

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Academic Senate October 26, 2010</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Burroughs, Contreras, C. Davis, De Cocker, Drake, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Hauselt, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, Marshall, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Noble, O'Brien, Pahal, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Provost Strong, Regalado, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Silverman, C. Stessman, Strahm, Stone, Wallace and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Eungsuk Kim for Elaine Peterson</p> <p>Guests: Deans Flores, Goodwin, Moore, and Tuedio. Lisa Bernardo, Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, Gina Leguria, Jim Riggs, Dennis Shimek, President Shirvani.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p> | <p>Second Reading of 10/AS/10/SEC Resolution on Respect for Diversity of all members of Campus Community. Passed unanimously by voice vote, Sense of the Senate.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, November 9, 2010 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p> |
|---|--|

1. Call to order

2:00pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Jasek-Rysdahl adjusted the agenda, and inserted item #6 Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee. Everything will be renumbered following that. No other changes.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 12, 2010

No changes offered. Accepted as written.

4. Announcements

Inner Pahal announced that he is raising funds for the homeless and checks can be made out to the Hunger Network.

Regalado will be on ESPN at 5pm and 8pm tonight, and at 9pm on Friday and 2pm Saturday. He will make cameo appearances on the program on Fernando Valenzuela.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted there was a meeting of directors of academic programs operating thru UEE. SEC has approved the creation of an ad hoc committee to identify and consider concerns related to UEE Programs. Jasek-Rysdahl will be working with COC on this. He noted that this is not related to the announcement from Friday related to the change in leadership of UEE.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Nagel said the UEPC resolution on maximum units is not back for another reading. Is it correct that UEPC is still working on this? Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that there were questions asking for data, and Chad Stessman is waiting for data from the office of Institutional Research.

6. Information Items

a. Ad hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee

Jasek-Rysdahl offered the context to the draft structure and charge of the committee and that is why he's bringing this to this group. This is something that SEC has been working on with the Provost and also others

in administration. We're bringing it to the Senate to get some feedback. Hopefully, what we've done is much listening and heard what you've told us, and this reflects what you want. If it doesn't reflect what you want, we'll hear that today and this document won't be sent out. If it does reflect your thoughts, we'll put this forward as an ad hoc committee. This relates to the WASC commission letter but it also reflects on some issues that we've addressed for a long time on this campus. Jasek-Rysdahl read portions of the introduction of the document as follows:

The WASC Commission letter of July 13, 2010 cites a chief concern indicating "long simmering tensions between faculty and the senior administration have risen to levels of potential disruption to academic operations." Later in the paragraph the letter cites the "divisive environment that characterizes the campus at this time." In order to address these concerns the Provost and SEC have spent a good amount of time gathering input from the campus community about what needs to be done to move forward. The next step toward rehabilitation and restoration of relationships between faculty and upper administration is an intensive planning process involving faculty and upper administration. An Ad Hoc committee will begin a regular dialogue to address the instructions in the WASC commission letter by developing a proposal for actions to reduce the level of conflict.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that the Provost has been meeting with dept. chairs, and having brown bag lunches to gather input. SEC held forums, took a survey, and had discussions in the Senate. We're trying to get information on how to move forward. He read the plan and the bullet points as follows:

Plan

A four person working group (two administrators/two faculty members) will be established to meet regularly to develop a plan to improve campus morale, improve communication between faculty and upper administration, and rebuild a productive working environment.

- *The working group will be referred to as the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee (Ad Hoc TRPC).*
- *The members of the Ad Hoc TRPC will be the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Human Resources & Faculty Affairs, the Speaker of the Faculty, and Speaker-elect of the Faculty.*
- *The Ad Hoc TRPC will be charged to develop a plan of specific actions to address the issues listed above. The Ad Hoc TRPC will present draft proposals to various campus groups for input and eventual approval.*
- *Proposals should address timeline, budget, outcomes, and assessment.*
- *The Ad Hoc TRPC will devise a schedule of meeting times and locations.*
- *Decisions of the group will be by consensus.*
- *Meeting agendas will be jointly prepared in advance.*
- *Notes will be taken and the group will come to agreement regarding a common set of notes for each meeting. It is expected that these notes will become part of the evidence provided to the Fall 2011 WASC special site visit team.*
- *There is no expectation that committee meetings will be open to the public, but the content of the meetings will not be confidential. Members are free to discuss meetings with their constituents. The group will respect requests to speak confidentially or "off the record."*
- *The ad hoc committee will exist until the plan it is charged to create is approved by the Academic Senate and the President's Executive Council or it is clear to the Academic Senate or administration that the committee cannot carry out its charge. The target date for approval is the latter half of the Spring 2011 semester.*

When reviewing the bullet points, you will see that there will be 2 representatives from administration and two from faculty governance. WASC cited conflict between faculty and administration, that's why it's those groups. We received feedback in that survey that we need more regular communication in small groups of people. This document comes from input that this be a regular meeting with administration. The Charge is to develop a plan with specific action. This group will not be making decisions, and they can only work by getting input. This group will present drafts to various groups for input and approval. The group will get input from the Senate, various committees, the Academic Affairs Council, ASI, Staff Council, Dean's Council, and the President's Executive Council.

The next items are related to agendas, meetings, and notes being taken. There is no expectation that these are open meetings, but the content is not confidential. This document reflected some feedback from UBAC members who wanted an agenda in advance for their meetings. Minutes will be taken that the group agrees to, and these minutes need to be available to all. This is not confidential and it's incumbent on the people to talk with others. The committee reserves the right to say things off the record. There are two time limits on this: a plan to be approved by this group in the spring, or if this group or others feel it's not moving forward, the group can disband.

This is something we hope reflects what we've been told, and it's a next step, not the end or first step in the process. Jasek-Rysdahl opened up for questions, comments, and feedback.

Sarraille added that members of SEC feel that what we are doing now is an important step. SEC didn't just want an announcement to come out that this restoration committee exists. We very much want to bring it to you so that you may provide us your thoughts. If there is anything of concern to this group we want to provide this opportunity to modify what needs to be modified.

O'Brien said from the SEC perspective, we've heard concerns and seen comments distributed. He feels that this is a good step forward with administration to clear the air and move on. Whether it's perfect can be critiqued, but this is our best thinking of how to move us all forward.

Jasek-Rysdahl said we have input on what processes should happen, and also on what the problems are. That input will be part of this process. We're not going to toss the other feedback out the window.

Petrosky asked if students were aware of the conflict and if they should have a voice on the committee.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that SEC did discuss this, and noted that WASC indicated that faculty and administration were having the problem. We did indicate to include consultation with students and other groups.

Dean Moore said that while students need to be and are aware of what is happening on campus they are our clients and we serve them. He cautioned on how we involve students in the process, given that we serve them and they are a customer. Some things are not ones students need to be privy to in a difficult process such as this.

Regalado asked what would be the outcome. Is this a documentation of sorts that people will sign on to, and how do we know it will have a successful end?

Jasek-Rysdahl doesn't know if it will have a successful end. To him, the documentation will be reports back to this body. Also minutes are part of documentation which is tied to evidence for the WASC visit. If it is successful; there will be a proposal submitted through faculty governance and the administrative ranks to be approved. The idea is that this doesn't drag out but there is not a guarantee of success.

Regalado said ultimately we will see something that will get approval. Jasek-Rysdahl said that the Senate would not only see it, but would have input into it and give approval or disapproval. The committee will not make decisions.

Filling echoed Jasek-Rysdahl that students and staff have a deep interest and right to be involved. What this project relates to is that there is a clear history here of faculty having the primary responsibility for curriculum and academic areas and that's where we're targeting our efforts. He doesn't think of students as customers as this isn't an open market and they cannot buy and sell as they wish.

Eudey thinks there are lots of things in this process to allow multiple constituencies to have input in design of the plan. The most important includes the appropriate next step to put the plan into action. She also agrees with Filling regarding the issue of referring to our students as clients. These are the most important people that are vulnerable on campus. We need to continually try to figure out a means to get many people offering input into the plan to allow for good decisions. She hopes that we continue to use multiple means to seek out input. Having targeted individuals working on this will be easier, and she hopes that we can find ways to make it better.

Poole said that SEC has discussed issues related to WASC #3 as soon as we got the letter from WASC this summer. A lot has been done so far, but no action was taken to make progress yet. This is that first step to come up with a plan, and if you have too many people involved nothing happens because they cannot agree. Representation of administration and faculty to get something on the table to identify various groups is a good start, and she fully supports what is being proposed.

Silverman inquired about the last sentence of the last bullet point. To him that sentence is not sufficiently precise or clear. What is your deadline to be completed?

Jasek-Rysdahl said that the last sentence indicates the target as the end of spring 2011 semester. This will be a short lived committee. We're seeing this as a group that meets regularly, getting input regularly, and if things go well this would work its way thru the governance process in the spring. If the Senate approves it, then it will be implemented at that time. The committee can't implement anything without the Senate's approval.

Silverman asked if the Senate doesn't approve it in spring 2011, then what?

Jasek-Rysdahl said that either the committee is disbanded for not doing its job, and then we try something else. We may have signs before then if this should happen. That's the other out, if it's not making progress we get out earlier and find another alternative.

Garcia said from reading it seems this was developed by a partnership between SEC and administration. Is there a parallel process that might occur from the administration that would also address the WASC issue or is this it? Jasek-Rysdahl is not aware of anything but we have administration here.

Provost Strong said that this will be the process, and administration is not working on anything else other than this.

Dean Moore wanted to be clear that what students come here for is an education and that is something they get from us. He wasn't comparing students to a product like Coca Cola, but they shouldn't be impeded by a process like this.

Sarraille said that in his opinion this proposal is nothing more than a proposal for how you can assign a

group of people to produce some ideas for the Senate to review. It's a way of getting some things to consider, and by accepting the plan you're not buying anything or committing to anything. That is an important feature of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee. One advantage is that a lot of what is at issue now is about shared governance and in particular the governance dynamics between faculty and administration. We should put some faculty and administrators in a room for some extended periods of time to hash out those considerable issues.

McGhee is in favor of this, and thinks it would be better for this to be the sole group to do this because if another administrative group operating on its own could lead to conflict or mistrust. A better scenario to have academics and administrators to work together to put forth that effort instead of having multiple groups trying to get to the finish line first.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that at the top of the page it's noted that this is coming from the President and himself. This is something he is on the hook for it, but we heard also that the President needs to be invested in this as well. Jasek-Rysdahl heard that the President is in support of this process as well.

President Shirvani said he appreciates the work the Speaker and Speaker Elect have put into this process in addition to Provost Strong. He feels this is a great process and it has his full support, and he looks forward to great results.

O'Brien said this is the embodiment of shared governance. The President had a broad theme from the WASC letters and tasked administrators to work on this with SEC. This is how everything should be done. Faculty, and faculty leadership working with the administration to talk, debate, and come up with something like this.

Jasek-Rysdahl appreciates the input and looks forward to sharing with this group what is happening. He hopes it will be successful.

O'Brien asked if we would vote on this. Jasek-Rysdahl said this is an information item, so there is no vote.

Pahal said that he understands the streamlined effort to make it more efficient, and there seems to be a lot of positives. The only area that was discussed in ASI was the area of shared governance with regard to students. Do students have shared governance? There are different beliefs on this. When issues of shared governance come up, please consider students in this Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Committee. Shared governance is being discussed at CSSA, and this is one of his main goals. ASI will have its own policy written in the next two weeks. On the area of input from students, he will be attending the Senate meetings and plans on being involved in the process. He's aware that the tensions are mostly between faculty and administration, but students are a big part of this campus so please include them in this process. ASI is especially interested in shared governance as this is a major concern for them this year and this semester.

Regalado supports O'Brien's comments about the effort to bring about shared governance. This is a fine exercise in doing that and he hopes for a successful end. Although, this is not the first time that the faculty have made attempts to bring about a process of shared governance, as he recalls several attempts prior to this. He's hopeful that we won't be revisiting that discussion. He's being cautiously optimistic.

7. Action Items

a. Second Reading of 10/AS/10/SEC Resolution on Respect for Diversity of all members of Campus Community

O'Brien reminded the Senate that the catalyst to this resolution was the recent suicide of a student at Rutgers, and there are other similar incidents out there. He brought this to the Senate via SEC. From his notes there

were three categories of comments. First, do we want to add more categories in the last sentence of the first resolved. There was a question about the second resolved regarding safety and/or beliefs. Finally, there was a comment about distribution. He found some different protective categories and added some to the list in the first resolved. This is a tricky thing that can be debated here, whether we want every category imaginable on the list. From his perspective, you get a list that becomes less meaningful but others may have a different opinion.

O'Brien noted in resolved two a question about "beliefs" was included and he addressed that. The second resolved used to say "and/or beliefs" and O'Brien removed that and added "religious or other beliefs" to the first resolved. He also added disability or sexual orientation to the first resolved.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if there was a change to the third resolved. O'Brien said he put "distributed electronically" as a distribution. If someone thinks it should include placement in faculty and student handbook, he's okay with that. Filling suggests we append to the third resolved, after "faculty" "and that we request that this resolution be placed into the faculty and student handbooks." O'Brien supported the additional text.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted the three changes to the printed document. McGhee asked if after reading the Federal guidelines, why did O'Brien leave "veterans" off of the list. O'Brien said no reason and that could be a friendly addition. He will add "veteran status" before "disability."

Shimek wanted to raise the same point; veteran status and medical condition are important components of nondiscriminatory law. If widely published, it's important that we track the categories that pertain to the State and Federal law with regard to Federal law. "Medical condition" should be added.

Sarraille says it may actually be problematic to distribute this electronically to all students, so he suggested that in the third resolved, after the word distributed to include "preferably" before electronically. Sarraille asked if we can send an email to every student containing this resolution. Duggan said it can happen whether or not they read their email is another question. Sarraille agreed to drop the first recommendation.

Strahm wanted clarification as to how "medical status" might differ from a disability because in her mind if you have a medical status it might mean you have a disability of some sort. Shimek said there are people with a medical condition that by law are not defined as disabled, and we want to not discriminate against them because of the condition. Bettencourt offered pregnancy as an example.

Burroughs asked if we can add staff to the list. Agreed to include staff after "Students."

Routh said that adding "political ideology" would be a good addition. You have religion or other beliefs, but ideology can become a problem. Strahm asked if that wasn't tied to other beliefs. Routh said the concept is framed by religion. Routh made a motion to add political ideology, seconded by Nagel.

Routh said that it seems like a good idea because we have divisions on campus and there should be more directly articulated support for those who disagree ideologically. Sarraille would speak against this for a reason that is friendly to it. He thinks that in his way of looking at it, the religious is not necessary and the beliefs should remain. He would prefer to have "beliefs" without a tie to religion as it could be any kind of belief.

Strahm said that in the rationale the core value is indicated.

Eudey said that because religion is in the Federal guidelines she would prefer not to remove it so that we can

be as inclusive as possible. She reminded everyone that the rationale doesn't always follow the resolution so the resolution must include all of the important text.

C. Davis said that our list includes the Federal protected categories, but she's not sure if should start adding other things to the list like "political ideologies" as it may get really long. She would be more in favor of keeping it to the Federal list and adding the "beliefs" in without adding every possible category because if you add too much the list becomes meaningless.

McGhee supports the idea. One of the problems we've seen across the country is the accusation that people are not treated fairly. Given the accusations made against academe, it's probably a good defense against those accusations to indicate freedom to express viewpoints. We don't want to see this on the Bill O'Reilly show saying that we're protecting everything except your political ideas.

Garcia doesn't think this is the appropriate forum to have this discussion. He's fearful that we are losing sight of what we are trying to do here. The rationale is about creating a community where people can engage in dialogue and learn, so regardless of his beliefs, the idea is to have the word "beliefs" on the resolution.

There was a voice vote on the amendment, lost by voice vote.

Eudey recommended including "sex" to the list before "gender".

Marcell said we have a nondiscrimination policy on campus, and is sure it is in the handbooks. This resolution was for a specific topic and it's morphing into something that is an interesting academic debate. He'd like to go back to the intent of the original document and remove all of the extra non-discriminatory policy. You can say that regarding non-discrimination you should refer to the previous policy. He encourages going back to the original intent and referring to the university non-discrimination policy which this is speaking to.

O'Brien spoke against this. In theory he agrees with Marcell, that the more we put in the more it becomes distracted away from the intent, but he doesn't expect people to do that. The incident mentioned in the rationale is good to reiterate our belief in an open and free campus.

Marcell said this is speaking to an issue, and we have a nondiscrimination policy. He doesn't see that this document has to override or rewrite the original document.

Jasek-Rysdahl said you can propose an amendment, and if it is seconded we can discuss it. Marcell withdrew his recommendation.

Garcia said the faculty of the MSW program were in full support of this resolution, but he wanted to remind all faculty that a resolution will not create the environment we are hoping for. It's a nice step, but we can't have enough of these reminders. It's incumbent upon faculty to serve in a role to create space for students, faculty, and all members of campus community to engage in dialogue and critical reflection about these issues. O'Brien thinks the resolution is about that issue. Every CSU is mandated to have a policy, and it's out there for people to read it. We are affirming it based on recent incidents.

Silverman is looking at the policy that is being discussed. EO #883 which replaced EO #774 from the Chancellor's office includes pretty much everything we talked about. Maybe we should send everyone a copy of the EO 883 policy. One sentence from the policy notes the types of discrimination as(including sexual harassment, racial, ethnic, national origin, sex and disability discrimination).

Garcia understands that most institutions have these policies, but it's a reaffirmation of what we already have. We get involved in our lives and we see something bad in the world, and we need to have this back in our vision again to act as a reminder as a first step in how we should be living our lives and behaving.

Approved by voice vote unanimously. The final version of the resolution will read as follows:

***10/AS/10/SEC Respect for Campus Diversity of all Members of Campus Community
(Sense of the Senate)***

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University Stanislaus affirms the basic rights of all members of the academic community of students, staff, administrators and faculty to be respected regardless of race, age, religious or other beliefs, ethnicity, sex, gender, country of origin, veteran status, medical condition, disability or sexual orientation, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate affirms that all members of the academic community have a right to an educational environment free of fear for their personal safety, and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed electronically to all students, staff, administrators and faculty, and that it be placed in the faculty and student handbooks.

Rationale: Recent news events in the national press have reported on continued hate incidents targeted against students. Some of these incidents have resulted in suicides. A core value of academic communities is freedom and safety where all members can freely discuss and debate ideas and issues. Incidents of hate and intolerance towards any member of the campus community is an act directed at all members and cannot be tolerated.

8. First Reading Items

a. 3:00 PM Time Certain for Jim Riggs to discuss 11/AS/10/GC Dissertation Policy Resolution

Poole moved the resolution, seconded by Eudey. Poole read the resolution and rationale as follows:

11/AS/10/GC—Dissertation Policy

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate endorses the Dissertation Policy; and be it further

Resolved: That this be effective for Spring 2011 upon approval by the President.

Rationale: On October 7, 2010, Graduate Council approved the Dissertation Policy, the first such policy on our campus. Although CSU Stanislaus currently offers only one doctoral program, it is anticipated that others may be offered in the future. As such, while EO 991 mandates some of the dissertation requirements within the Doctor of Education program, this policy is broad enough to encompass programs that may be developed. The policy ensures rigor in the dissertation across campus doctoral programs.

Approved by Graduate Council 10.07.10

Jim Riggs is the primary author of the resolution. Riggs stated that in writing this they looked to develop a broad policy for minimum requirements and whenever possible referred to specific program requirements so as not to tie the hands of current or future programs.

Strahm commented on item 11 in the policy that states the following:

11. Timeframe for Completion of the Dissertation

Each program shall establish a timeframe for completing the dissertation; however, consistent with Title 5, of the California Code of Regulations and CSU Stanislaus policy work on the doctoral degree, including the completion of the dissertation, shall not extend beyond a total of seven consecutive years.

Strahm asked if you enter with an MA do you have an advantage? Riggs said the only doctorate we have now requires a Master's. Strahm said if we add new programs and can enter with a BA, would you have two years less time than someone who enters with an MA? Riggs said that could be a possibility. The language comes from the university catalog that says that they are restricted to seven consecutive years to complete a degree. That language would have to be addressed first before changing it in this document.

Strahm asked if the seven year time start when you begin working on the dissertation or from when you enter the program? Riggs said it's from when you enter the program.

Petrosky asked about some language under item #7 in the policy as follows:

7. Dissertation Committee

*The dissertation committee shall be composed of a minimum of three members; two of the members must be full-time tenured or tenure track doctoral program faculty, and the committee chair shall hold the rank of associate professor or higher. When appropriate or required, an individual who is not a member of the University faculty may be selected as the third member to serve on the dissertation committee. All members of the dissertation committee shall hold an appropriate doctoral degree and have relevant professional experience and expertise in the area of the dissertation. The director of a specific doctoral program may approve an exception to the membership criteria stated above if **an** individual nominated for a dissertation committee has expertise particularly relevant to the candidate's dissertation research.*

Near the last third of the first paragraph, it mentions that "The director of a specific doctoral program may approve an exception to the membership criteria stated above if **an** individual nominated for a dissertation committee has expertise particularly relevant to the candidate's dissertation research." The word "An" suggests only one, or is this open to several people sitting around conferring a degree they do not themselves possess?

Poole said that the Graduate Council discussed the constitution of the dissertation committee. Initially the policy had all three members with a terminal degree. Members of the GC thought that was problematic because it might be difficult to find 3 faculty with a terminal degree, i.e. Nursing. The policy gives some flexibility when it is not always possible to have three with a terminal degree and recognizes expertise in a specific area.

Petrosky wondered if we are going down a dangerous road if we confer doctorates with committees of folks who don't have them.

Poole said that the policy is written to indicate that is the exception, not the rule. Because we don't know what doctoral programs we might have down the road, they thought it was helpful to have flexibility and rigor.

Riggs said that two members of the dissertation committee need to be core doctoral members of the program as prescribed in Title V and the EO #991 which requires full time status, tenure track and doctorate. The language comes from the EO #991 which allows someone with particular expertise to serve. As this reads it may not restrict it to one person, but right now our only doctoral program has a restriction with two who are

the core with a doctorate. This was drawn from that language.

O'Brien asked what is an equivalent to a dissertation noted in Item #2 in the policy as follows:

2. Requirement for the Dissertation

A dissertation or the equivalent shall be required as a part of all doctoral programs offered at CSU Stanislaus and normally consist of no fewer than 20 percent of the total units required for the doctoral degree. Each program shall establish the number of units required for the dissertation as well as the required number of semesters for enrollment in a dissertation course.

Riggs said the reason they put that in there had to do with looking down the road if there are programs that require some sort of capstone activity such as practice doctorates in Nursing, and performance doctorates in Music or Arts that might require a portfolio. The intent is a significant 20% or so of the program as a capstone event.

McGhee said regarding Item #7, it bothers him in the rationale using nursing, but if we are going into a doctorate, we should have enough faculty to do this. He understands the expertise, but we have to be careful about justifying it with not enough doctorates in the doctoral program. This is a slippery slope as disparity between bachelors and masters are not unique.

Regalado said that on the presumption that the dissertation process is more cumbersome than a MA, is there anyone in the committee who receives WTU's to head the committee? Is this the same for doctorates, and what are the odds that people will do this level of work for free? Riggs said the current practice is just the chair receives .5 WTU per semester up to four semesters. Beyond that you may continue as chair but do not receive any WTU's. Regalado asked if the other two members work for free. Riggs replied yes.

Responding to Strahm's concern regarding 7 years to complete, Eudey noted that this is a problem with the CSU language. At other campuses where this occurs they typically split the degree so that students are conferred on the MA before moving to "doctoral work, so the seven years should start again after the masters is done. She also noted that the 2nd resolved notes that this will be effective for spring 2011, so are there any students in the current EDD program or those entering upon approval by the President?

Riggs said 27 students are working on dissertation now, and 11 more will be in the spring. He's not aware of any with concerns with regard to the policy.

Sarraille said being on a committee is not about being compensated or doing it for free, but having the time to do it. At an institution like this where faculty are pressured to teach four classes per semester, to carefully study a dissertation looking for flaws would be a major addition to their workload. All committee members should do this. He doesn't expect to see PhD's offered from this institution from any field closely allied to his own, and is glad at the moment because he feels like this describes things that would not work well for his field. For one thing, he doesn't think people with PhDs in Math get an MA first. They just advance to candidacy and get a PhD. He thinks it may be an error to try to make a policy right now that covers widely talking about how committees should be established and regulated. Since we're new it makes more sense to start small in the process and design it to fit specific programs. On other hand, he sees that what Riggs is proposing is something that could be revised and seems to work for now.

Petrosky thinks that in some fields the doctorate is not the appropriate terminal degree, but we shouldn't be conferring degrees upon people with committees constituted by people without those degrees. He would want to see more restrictions there, like no more than 1/3 of the committee not having the degree.

Poole noted it says at least two members of the committee hold the rank of Associate Professor or higher

suggesting they hold the terminal degree. She understands that if there is a program wishing to propose a doctoral degree and they don't have sufficient faculty to carry it out, when it goes through governance that we would not approve it. This is written in a way where there is expectation of all three members of the committee having the degree, and the exception is for other circumstances.

Petrosky said it would be better to be clear now and not fix it later.

Keswick questioned from last sentence in Nursing has 13 faculty, 3 with PhDs and two working on them. From her understanding from reading it, you would have a couple of faculty from the department, but could also have someone from outside the department with expertise in that area of interest. For instance, you could have medical faculty, but would rather have experts from another area. That's how she was reading it.

McGhee noted that the committee shall be composed of a minimum of three members and two of the members must be full-time tenured or tenure track doctoral program faculty. Yu might want to put a requirement on how many are non-full time faculty. The limitation should be reversed to protect against the downside of it rather than the upside of it.

Dawn Poole to work on these revisions and bring this item back to the Senate for a second reading.

9. Discussion Items

a. FBAC review of programs proposed for UEE

Jasek-Rysdahl noted there are several proposals for new programs to be offered via UEE. SEC took the position that these proposals have to be reviewed by faculty governance in the same way that it would review proposals for state-side programs. This means the proposals are referred to UEPC and/or GC, and FBAC.

FBAC Chair Sarraille asked senators for their opinions. Should FBAC recommend against approval of a UEE program proposal if there appears to be a serious problem with the proposal, or should FBAC simply pass along its concerns and ideas for improving the proposal?

Sarraille gave a couple of hypothetical examples. Suppose a program is proposed to run out of UEE, but FBAC doesn't think the program has a chance of being in the black. Suppose UEE has agreed that if the program fails, UEE will make up the difference in revenue for a while, allowing the program to service students that are in the pipeline before the program is discontinued. Should FBAC recommend for or against approval of the program in such a case?

Another hypothetical example: supposed FBAC has reservations about the salaries paid to the instructors. FBAC does not think the salaries, in the long run, are sufficiently high to attract the caliber of faculty that should be teaching in the program. However, sufficiently many qualified faculty have volunteered to teach in the program for the first couple of years. Should FBAC recommend the program or not?

One proposal mentioned an amount of money to be spent on advertising the program, but someone on FBAC felt ten times the proposed amount should be spent. What kind of recommendation should FBAC make? Sarraille is not expecting immediate definitive answers, but FBAC will be struggling with such questions and Sarraille would like some input.

O'Brien has another question. If a program is approved that may have a deficit, what happens if it moves to stateside? It moves through the door without rigorous concerns because of self-support, but if it's stateside should it go through the whole process again.

Sarraille indicated it would be a great mistake to allow a program that is hemorrhaging money in self-support to move into stateside without further review. If it's failing there, one would hope it would have a much reduced likelihood to be moved stateside. He opined that there should be an established process for deciding when a program may migrate from one side to another. The Senate should be concerned that the design of the process incorporate its advice and consent appropriately.

Garcia pointed out that FBAC's role is advisory only, and said FBAC should look at the proposal, review it, and offer advice.

Provost Strong asked if these are new programs or existing programs offered at another site. Sarraille believes that these proposals are for new programs.

Provost Strong said new programs go thru the normal curriculum process. They would have to follow WASC standards that are relevant. That's one issue. If FBAC has concerns about the economic viability of the program, those need to be voiced and pointed out to academic department working with UEE as well as to UEE. Those questions should be answered. As an advisory body, for FBAC to say don't offer the program could be excessive because there could be dimensions of the opportunity that the committee is not fully aware of. The UEE director, program director, and lead faculty should be able to answer those questions. He's concerned that we not stifle the entrepreneurial spirit and that process. Although, oversight is a good thing so those questions need to be raised and addressed, but having FBAC say no you can't do that is concerning.

Sarraille said it was clear to him that FBAC doesn't have the authority to approve or deny a program. However, it should not be overlooked that there could be circumstances under which it would be appropriate for FBAC to recommend against approval of a program. That being said, the hypothetical examples are extreme, and it well may be that in most cases it would be better that FBAC simply make a review and offer suggestions, as Garcia indicated. In answer to Provost Strong's statement that a negative recommendation from FBAC might be excessive because of ignorance of certain dimensions, Sarraille said that it is FBAC's business to learn all the dimensions, and Sarraille is confident in the ability of FBAC to do that.

Filling suspects some stifling of entrepreneurial behavior may be wise. Most for-profits go bust even though people try hard to make them viable. The more careful review they get, the better off we are especially since we confuse entrepreneurial and educational behavior.

10. Open Forum

McGhee thanked the Provost for addressing an issue brought to the Senate at an earlier meeting. Instituting a policy for future semesters for classrooms to only be listed on the online class schedule if classrooms are assigned. He appreciates the action on this to cut down on disruption to planning in the future. Agreed.

Jasek-Rysdahl said there are rooms still to be assigned. He sent an email to the Provost, and he was assured that rooms will be assigned before the schedule goes live. Lisa Bernardo said that is how they are proceeding. Nothing will be on the schedule without a classroom assigned. Provost Strong said the situation exacerbated by the loss of Science I classrooms. It's been tighter than in the past, but assigning classes without rooms was setting students up for problems.

11. Adjournment

3:48pm