

<p>Academic Senate March 8, 2011</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Burroughs, Contreras, Davis, De Cocker, Espinoza, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Manrique, Marshall, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Pahal, Peterson, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Seong Soo Oh, Rogers, Silverman, Stessman, Stone, Strahm, Strong, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: Nancy Burroughs for Trystan Cotten, Chad Stessman for Michael Drake, Elaine Peterson for Mark Bender, Cathlin Davis for John Sarraille, Ann Strahm for Paul O'Brien</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, Deans Bartell, Goodwin, McNeil, Moore, Nowak, and Tuedio, David Lindsay, Lynn Johnson, Gina Leguria, Elizabeth Breshears, AVPAA/ALO Kornuta, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, and President Shirvani.</p> <p>Isabel Silveira Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>2/AS/11/UEPC Recommendation for the Continuance of the CIS Program was split into 2 resolutions as follows:</p> <p>2/AS/11/UEPC-1 Recommendation to not discontinue the CIS Program passed.</p> <p>2/AS/11/UEPC-2 Recommendation to not suspend the CIS Program did not pass, and was referred to SEC for consideration of suspension of the CIS Program.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, March 29, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Steven Filling on behalf of Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	--

**1. Call to order**  
2:04pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**  
Approved as distributed.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 22, 2011**  
Approved as distributed.

**4. Announcements**

Pamela Contreras announced a CSU campaign. She has lots of item to hand out, including wrist bands, buttons and posters. Next week they will be sending 50 Stanislaus students to Sacramento for the march in March. They expect 20,000 students from CSU and the community colleges.

Isabel Pierce received many committee preference forms, but still needs candidates for Speaker-Elect.

Halyna Kornuta brought a ceramic elephant “guest” which she referred to as the “elephant in the room”, that is, the way in which APRs are not talked about. She feels a commitment towards assisting faculty in getting through the APR process more easily. She and her office staff will be hosting workshops where tools, designed in collaboration with faculty, will be featured that enable access to a shared data collection. Please feel free to contact her or stop by for any assistance. She thanked the Senate for inviting the elephant into the room.

Strahm spoke on behalf of Paul O'Brien who is not here today. He is attending an Academic Senate meeting at MJC where they are voting on layoffs of fulltime and part-time faculty and staff. O'Brien thought it was

important to attend to show support.

McGhee announced that tomorrow, March 9<sup>th</sup>, at 10am in the quad area there will be an activity for veterans. They are accepting new pillow cases which will be painted and sent to the armed forces hospitals. This is a good program to help veterans and wounded soldiers.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that SEC has been working with the administration on a proposal to complete the WASC report. He expects to bring a report to the next Senate meeting for input and reactions. The Trust Restoration Planning Committee met this morning, and he thinks that they have started hammering out some very specific items for recommendations. He hopes that the TRPC might have something to share with the Senate at the next meeting.

Nagel is a fan of the Chamber Singers program. Next Wednesday, March 16<sup>th</sup> there will be a concert of the Chamber Singers in Snider Hall at 7:30pm.

Pahal noted that they just had an IRA committee meeting today, and they are still soliciting for IRA proposals for funding of instructional programs. Please send an email to Inner Pahal or Mary Baker for further information, as there is still funding available

## **5. Committee Reports/Questions**

Regalado relayed some questions for the TRPC on behalf of his dept. chair who attended the TRPC meeting with Chairs.

- 1) A question was asked about the goals of the committee. The Provost stated that the goal of the committee was to identify problems. Haven't the faculty and WASC already identified the problems?
- 2) There was an assumption that the Provost thinks that discussion is an end in itself rather than a means of seeking resolution to issues.
- 3) There's a perception that the administration participation on the TRPC is window-dressing to get WASC off our backs. There seemed to be no real formal resolutions planned by administration.

Regalado is asking the Senate to get further clarification.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that the charge of the TRPC was to come up with actions that address trust and what WASC gave us. He keeps referring to that charge, as we need to be working toward specific actions.

Provost Strong addressed the questions. Certainly WASC spelled out what they considered to be the problems, so he thinks that the TRPC can help the campus identify some of the causes of some of the problems so that we may better create some actions and remedies that would address those causes. As far as the comment that he thinks that discussion is an end in itself, he can't imagine he would say that. He certainly thinks that discussion is important and useful, and it also tends to lead to effective action which is what the TRPC is trying to do.

As to these efforts being window dressing, he absolutely does not think that. He thinks that the committee has done very good work in improving situations and relationships. There were dysfunctional communications from a variety of causes. The TRPC would like to further expand and spread some of the progress that they've made. Their charge is to report to the campus and they will do so.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that we will have something on the next Senate agenda, if nothing else a discussion of the charge will be on the agenda.

Shimek thinks that we're extremely close to fulfilling the charge that was given to the Trust Restoration Planning Committee. The charge was to identify issues, and in good faith come up with recommendations and action items which would come back to the Senate. This is not a onetime only thing. Speaking for himself, he's put in a lot of hours into this, and he would like to think that others perceive the effort as genuine.

Regalado wanted to clarify that his dept. chair did not say the Provost said that discussion is an end in itself rather than the perception is that is what the thought is. Regalado hopes to see a formal resolution to this.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that to him that is what the charge requires. When we bring this forward to the Senate we will have a full discussion of that. He hopes it is not window-dressing, and he feels that conversations have been genuine. He can't control what happens at TPRC, but it is certainly more communication than we had a year ago.

## **6. Action Items**

### **a. Second Reading Item 2/AS/11/UEPC --Recommendation for the Continuance of the CIS Program**

Jasek-Rysdahl thinks this could be a spirited discussion. He reminded Senators that we have a 3 minute limit on speakers. Also, the final vote on the resolution will be by a secret ballot. We'll consider amendment votes as they come up.

Dean Nowak brought some more data to share with the Senate; a handout that compares the CIS concentration and the CIS major. When reading the UEPC comments, someone noted a statement of concern about a watered down version. You can see there isn't watering down. This has become a workload issue, and we were hoping that you as fellow faculty would support our CIS faculty on this issue. The concentration is very well thought out, and has been approved by local employers. There has been no feedback that this will impact students finding jobs. Again, she asks that the Senators support the CIS faculty. It sets a negative precedent for other depts. and programs that might develop a proposal that could be declined by the Senate.

Lindsay said that the CBA received some relatively new information recently. On February 24 and 25 CBA had an AACSB consultant here to do a mock reaccreditation visit. Overall he liked what he saw but he noted some red flags. One was that we have 22 FT faculty and 5 degree programs. He suggested that we consider any way we can to reduce the number of those programs.

Lynn Johnson recognizes that the proposal was brought forward by Al Tsacle with budget as the primary purpose. As they have discussed this in the CBA, they see that they may have a problem accomplishing a successful reaccreditation with the number of programs they have. Separate degree programs need to be different to justify their existence. If you laid this out next to the accounting concentration, the only differences are two lower division prerequisites. Accounting requires an additional economics and an ethics course. For her the big issue is assessment. They anticipated that this program would be suspended, so there has not been any assessment work done. She recognizes that not all CIS faculty are in favor of suspension. They don't want to see a precedent for killing a program with 90 majors because of budget worries. They don't want to dismiss the issues of student concerns, but she thinks they are largely illusory.

Lindsay said that CBA had 3 degree programs when they were accredited. They will have 5 if the online MBA is approved when they have the reaccreditation visit.

Garcia would find it helpful if the UEPC chair could address their decision criteria. Was accreditation risk, and faculty workload, etc. in the UEPC statement?

Stessman said that UEPC's reading was that accreditation is not criteria for discontinuation of a program. It may be considered a financial burden because of the need to hire more faculty. UEPC didn't think accreditation issues were relevant. The CIS faculty asking for a switch to a concentration isn't a financial item. That had more to do with how good the program is and how relevant it is to current needs. It is pretty much the same program. There are two classes that are different between the concentration and the degree program, but it's not really a difference. He asked that folks look at the last set of minutes, and look at what the CIS faculty said. See if you see evidence that they like the concentration better. UEPC did not see that. When they looked at the evidence, they felt that financial reasons were the only reasons for discontinuation. UEPC didn't feel that \$15K a year was worth the upset.

Salisbury noted that as a graduate from the CIS program, she's gone out on interviews one of the questions she's been asked is "what's up with this downgrading of your program?" The comment she gets from employers is, "that will change our relationship with the department of CIS."

Salisbury said that CIS majors are expected to increase by 20%. Computer math and science positions are expected to increase by 22.9%. When students submit their applications they ask to be CIS majors not Business Administration with a concentration in CIS. She really thinks this change will do a disservice to students in the program.

Provost Strong has known Dean Christy since 2004 and respects him. He's been deeply involved in AACSB and is quite an expert on AACSB accreditation standards. Provost Strong also thinks that there is a difference from AACSB's perspective between a major and a concentration. There is a difference in the assessment of learning outcomes. Additionally, when we don't make this change, the AACSB site team will ask us why we have two programs that are very similar. Why are we spreading scarce resources over two program that are so similar?

Strahm read a statement from Paul O'Brien stating that he wishes to support the UEPC resolution. O'Brien noted that on the surface this goes against the faculty wishes, but he believes the faculty were coerced.

Petratos provided some clarification. All the CIS students undergo the same assessment as other Business students. In addition, they also have a capstone course for CIS. By the time the next AACSB visit comes, they will have offered that capstone and will have the data.

Kofi Akwabi-Ameyaw noted that this is a very unique situation. He's wondering what the institutional memory is in terms of the elimination of programs. Do we have anything comparable?

Stessman said that the French program was suspended due to lack of majors, and then nothing happened with it so he thinks it was discontinued. Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the Cognitive Studies program went through the process but it continued.

Akwabi-Ameyaw noted that these were one person depts., so there don't seem to be any apples to apples

comparisons.

Tuedio said that the last program that had student demand that was discontinued was Speech Therapy in the 1980's, but that one was very complicated.

Petrosky said we're all left with kind of a curious choice here. It's clear from what has been said that the initiation of this was not with the CIS faculty. At the same time, the CBA and the CIS dept. has been treating this as if it has been accomplished for the past year. What are we rewarding them with when we give them a continuance vote?

Filling noted that the accreditation issue was not a constraining factor when the EMBA program was initiated, nor has it been a constraining factor in discussions of the online MBA proposal. Given that, he is a bit perplexed that accreditation issues [aka assessment] seem to be the compelling reasons for discontinuance of the CIS program. The arguments don't seem very consistent.

Tuedio thought that one of Nowak's points should be accentuated. Gallo agreed that the concentration was a better curriculum than the major, which is counter to the notion that employers would see this as a downgrade of the program.

Petratos said that one past event was somewhat comparable; a suspension of the MSBA which was later reincarnated.

Lindsay said that many years ago an MSBA degree was approved for the Department of Business. It was used as a vehicle for offering a concentration in management. Very few people were going through the program, so at some point they stopped admitting new students and the program was never acted on and is just sitting there. Amin Amallah figured out that the easiest way to move forward was not a new degree program, but rather using the extant [but defunct] degree program. So they created an International Finance concentration for the MSBA.

Strahm noted that one employer says they don't care; but on the other hand we have evidence that says that employers want a degree not a concentration. If we get rid of CIS degree, from a purely competitive notion, will we in five years find ourselves behind the curve when other places have kept their programs -- aka they will have an advantage.

Dean Nowak wanted to comment on the accreditation issue. For business schools it is very important for us to have AACSB accreditation. Students have spoken about their concerns about getting jobs, and she respects their concerns although she's not sure it is warranted. The bigger issue is; if we lose our accreditation then our students will not be so competitive anymore.

Baker said that the way he sees accreditation is that there has been no decline on the accreditation, so no action might be required. His question is discontinuance vs. suspension. These are not interchangeable, right?

Stessman answered, yes these are not interchangeable. We have a discontinuance policy, but there is no policy for suspension of a program on the campus. The CIS faculty actually would prefer suspension over discontinuance.

Petratos said that the CIS faculty asks for a suspension of no more than 5 years.

Dean Moore said that programs change and modify overtime and sometimes are driven by industry. We have students concentrating in certain areas. In visual arts we have programs and students who are in concentrations. You've got the 2 different curricula, and they are identical. He's not sure there will be individual companies who see a difference but part of the process is informing them that there isn't a significant difference.

Lynn Johnson would like to support Petratos, and thinks that CBA would really support a suspension rather than discontinuance. She's concerned about reaccreditation, but would like to see it set up in a 'safe' way so that we might reactivate it if we have resources.

Tuedio thinks that a motion to suspend the CIS program for five years would be in order. It's a more compelling argument than overriding the UEPC arguments. That would give us 5 years to look for significant effects on employers and graduates.

Jasek-Rysdahl had some discussions prior to this, and he doesn't think we can have an amendment that is counter to what the resolution is. We need to vote on the UEPC recommendation. One way to handle this is to divide out discontinuance and suspension.

Strahm motioned to separate this resolution into 2 separate resolutions. McGhee seconded the motion.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that this is a majority vote. We are voting on the division of the original resolution into two separate resolutions as follows:

2/AS/11/UEPC-1 Recommendation to not discontinue the CIS Program

2/AS/11/UEPC-2 Recommendation to not suspend the CIS Program

Filling requested a secret ballot for the vote on whether to divide the resolution.

**33 yes, 9 no's, 1 abstention. The resolution will be divided into two parts.**

Resolution 2/AS/11/UEPC-1 Recommendation to not discontinue the CIS Program

Voting yes for this says NOT to discontinue the CIS Program.

Voting no for this essentially means nothing happens.

**38 yes, 4 no's, 1 abstention. Resolution passes to not discontinue the CIS Program.**

Resolution 2/AS/11/UEPC-2 Recommendation to not suspend the CIS Program

Yes on this says do NOT suspend the CIS Program

No on this is means that we should consider suspending the CIS Program

**18 yes, 21 no's, 4 abstentions. The resolution does not pass.**

Strahm motioned to send this back to SEC for consideration of suspension of the CIS Program.

Jasek-Rysdahl is not at all sure that is needed, as he thinks that is the default position.

Strong said that in the absence of not knowing the rules, he suggests that we go ahead with the motion.

Filling moved to waive the first reading, seconded by C. Davis.

Motion passes, we're now at the second reading.

Nagel is not sure if this is friendly, but he suggests that SEC contact the CIS faculty and solicit their input.

Petratos polled the CIS faculty, and their proposal is to suspend for no more than 5 years because of the budget crisis.

Provost Strong suggests that SEC use their good judgment in evaluating the situation.

Motion passes, and the matter will be sent to SEC.

## **7. First Reading Items**

### **a. 3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC- Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs**

Stessman moved the resolution and Baker seconded it. Stessman read the resolution as follows:

*Be it resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves a Policy for Online and Technology Mediated (OTM) Courses and Programs; and be it further*

*Resolved: That the policy 3/AS/11/SEC/UEPC take effect upon approval by the President, and that this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook upon approval.*

*Rationale: As CSU Stanislaus moves towards more online course and program offerings, a policy regarding such offerings is needed which ensures and protects college and department autonomy in developing and teaching online courses. The current UEPC guidelines on online courses and programs are not adequate to meet University needs. Technology is changing and evolving rapidly with respect to course delivery methods. Online courses in the last three years have shown substantial growth.*

*The existing UEPC guidelines (approved December 8, 2005 <http://www.csustan.edu/oit/LearningServices/FormsPublications/OnlineCourseGuidelines.pdf> do not adequately address university values, principles, and concepts.*

*As our growth in OTM courses and programs increases, WASC will require a university policy to be in place that addresses faculty and student support, security, assessment, etc., with respect to said courses and programs.*

Stessman said that the OTM is a policy that has been needed on our campus, as technology has advanced and more courses are shifting to online components. At present there is only the December 2005 guidelines from UEPC, and the Technology & Learning Subcommittee of UEPC brings this forward after several major revisions/ They have been working on it for a number of years, and hopefully finally have something that the Senate can approve. We need this for WASC and for guidance at the University. He thinks that the Technology & Learning Subcommittee will say that this is a starting point and will be modified as technology advances.

Jasek-Rysdahl read the standing rules on the first reading items.

Petrosky had a concern with item 3.6. It states that a dispute on delivery mode follows university procedures. His college and dept. already have procedures. Would enacting this overrule those procedures?

Breshears doesn't think there was intent to supersede the college or dept. procedures. Part of the message is that there should be a process.

Duggan noted that the intent was to provide for communication with the dept. and college on the process, but there was no intent to subvert anything.

Provost Strong noted that the university procedures would include the dept. and college procedures.

Stessman said that item 3.7 pertains to class size and faculty workload which should be under the realm of the dean or dept. chair. The concern is that courses would not go beyond Face to face maximums.

Item 4.5 indicates that digital archives are retained for 3 years. Currently, we retain things for 1 year.

Duggan noted that we have defaulted to 3 years at present to make Blackboard course material available to faculty, but they would be happy to keep it for a shorter period.

Regalado asked if there is any language here that indicates that the sole discretion of the mode of instruction rests with dept. chair.

Breshears noted that item 3.2 addresses that the dept. chair and relevant curriculum committees. Different depts. and colleges have different expectations and want flexibility, so we were trying to say that a process should occur but not to dictate the process.

Regalado noted that a concern is that as we become more concerned about enrollments that depts. still maintain control over the mode of instruction.

Breshears believes that is why dept. chairs are mentioned here. Nagel said that item 3.2 looks ambiguous, the first and last sentence. Breshears noted that this is within the purview of the program and dept. For example, Social Work goes before a curriculum committee before changing textbooks, but others don't seem to care to do this. So, flexibility needs to be maintained.

Garcia asked why item 3.3 is even in there. Duggan said that's a WASC requirement. In the WASC guidelines they have specific areas of responsibility for the University, faculty, students and staff. Faculty have to be provided resources and training where appropriate.

Provost Strong noted that on item 3.7 of the OTM policy, he doesn't see any problem relative to course caps. Item 3.2 addresses the faculty need to inform students about mediated, online courses and notifies the dept. WASC recently significantly increased standards relative to online courses.

C. Davis asked if item 3.3 actually belongs under faculty support.

Silverman said that he is not questioning the value of the principles stated within the document (Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs). However, the problem is the use of the word "shall". The word denotes degree of "necessity" or "mustness". Unfortunately, the word is defined in the dictionary as: (1) absolutely required, (2) strongly suggested, (3) weakly requested, (4) you can do it, but if you don't feel like doing it, you don't have to. In other words, it neatly covers all degrees of "mustness" from 0% to 100%. The problem with the word "shall" has been known in some professions for example: the legal profession redefines the word as (1). The IETF engineering group defines "shall" and several other words that denote a degree of "mustness" in the RFC2119. The question that needs an answer is: "What is the

degree of "mustness" the word "shall" has in this document.

Nagel said that is part of the problem he has with item 3.2. From what the Provost said, this is different. The way he interprets sentence 1 is that "somebody" consults with the dept. chair and relevant bodies and then some other body is told "You will be teaching online." Item 3.2 doesn't read as if it is addressing faculty taking courses online, rather chairs/depts. and others.

Breshears said that we run into a real problem if we change shall to may. Nagel agrees. This isn't intended to say you will be assigned to do this.

Peterson noted that possibly item 3.2 could say "courses shall be modified only after consultation."

Provost Strong thinks it would be very bad practice for a chair or anyone else to coerce a faculty member to teach an online course.

Breshears feels that there are four underlying drivers

1- Policy should be about teaching not technology

2- Technology is advancing so rapidly that we don't want to be too specific.

3 -At the same time, the policy should be sufficiently specific in addressing values, principle, and concepts that apply across academic disciplines and the technologies.

4 – She felt it is important to identify some of the processes and policies, using whatever approval processes or policies extant within departments, colleges, and university structure.

Regalado agrees that the dept. chair should not be ordering the mode of instruction. In most depts. we have a curriculum committee and that's where this should start. To Filling's point – we are experiencing pressure to teach online. He would like to see item 3.2 modified to say "*OTM courses shall be offered or modified following consultation **primarily** with the department chair and relevant departmental/college bodies, and course proposal shall follow standard University procedures.*"

Provost Strong said that one of the problems with that other campus incident was that there was no online policy requiring faculty to receive permission from the department chair regarding offering an online section.

Duggan said that the first and second major revisions of this policy were much looser. After working with UEPC and Diana Demetrulias they learned that "loose guidelines are not university policy".

Jasek-Rysdahl said that UEPC meets this Thursday so they will share these comments with the committee.

Nagel asked how UEPC will look at this. Will they consider alterations to policy documents?

Jasek-Rysdahl said that's up to the UEPC committee.

## **8. Open Forum**

Pahal said that the ASI discussed the campus food policy. Basically, what started this discussion was that one of the club's rates shot up 30% and ASI formed a food service committee. They will be presenting a report on this soon. Pahal also noted that Ron Noble has been working with ASI and Business & Finance toward clarity on this issue. He's not sure if we are aware that if we have an event on campus you must use Chartwell's for food service. This may have something to do with liability, but he doesn't believe so because permission to sell food in the Quad requires a liability warrant. The concern is that this policy has been

developed absent from input from the campus community. It is very important that the community members have input into this policy.

Peterson asked for clarification on the report Pahal referred to from ASI.

Pahal said that the ASI will share their report with the campus community. Their concern is that the policy being developed should have community input.

Marshall was just interested to hear about two-pass registration that was recently denied.

Jasek-Rysdahl doesn't have anything to add as he just received the denied resolution late on Friday and forwarded it to the Senators.

Provost Strong said that relative to a food policy, he knows that Business & Finance is working on this, and they will certainly consult with the Senate, ASI and other relevant bodies if they have not already done so.

Relative to the two-pass system, administration has concerns as he noted in his email. The proposed policy might have some negative impact on enrollment. The new VP of Enrollment Management & Student Affairs brings a new set of eyes and a new perspective to this proposed policy. She consulted with folks on her staff, and they had concerns and brought them to the Provost, so he recommended that we not sign off on this policy. He's more than happy to discuss this further with SEC and reconsider this at a later date. He thought it was unwise to implement this policy now given looming significant budget cuts and the importance of achieving the enrollment target.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that SEC received the denied resolution on Friday afternoon, and this is something to add to the SEC agenda next week. There have not been any discussions about this.

Regalado said that their History Department club is concerned that they were facing fees that were unannounced. The problem is that you have so much in terms of subsidy planned and then Chartwell's changes the game. In principle this could be applied to faculty as well.

9. **Adjournment**  
4:01pm