

**CSUF ACADEMIC SENATE**

Date: May 12, 2000

To: Faculty Electorate

From: Harry P. Jeffrey, Chair  
Senate Elections CommitteeSubject: **RESULTS OF MAY 2000 ALL-UNIVERSITY ELECTION – S-O-O Section****STATEMENTS OF OPINION****1. Part-time faculty should be a constituency with representation on the Academic Senate.**64 Strongly Agree55 Strongly Disagree64 Agree10 No Opinion53 Disagree

**PRO:** The Senate now includes representatives from full-time faculty, students, and the administration. Since the Senate votes on policies which directly affect them--FMI policies and Personnel Guidelines for Part-time Lecturers come to mind--it is only fair that they be afforded the opportunity to have their voices heard. Many of our other policies indirectly affect them in various ways. Part-time lecturers make up a sizeable and growing proportion of the campus population. It is time that their voices are heard.

**CON:** Adding part-time faculty to the Academic Senate as full members does not accomplish anything in terms of giving these groups a voice that they do not already have. This is true because committees do much of the work of collegial governance and because unions represent these groups with regard to employment conditions. Further, the long term academic stature of the University depends on the involvement of the permanent full time faculty, working closely with the administration. Part-time faculty do not have the commitment to the campus that full-time faculty have. This would make the Senate itself a larger deliberative body and likely expand the time necessary to conduct business. It would also create a new constituency.

**2. Staff should be a constituency with representation on the Academic Senate.**36 Strongly Agree99 Strongly Disagree44 Agree11 No Opinion77 Disagree

**PRO:** The Senate now includes representatives from full-time faculty, students, and the administration. Staff make up a sizeable and growing proportion of the campus population and many engage in regular and important interaction with faculty and students regarding academic policy. They are knowledgeable about the campus and its needs. It is time that their voices are heard.

**CON:** Adding staff to the Academic Senate as full members does not accomplish anything in terms of giving these groups a voice that they do not already have. This is true because committees do much of the work of collegial governance and staff are included ex officio on relevant committees. This would make the Senate itself a larger deliberative body and likely expand the time necessary to conduct business. It would also create a new constituency.

**3. All full and part time instructors should be required to post, or submit for posting, each semester, their course syllabi on a CSUF-hosted Web server.**

39 Strongly Agree

99 Strongly Disagree

43 Agree

8 No Opinion

61 Disagree

**PRO:** All instructors are currently required to distribute a syllabus to their students in the first classroom session of the semester. In addition, all instructors are required to submit a copy of that syllabus to their department for access by other instructors, students, and administrators. Converting syllabi to electronic form, accessible on the World Wide Web is simply a routine activity that is consistent with the university's project concerning the implementation of a campus-wide, integrated electronic document management system.

**CON:** Some instructors do not wish to publicly display their syllabi because they are concerned that their availability on the World Wide Web may lead to unauthorized copying of their work by other instructors. In addition, the posting, indexing and cross referencing all syllabi each semester will require the commitment of inordinate resources that might better be utilized elsewhere.

**4. If "YRO" state-supported instruction in the summer is fully funded and essentially takes the place of our current fee-supported "summer school," CSUF should move to a trimester calendar.**

60 Strongly Agree

70 Strongly Disagree

57 Agree

16 No Opinion

42 Disagree

**PRO:** Done right, this could be a win-win-win for faculty, students, and the citizens of California. Faculty could choose extra pay for extra work or, intriguingly, might work "year-around" for (let us say) four trimesters, and then take two consecutive terms off. The opportunities for research, creative activity, and / or travel seem inviting. Students could move quickly through academic programs featuring course selections more extensive than we now offer in summer school, creating institutional capacity. Taxpayers would gain capacity without building many new buildings.

**CON:** A trimester calendar boils down to running a longer term in the summer. But flexibility is the hallmark of summer sessions currently, and we'd lose it with trimesters. Presently, we can have many sessions within a summer term, well designed to meet the needs of particular clienteles. Class A might begin June 15 and run six weeks; Class B might begin July 5 and run four weeks; etc. Note also that public school teachers both need our summer instruction (for credential maintenance and salary advancement), and probably could not begin early in June -- their school years don't end that early. It seems that trimesters would not serve them. Losing intersession, moreover, disadvantages faculty who seek to engage in other endeavors, and students who wish to accelerate their progress to the degree. And: just how much can we battle the very familiar American pattern of "summers are different?"

5. **The Senate Forum has been a publication of the Academic Senate focusing on campus issues of interest for more than a decade. In some years it has been published twice a semester while in other years it has only been published once a semester (but in a longer format). Please respond to the following questions:**

a. Do you regularly read all or part of Senate Forum? Yes 170No 72

b. Do you think that the Senate should continue publishing the Senate Forum? Yes 181  
No 41

c. If your answer to b. is "Yes", what is your preference regarding the form of publication?

Hardcopy (paper) only 40      Electronic format 62      Both Hardcopy & Electronic Format 77

d. What suggestions do you have for improving the Senate Forum? 27  
suggestions

6. **The student withdrawal policy should be changed to allow students to withdraw from a class with a W without demonstrating a serious and compelling reason, but require instead payment of a substantial fee for withdrawing from a course after the third week of the semester.**

60 Strongly Agree

67 Strongly Disagree

48 Agree

14 No Opinion

35 Disagree

**PRO:** The current system places a significant enforcement burden on department chairs and/or associate deans. It is not clear that the policy is consistently enforced. There are good reasons why a student would drop one course and not all courses, yet the current policy strongly discourages dropping a single course after the third week. A substantial fee would signal to students that enrolling in a course and not completing it is not costless and should not be treated as trivial.

**CON:** Students who enroll in courses and drop them generate significant costs to the university and to other students (who could have had the vacated seat). Although the current system creates additional paperwork, it is worthwhile because students do understand that a W is not automatic and that courses cannot be dropped for flimsy reasons. Many of our students are already financially constrained and an additional fee would be unfair.