

G. Graham, G. T. Haight, C. Selkin, L. Taiz, K. Tsai

ABSENT

M. Ayati, P. Hechler, S. Herrera, A. Muchlinski, G. Wong

EXCUSED ABSENCE

L. Adams, S. Albert, L. Allison, P. Brier, J. Casanova, D. Dewey, M. Friedman, P. Ganas,
T. Graham, M. Gormly, J. Heppe, J. Hoyt, K. Johnson, R. Nilson, A. Sandler, M. Schiesl,
L. Schwartz, B. Sinclair, F. Stahl, E. Wilson, M. A. Zrimc

EMERITI

W. Taylor convened the meeting at 1:45 p.m.

1. 1.1 The Chair's Announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.1.1 Following is the response from Associate Vice President Winnick to the questions raised by Senator Hechler regarding final exam scheduling:

The questions raised about the scheduling of final exams really focus on three issues that I will address in turn.

Why, with the new schedule of time modules for classes, did some finals have to be moved away from the same time on the same day as the class.

The basic answer is that there are only so many hours and days available and we because keep finals for daytime courses in the daytime hours and finals for evening courses in the evening hours. Thus, while there is room for three evening classes each day (4:20, 6:00, and 8:00), there is room for only two evening finals 4:30-7:00 and 7:30-10:00. Hence, one of the evening classes has to have its final on another day.

The related problem is that we have Monday Only evening classes, Wednesday Only evening classes, and also Monday/Wednesday evening classes. Hence, for any given time slot, while we can schedule two of the three Monday Only and Monday/Wednesday classes for a final exam slot on Monday, one of those has to slip over to Wednesday. That means that the three Wednesday Only evening classes have only one, not even two, final exam slots on Wednesday available to them - two have to be moved to slots on other days. The same problem exists for the Tuesday Only, Thursday Only and Tuesday/Thursday evening classes.

So, when do we schedule these other four finals, two from Wednesday and two from Thursday? They cannot be on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday evenings, nor during any weekday daytime slots. Also, we are not currently scheduling finals on Sundays (though that raises some interesting religious observations questions I will address below). Hence, these finals can only be scheduled on Friday nights or on Saturday during the day or evening. Assuming that evening students prefer evening finals, two of the four go on Friday night. That leaves two for Saturday. It should be noted that as we teach more Friday evening and Saturday classes to accommodate more students, the problem of conflicting times is becoming even more difficult.

The second issue raised is that of notification and consultation.

There was full consultation when the new class time module schedule was adopted, and the resulting problems with final exam scheduling was obvious in those considerations. Regarding notification: we purposely publish the Final Exam Schedule in the Class Schedule, so that students and faculty alike know, the finals quarter before, when are for a given class and can plan accordingly. Both faculty and students are expected to review that schedule and to take it into

ANNOUNCEMENTS (Continued)

account when planning for the following term.

Please note, that with different holidays falling on different days during different quarters each year, the final exam schedule, of necessity, cannot be the same each term. So checking it carefully is a reasonable and appropriate expectation of faculty and students alike. For example, when two holidays fall on a Monday during a given quarter, it is the University's practice that the Monday of the week normally set aside for finals becomes a regular class meeting day to avoid losing 2 out of 10 class meetings. That implies that finals have to be compressed into the Tuesday through Saturday time frame, which necessitates proportionately more final exams on Friday and Saturday. When, as in the case of this coming Spring term, we have both this problem and the problem we have every Spring, namely that final exams cannot be held on Saturday before 1:30 in the afternoon due to graduation, the problem is even worse. So, the result is that in a term like this Spring, we try to schedule for as few conflicts in the exam schedule as possible and then allow for some safety values for conflicts that do happen. Indeed, after some responses to the initial final exam schedule announced for this coming Spring, it has been decided to make some further changes - but even so, inevitably, some potential conflicts still exist that will have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

The Religious Practices Issue

This is a matter that the University takes quite seriously. We understand that we have students and faculty some of whom observe the Sabbath on Friday, some on Saturday and some on Sunday, and that those observing Friday, actually start the observation Thursday evening, and those observing Saturday, begin Friday evening.

As a matter of sensitivity, collegiality, and respect, and to comply with Federal and State law, the University is committed to making reasonable accommodations to such religious practices among both its employees and students. The basic rule is that the University will consider reasonable, alternative means to accommodate the religious practices of its employees and students, so long as that can be done without imposing an "undue hardship" on the University.

As to the matter at issue in the questions raised about final exam scheduling:

If a student or faculty member who observes the Sabbath during the Friday evening through Saturday afternoon hours, finds that a final exam from a class that meets from Monday through Friday afternoon has been scheduled on either Friday night or Saturday daytime, they can either choose to register for, or teach during, some other time slot if that is feasible given the courses scheduled for that term - or - they can request that a reasonable accommodation regarding the final exam be made. In the case of students, this could mean that we might offer them an alternative time slot during which to take the final - which might mean even on Sunday, which is logically not their Sabbath. For the faculty member, it could mean that someone else is found to proctor that exam.

This University, as a community that attempts to adhere to a code of mutual respect and collegiality, and as one that seeks to abide by both the spirit and letter of the law, is quite willing to make any reasonable accommodation.

I hope this adequately responds to the questions raised. If not, please feel quite free to pursue the matter with me further.

1.1.2 I would like to remind the Senate that President Rosser will be presenting the State of the University Address on Tuesday, February 26th.

1.1.3 Distributed with the Senate packet is the Executive Action taken by the

Executive Committee on the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects change in meeting time. If you wish to discuss the issue, a motion can be made to add it to the agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENTS (Continued)

- 1.2 The Vice Chair's Announcements:
 - 1.2.1 Dale Weaver (Social Work) has accepted appointment by the Committee on Committees to assume the remainder of Ira Sommers term on the Institutional Review Board - Human Subjects which ends Summer 2004.
 - 1.2.2 Marianne James (Accounting) has accepted the appointment by the Committee on Committees to serve as the Winter Quarter, 2002 alternate for Pedro Ramirez on the Faculty Policy Committee.
 - 1.2.3 Committee on Committees has made two appointments to the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee: Thomas Barkley (Nursing) has accepted appointment to serve as the Winter Quarter 2002 alternate for Laura Calderon and Madelyn Detloff (English) has accepted appointment to assume the remainder of the term for Susan Cash which ends in Summer, 2003.
2. Chair Taylor welcomed the following Emeriti Faculty who introduced themselves: L. Adams, S. Albert, L. Allison, P. Brier, J. Casanova, D. Dewey, M. Friedman, P. Ganas, T. Graham, M. Gormly, J. Heppe, J. Hoyt, K. Johnson, R. Nilson, A. Sandle, M. Schiesl, L. Schwartz, B. Sinclair, F. Stahl, E. Wilson, M. A. Zrimc ,
3. None.
4. 4.1 It was m/s/ (Anagnoson) to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 22, 2002 (ASM 01-9).
 - 4.2 Senator Margaziotis reported that the minutes of January 22 should include his name under "excused absence."
 - 4.3 The minutes were approved as corrected.
5. It was m/s/p (Garcia) to approve the agenda.
6. Senator Anagnoson presented the Report of the Task Force on Academic Governance. A question and answer period followed.
7. 7.1 It was m/s/ (Benedict) to approve the recommendation (01-8).
 - 7.2 It was m/ (LaPolt) to waive the first-reading rule.
 - 7.3 The LaPolt motion was withdrawn.
8. It was m/s/ (Benedict) to approve the recommendation (01-9).
9. It was m/s/p (Faust) to adjourn at 2:35 p.m.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION
OF EMERITI

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON
THE GOVERNANCE OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE, SPRING 2001
(01-7) *Presentation by J. Theodore
Anagnoson, Vice Chair and Member of
the Task Force*

PROPOSED POLICY DELETION:
REGULATIONS FOR CONTINU-
ANCE OF EMPLOYMENT
BEYOND AGE 70 FOR TENURED
FACULTY MEMBERS, FACULTY
HANDBOOK, CHAPTER VI
(01-8) First-Reading

PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICA-
TION: EMERITUS STATUS,
FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER
VIII (01-9) First-Reading

ADJOURNMENT