule is live so check to make sure it’s correct. Summer book orders should be turned in ASAP.

Facilities Planning is presenting a new Bicycle Master Plan and looking for a focus group of faculty members.

The campus Center for Excellence in Graduate Education graduate assistant and applications are available for fall 2014.

The Chancellor’s Office provided a document, “CSU by the Numbers,” which should be available electronically soon. If not, Eudey can provide paper copies.

The Faculty Center will issue a call for Faculty Center Fellows for next year, Faculty Learning Communities, and Mini-Grants. This year’s fellow, Ann Strahm, has offered to meet with programs to discuss Twitter and other technologies.

Tuedio: tomorrow and on Thursday, Luis Valdez, Cesar Chavez scholar-in-residence, will be on campus, with a keynote in the main dining hall. Thursday night, a screening of *Zoot Suit* at the State with an introduction by Valdez.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

Graduate Council: (Perrello) The committee will recommend a policy change concerning continuous enrollment in summer term.

Reviewing the APR review process to attempt to make it more efficient.

Work continues on a strategic plan for graduate education.

UEPC: (Schoenly) The committee reviewed the latest draft of the Student Fee Advisory Committee Guidelines and Procedures, provided by VP Espinosa. This revision, which incorporated suggestions of UEPC members, outlines how the student committee will review different fee requests for courses (e.g., lab and art fees). This policy now goes back to the VP’s office for immediate implementation..

Eudey met with the committee to discuss the need for a curriculum policy for Selected Topics or Special Studies Courses. Such courses provide faculty a platform to test out new courses, especially for new faculty who wish to teach courses in their areas of expertise. Present policy allows the same Selected Topics course to be offered twice (at the undergraduate level), but that’s where policy ends. Current practices vary across the colleges regarding how Selected Topics and Special Topics courses are handled (e.g., do they go through curriculum committees?) and how much paperwork is required. While UEPC acknowledges the need for flexibility and procedural simplicity for creating and teaching such courses, it also recognizes that new policy language will be needed to provide guidance in the future.

Completed a revision to the Instructor Withdrawal Policy regarding online classes. Specifically, UEPC is responding to faculty requests to require a deadline for students to login for online classes after classes begin. The proposed revision has gone to SEC for AS consideration.

VPFAHR Shimek and CFA president John Sarraille met with the committee to discuss the new course proposal form, specifically why the optimal and maximum class size information was deleted from the C&S classification section which specifies the faculty member’s mode of instruction. The current version only includes the SFR which is not part of the C&S section. Much discussion followed as to the need for faculty to retain such information when designing the curriculum and incorporating pedagogy in their courses. Despite assurances by Shimek that course maxima are decided (in consultation) between the dean, faculty, and department chair, faculty around the table exchanged stories that such changes have occurred in the past. Contingent and probationary faculty are particularly at risk in this situation in that they may feel compelled to agree to a change 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. UEPC will continue this discussion.

Continued discussion of a new concentration in Kinesiology, called Health Promotion that is being proposed. FBAC has completed its review of the budgetary considerations, and UEPC has scheduled times to meet with Kinesiology and Nursing faculty to discuss the proposal.

Completed work on a revision to the Course Requirement Policy which has been renamed the Syllabus Requirements policy that senators have in front of them today to consider as a 1st reading item.

FBAC (Lindsay) Patrick Kelly met with the committee to discuss constraints for research funds, time, space, technical support and supplies. FBAC will keep this item on its agenda and will be checking with other CSU’s to see how they handle this.

Paul O’Brien met to discuss international travel funding. Perhaps the campus may be able to increase funding if the funds in the International Students office increases.

SWAS (Eudey): The SWAS’ resolutions:

Recommends that lecturers be eligible for emeritus status. It is possible for lecturers to obtain Emeritus Status but is not allowed for PT lecturers. SWAS welcomes a change to our emeritus policy to allow that. Stanislaus is listed as one of the 16 campus that allows FTL’s to have emeritus status.

Supports shared governance in appointment of faculty to committees where the faculty fill a representative role.

Asks that academic senate chairs and state-wide senators have ready access to communication with their faculty.

Express great concern with allowing community colleges to have Baccalaureate degrees and mapped out criteria that should be contained in any legislation.

Called for the Chancellor to make RSCA funding a budget line rather than one-time money and to make all ranks eligible for the grants. Some campuses grant priority to probationary faculty and faculty going for promotion.

Upcoming first readings concern exceptions to the 120-unit degree maximum, facilitation of CSU-wide discipline councils, faculty definition of teaching modalities (for example, what is the definition of an online course; required by 2015), changes to Title 5 pertaining to residence requirements in graduate programs, RSCA funding from the Chancellor’s Office and the eligibility for that funding.

 **Discussion Item**

* 1. **Student Athlete Progress Report policy/process (Raichelle T. Grays)**

Speaker Garcia reminded us that this item emerged from the last Senate meeting when one senator raised questions and concerns about progress checks for students who participate in athletics.

The item was brought up in Open Forum at the previous senate.

Grays’ role is to ensure academic success for student athletes through advising and other activities. The advisor sends out academic progress report requests after census in order to catch any problems early, then later in the term to follow up on progress. The return rate has been around 83%, she has not had any notification of problems previously, and she is open to feedback.

*Points of discussion:*

Regalado noted that he had attempted to follow up without getting a response. He noted that concern should be around the University mission rather than the NCAA and is concerned about an emphasis on athletic eligibility. He believes that student athletes are not faring as well academically as the general student population. Grays: Interpreted the email as a recommendation rather than a query. The issue about student progress is a different question. The progress report provides useful information to help student success. Matoso, Athletic director: The information is different for students on scholarships. The 2012 graduation rate actually goes back to 2006. Those figures don’t include the students that left or had to work. Graduation rates are based on a very small cohort. Mayer: The senate is not a place to air personal concerns such as noting that emails were not responded to. Grays has improved the attention provided to student athletes and has resolved many issues through early monitoring and consultation. Regalado: Supports athletics, is interested in facilitating graduation and success, and mentioned the emails to provide context.

What *is* the best time to query for information about students and what are the uses of the information? Grays: She makes individual academic plans for students and tries to see if there are academic issues or adjustments due to learning disabilities or if there is a need for mandatory study halls or other sanctions. The information is reported to administration.

These reports can also generate conversations between students and faculty and contribute to student success.

Can faculty delay completing the forms until a time they believe better fits the evaluation of students’ progress? Matoso and Grays: Yes, Athletics is not mandating a faculty response time. If there is a delay, Athletics would appreciate a notification sent to Grays.

1. **First Reading Items**
	1. **2/AS/14/UEPC – Syllabus Requirements**

It was M/S Schoenly/Lindsay.

**California State University Stanislaus**

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

**Be it Resolved:** That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus, approve the revised Course Requirement Information; and be it further

**Resolved:** That this policy be effective beginning with the Fall 2014 term.

**Rationale:**  The current policy (12/AS/82/EX) only states what information must be shared with students, not what is mandatory in a syllabus. The syllabus is the appropriate means to communicate such required information, for reasons of student learning, faculty protection, accreditation, etc.

UEPC approved 2/13/14 [END]

This is a revision of a 1982 policy which included suggestions to faculty about what should be in a syllabus. The policy may protect faculty and aid transfer and articulation. The proposed policy asks that we make certain inclusions more explicit.

*Points of discussion:*

Is the resolution’s rationale too vague?

Should there be a statement about plagiarism.

Why was the policy taken up again? Schoenly and Eudey: The policy is a reference point for workshops on syllabus design, and the feeling was that the policy could stand a review and possible update.

Many other things could be required, for example, ADA compliance, technological requirements,

The policy does not require a syllabus; should that be a requirement?

Does item #1 refer to the instructor’s learning outcomes and goals or some other outcomes or goals such as those on the course proposal or program learning outcomes?

What latitude should faculty have in presenting learning outcomes on a syllabus?

Should faculty be barred from clauses which allow them to “change the syllabus at their discretion”?

Should there be language restricting the latitude of faculty in changing syllabi after the beginning of the term?

Is item #3 too ambiguous?

Should the second resolve include language that the policy be incorporated into the faculty handbook?

Should we require a common format for syllabi?

What was the reason for striking *requirements* from item #1 in the 1982 policy?

Should item #3 include *participation* in light of online courses?

Should online courses have additional requirement for syllabi?

Should there be a common format required of all syllabi?

Should there be a requirement to reference student adherence to pre-requisites?

Soodjinda: as we start inviting more online courses can we…..

Schonely we just passed a revision of a policy on IW’s and are moving in that direction. Taking what is face to face. Anything else for UEPC to consider

Wisniewski asked for flexibility while still adhering to this initially .

Speaker Garcia cautioned us to be cautious. He sees a tendency in the conversation to separate faculty from students, give all power to faculty, and leave students out of equation.

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

It was M/S Lindsay/Eudey

*3/AS/14/FBAC – Budget Priorities Resolution*

*PREAMBLE: The budget priorities of the CSU Stanislaus for 2013-14 must recognize the primacy of our central mission:  educating the people of our region.  While universities often take on additional missions and acquire properties that are peripheral to their central mission, the size and role of CSU Stanislaus--as a public university in an under-educated, poorer part of a much better educated and wealthy state--makes our central mission that much more prominent. The budget lines that relate directly to educating our students both through instruction and the support of instruction should be enhanced.*

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 for the University are the following mutually dependent items, equally essential to the central mission of CSU Stanislaus:

* Maintain maximum possible access for qualified students, including admission to campus and access to courses required for degree completion;
* Raise the percentage of FTES instruction delivered by tenured/tenure track faculty to seventy-five percent (as per ACR 73) with the intention of reducing the student/faculty ratio;
* Adequately fund non-instructional faculty and staff positions to effectively support the central mission, specifically including tenure-track psychological counselors, tenure-track librarians, and career services advisors;
* Fund adequate assigned time for tenured/tenure track faculty to allow an average of 18 wtus teaching assignment thus allowing time for expected research, scholarship and creative activities, professional development, and community engagement;
* Fund the recently approved department chair workload rubric;
* Hire dean level leadership for graduate programs and the office of research and sponsored programs;
* Institutionalize funding for activities now performed by CEGE and PACE that contribute to student success;
* Fund campus activities that honor and promote diversity on campus and the neighboring communities; and be it further

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 Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) is established in the Constitution of the General Faculty and the priorities listed in this resolution should be given the same consideration as those of any other budget advisory committee; and be it further

 RESOLVED: FBAC is viewed as the advisory committee to the administration on fiscal decisions. The faculty is primarily responsible for all academic and pedagogic areas, and has ultimate academic responsibility for the programs, and be it further

 RESOLVED: That any major change affecting the central 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 be applied to all considerations of budgetary decisions, effective immediately.

RATIONALE: The Faculty of CSU Stanislaus wants 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 four involve procedures to ensure faculty input in decisions related to the budget. FBAC has provided statements of faculty budget priorities as follows:

3/AS/14/FBAC

10/AS/10/FBAC

22/AS/08/FBAC

10/AS/07/FBAC

21/AS/05/FBAC

20/AS/04/FBAC

17/AS/03/FBAC

24/AS/01/FBAC

1/AS/01/FBAC [END]

Lindsay noted that there were many other items suggested to the committee, each thoroughly discussed to see if it rose to the level of importance. Omission does not mean that the committee sees the item as unimportant. Eudey appreciates this resolution, especially our attention to diversity issues. It is a fantastic list of items that have been under our preview for a long time.

*Points of discussion:*

For resolved three, bullet point two: What is the current percentage of tenure-track FTEF.

Are there conflicts in reducing the TT faculty load and other items that will come at a high dollar cost? Lindsay: The document was designed to help decision making. The committee is aware that the document in aspirational. UBAC is also following a similar path. There is no expectation that all priorities will be met quickly.

1. **Open Forum**

Thompson: when FAC was talking about disruptive students and the policies that the university has, Ron Noble had said that there was a document available to be posted on the website when the new version of the site became available. What is the link to the document? Sims noted that is still on the FAC agenda, and he still trying to get 2 more faculty to join the focus group. Espinoza agreed to follow up.

Eudey: Steve Filling will be running for chair of Academic Senate of CSU so we do have a chance that one of our senators will be on the SWAS. If you think it’s a good thing please support him. He’s a candidate.

Byerly community announcement. Daniel Afonso directing the Modesto Symphony will be performing Brahms Requiem on May 9 & 10 at the Gallo Center of Arts. Tickets are very reasonable.

1. **Adjournment**

3:4ppm