

<p>Academic Senate April 29, 2014</p> <p>Present: Bell, Bice, Breshears, Broadwater, Carroll, Crayton, Espinoza, Eudey, R. Floyd, Garcia, Ghuman, Guichard, Hartman, , 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.</p> <p>Excused: Advanced Studies, Kathleen Hidalgo, Panos Petratos, Jeff Mulder and Noelle Won.</p> <p>Proxies: Eudey for Filling, Regalado for Carroll</p> <p>Guests: The following guests were welcomed: Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Annie Hor, Dennis Shimek, Carl Whitman, John Tillman, Chuck Gonzalez, Linda Nowak, and Oddmund Myhre.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second reading of 4/AS/14/GC Resolution for Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Project Units Policy. Passed.</p> <p>First reading of 5/AS/14/UEPC – Instructor Withdrawal Policy. Will return as a second reading.</p> <p>First and second reading of AS/14/SEC – Resolution in Support of the Statewide Resolution AS-3172-14-EX (In Support of AB 2324 (Williams) Pertaining to CSU Faculty Trustee. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: May 13, 2014 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Mark Thompson, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order

2:02 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved as distributed.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 8, 2014 (distributed electronically)

Approved as amended to include *Powell* on page 2 item 6.

4. Introductions

The following guests were welcomed: Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, James Tuedio, Annie Hor, Dennis Shimek, Carl Whitman, John Tillman, Chuck Gonzalez, Linda Nowak, and Oddmund Myhre.

5. Announcements

Whitman: UBAC community forum 10:00am on 4/30 MSR 130. Vice Presidents have presented their priorities, and now the UBAC is seeking input from the campus at-large.

Speaker Garcia announced that the COC and the SEC recommended and the Provost approved Dr. Jennifer Helzer as the CSU Stanislaus representative to the Academic Council on International Programs.

Congratulations to Chris Nagel on his election to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) National Council, representing District 1 (California, Utah, Arizona, Hawaii, Nevada, Colorado, and New Mexico). This is another demonstration of Chris' commitment to supporting and improving the quality of faculty work life and quality of teaching, learning and higher education.

Eudey: The Faculty Development Center received a \$19.7K grant to support quality online instruction. A summer faculty initiative will include grants for course redesign and workshops to help faculty self-assess online courses.

The CO will offer funding for faculty learning communities to address support for programs for student success, especially in STEM courses and related to Common Core. Eudey would appreciate input on possible topics. Regalado noted that Eudey sent out some information on the Dream Act and undocumented students. Eudey responded that, unfortunately, that initiative will not fit this funding, but Fullerton has opened a special resource center for families and their students to make sure undocumented students receive appropriate support.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Schoenly (UEPC) Report for the UEPC's April 10th meeting:

Discussion continued on the Repeat Courses Policy and Priority Registration for Super Seniors who have 150 or more units. Our system now alerts students that they cannot enroll in a course for the 4th time. Lisa Bernardo provided UEPC with data from the past 5 semesters. Since Spring 2012, the data show a slight upward trajectory in the number of students enrolling in the same courses at least 3 times with 3 notable clusters by department (Biology, Business, and Liberal Studies). The latest data (S2014) show 101 students are doing multiple repeats, out of thousands of enrolled students. Because seniors are the largest group who are repeating to complete their degrees, UEPC recommended no change at this time, but it is rumored that the CO may change the number of attempts from 3 to 2. Regarding the Super Seniors issue, ASI President Miriam Salameh took up the issue to the ASI Board and reported a proposal to lower registration priority for Super Seniors who have completed 150 units or attempted 180 units. Data provided by Enrollment Management showed that this change would affect only 50-60 students which was not viewed as problematic by the committee. The committee voted to keep priority registration as it currently stands to give Super Seniors the access to the classes they need to graduate.

Mechelle Perea-Ryan and Linda Goodwin, from the School of Nursing, and Erin Hall and Brent Powell, from the Kinesiology Department, joined UEPC to discuss a new concentration in Health Promotion, offered by the Kinesiology Department, that would lead to the B.A. in Kinesiology. This new concentration emphasizes health education (as well as promotion) and was motivated by the urgent and growing need to offer a transfer major for the hundreds of "pre-Nursing" students who are denied admission to the Nursing program but who wish to pursue an alternative career in the health field. After careful deliberation of the available documentation and the views expressed during two meetings, the committee found no compelling reason to delay or deny the Kinesiology proposal and voted to approve the new concentration as it fulfills both the intent and capacity for meeting the immediate needs of our students.

UEPC discussed a minimum GPA for Minors. There is no campus-wide standard or minimum and, currently, only two departments require a minimum GPA for minors. The committee felt that every minor should have a minimum, and that 2.0 is reasonable. The committee proposed to craft such a policy in the future.

Following discussions with Dennis Shimek and John Sarraile, UEPC received a revised version of the new course proposal form from the Office of Academic Affairs that now reinstates two columns for instructors to include optimal and maximum class size information. An asterisk and footnote have been added: "Max class size is determined through consultation between the dean, department chair, and faculty member and is subject to change in the future by the same consultation process." Dennis Shimek has reiterated his intent to bring this matter to the attention of chairs and deans. UEPC will discuss these additions to the form at its May 8 meeting. Regalado asked why an asterisk after so many years without one? The concern for the History Dept. is what the rationale for the asterisk is and why the administration wants input on this particular section. They're concerned on who makes that determination on the maximum enrollments on the courses. Schoenly noted that the reinstatement came from office of Academic Affairs and the committee has not met to discuss. The topic was listed for discussion under Open Forum.

UEPC discussed two items under New Business: First to have the Technology/Learning Subcommittee investigate additional support for instructional technology; the committee suggested that TLS move forward with their proposal. Second, Speaker-Elect Carroll has asked that UEPC consider drafting a resolution that re-affirms that course proposals be approved or disapproved based solely on their academic merit. The impetus for this request came last year when a new course proposal from the History Department denied largely, but not entirely, for budgetary reasons. UEPC's charge is to "review and evaluate proposals for new undergraduate programs and courses for study based on approved criteria and procedures." Such procedures do not extend to budgetary matters. Indeed, whenever the committee receives a new program or course proposal that contains requests for new resources (e.g., t-t faculty, library resources, start-up for research), UEPC consults with FBAC as directed in the committee's charge. The committee will resume discussion of this item at the May 8 meeting.

Following suggestions by SEC, UEPC completed revisions to the Instructor Withdrawal Policy, which AS is considering today as a 1st reading item.

Lindsay (**FBAC**) April 16th was the final FBAC meeting. Primarily discussed the year end committee report.

Eudey (**SWAS**) The final SWAS meeting will be May 14 – 16. Steven Filling is running for chair of the statewide senate and if he wins we'll want to congratulate him. Information on some of the resolutions at statewide has recently been shared and feedback invited.

Perrello (**GC**) The council discussed three issues: the report from the ad hoc Subcommittee for Assessment of Graduate Education (SAGE), the ongoing work and assessing campus wide graduate programs, and the role of the council in the academic program review process.

The council also reviewed 4/AS/14/GC – Resolution for Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Project Units Policy.

7. Discussion Item:

a. Responsible Use Policy (Dennis Shimek and Carl Whitman)

Shimek noted that the policy has been put forward by the Chancellor’s Office, has been discussed for years, and now is being presented to the campus to hear about. The emphasis is on safety, security, and use of information. This is a timely policy because of recent incidents on campus that involved confidential information. An important part of the process is informing the campus to help ensure the policy meets specific campus needs. The document will be an agenda item at all colleges and with any departments that desire meetings. Whitman added that all campuses have been involved in the production of the document that covers a broad range of concerns and is largely representative of input.

8. First Reading Items:

a. 5/AS/14/UEPC – Instructor Withdrawal Policy

It was M/S Schoenly/Nagel.

California State University, Stanislaus

5/AS/14/UEPC – Instructor Withdrawal Policy

Students who register for a class and do not attend the first class meeting should notify the instructor or the departmental office no later than 24 hours after the first class meeting of their intent to remain in the course. A student who fails to do so may then be dropped administratively from the class by the instructor. If a student misses any other class sessions within the first 7 calendar days of the start date without notifying the instructor, the instructor may IW the student. If a student who registers for an online class fails to logon to the course website within 48 hours of the start date (8am, Pacific Time), the instructor may IW the student. (Courses are assumed to begin on the start date of the semester, unless otherwise specified in the schedule of classes.) An instructor may also administratively drop a student who does not meet the catalog prerequisites for the class. These instructor withdrawals are done by the instructor following established procedures through the Director of Enrollment Services. These administrative drops shall be without penalty and must be filed by the instructor with the Director of Enrollment Services no later than the census date. At the end of the fourth week of instruction there shall be a campus-wide enrollment update; if the instructor fails to administratively drop a student who has not attended class; it is still the student’s responsibility to drop the class through the Enrollment Services Office.

22/AS/82/EPC Approved February 18, 1983. Amended by the UEPC on October 23, 1990. 4/AS/05/UEPC Amended and Approved May 19, 2005. Revised by the UEPC on April 10, 2014. [END]

This is a revision of the policy. The revision provides more flexibility for faculty in the process of IWing. The revision also extends to online courses.

- Kenneth Schoenly 4/3/14 9:26 AM
Deleted: writing an “IW” next to the name on the roster, signing the roster, and submitting to
- Kenneth Schoenly 4/10/14 4:42 PM
Deleted: Admissions and Records Office
- Kenneth Schoenly 4/10/14 4:42 PM
Deleted: Admissions & Records
- Kenneth Schoenly 4/10/14 4:43 PM
Deleted: Admissions & Records

Points of discussion:

What are the implications of adding more ambiguity for both students and faculty. Schoenly: Students are aware that they must attend the first day. The 3rd resolved lists ways students should be informed.

This is a policy helpful to those who teach online courses and is flexible enough to accommodate various course start dates.

The implementation date of spring 2015 will allow time for educating students on the policy.

Why the 48-hour time for online? Schoenly: Part of the concern was for students who are waitlisted.

Should students be required to submit something for online courses rather than just logging in?

Schoenly the 3rd Resolved is an attempt to insure that the information reaches the students, and the committee will revisit this item before it's implemented.

The resolution will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

b. 6/AS/14/SEC – Resolution in Support of the Statewide Resolution AS-3172-14-EX (In Support of AB 2324 (Williams) Pertaining to CSU Faculty Trustee

It was M/S Eudey/Sims.

6-AS-14-SEC Resolution in Support of the Statewide Resolution AS-3172-14-EX (In Support of AB 2324 (Williams) Pertaining to CSU Faculty Trustee

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus join the Academic Senate of the California State University in thanking the Board of Trustees, Assembly Member Das Williams and the Assembly Committee on Higher Education of the California State Legislature for their support of the Faculty Trustee Holdover Appointment proposal embodied in AB 2324, and be it further

Resolved: That, the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus request that that all members of the CSU Stanislaus community express their support for AB 2324 as it moves through the legislative process, and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the following:

Governor Jerry Brown
Assembly Member Das Williams
Assembly Committee on Higher Education of the California State Legislature
CSU Office of Advocacy and State Relations
ASCSU Chair Diana Guerin

CSU Stanislaus students, alumni, staff and faculty [END]

This is a resolution in support of senate bill 2324. The resolution concerns placement of faculty on the CSU Board of Trustees. The major change is that the sitting Faculty Trustee will continue to serve in the absence of a timely appointment of the recommended new Faculty Trustee. The ASCSU looks for campuses to support their resolution.

It was M/S/P Petrosky/O'Brien to waive the rules and move to the resolution to an action item.

Resolution passed on a vote of 37 yes 0 no; recorded as unanimous.

9. Second Reading Item:

a. 4/AS/14/GC – Resolution for Continuing Enrollment for Thesis or Project Units Policy

Perrello noted that the committee revised language based on input.

Points of discussion:

This is an important, appropriate change.

Guichard noted that her colleagues in Psych/Child Development are strongly in support of the change in policy.

Resolution passed on a vote of 34 yes, 1 no.

10. Open Forum

Course proposal form:

Sarraille noted that the asterisk points to: "Max class size is determined through consultation between the dean, department chair, and faculty member and is subject to change in the future by the same consultation process." He is struck that in the UEPC discussion Shimek stated that the reason for not having the maximum on the form was what is now stated as the asterisked section. What if the asterisk referred to other parameters of instruction such as number of examinations? Courses go through the curriculum approval process, and if someone wants to change a parameter of the course, it must go through the process again.

Nagel added that faculty with no protection of tenure are in a very different position than those who have tenure and may be called upon to accept a change in course maximum through consultation with the chair and dean. He has concerns of what that would mean if a lecturer is asked to alter a course maximum.

Sims: The size of the course is integral to the effectiveness of instruction. The current form removes onus from individual; other experts look at it prior to going to the administrative side. There is a difference in consultation as a collaborative process with consensus while the asterisked language indicates that individual faculty member must bear the burden in making the case for appropriate class size.

Scheiwiller: Sometimes the extant proposal may hinder effective instruction if the stated maximum is too high for certain methods and strategies.

Schoenly: A proposed course modification form has no box for changing the course maximum. He has a class that he teaches in spring which requires the use of slides that can no longer be replaced; over the years due to breakage of these slides, the program has considered reducing the class size. He could make a single slide for the whole class, but students learn a lot more by finding the information themselves.

Eudey: This is a shared-governance process that has a history of some flexibility, especially adjustments in difficult budget times. There should be an opportunity to give your department a proposal and provide a rationale that is then discussed at your college curriculum committee. There should always be control first at the program level. An individual should not have the authority to change the max or make program curriculum decisions.

Regalado: Who decides what the maximum is and should the onus be on the individual? He agrees that consultation is good, but, if our role is being watered down, it is not necessarily a good thing. Having to adjust courses for budget reasons didn't mean that they were our best courses. He assumes that UEPC will be discussing this as heavily weighted toward sound pedagogy.

Thompson: At the last Senate meeting we were told the maximum was deleted because it did not fit with PeopleSoft. He assumes that was taken care of as the slots are now on the form. It was also implied that the document belongs to Academic Programs; is there a policy that says so? The new statement attempts to remove an important part of process from governance. Like other recent issues, the administrative rationale seems unclear and changing.

Provost Strong: The administration's position is that it desires more flexibility and not a hard maximum on a form so as not be restrictive if a program or a faculty wants to teach the course differently. The asterisk language reflects the contract.

Sarraille responded that it is true that some contract language is paraphrased. However, that contract language applies to how workload is assigned to the individual faculty member; it doesn't have anything to do with designing a course. To equate deciding the maximum size of a class to the routine assignment of workload is not justified. Such a claim attempts to conflate faculty workload with faculty oversight of the curriculum. To simply try to represent this as assignment of workload is not accurate.

11. Adjournment

3:12 pm