CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
March 9, 2004

PRESENT: Brown, Cunha, Everett, Feldman, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Jensen, Karlstrom, Katsma, Luo, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, Oppenheim, Paterson, Peterson, Poole, Regalado, Riedmann, Rios-Bustamante, Sarraille, Senior, Shipley, Steussman, Tan, Thompson, Watkins, Weddle, Youngblom

PROXIES: Demetrulias (Dauwalder) Sarraille (Zarling)

ABSENT: Andres, A., Andres, C., Aronson, Bettencourt, Ferriz, Garcia, O’Brien, Rumayor, Sumser

GUESTS: Jaasma, Ruud, Stephens, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

16/AS/03/FAC--Policy for Review of the Chair of Agricultural Studies, Director of the Honors Program, Coordinator of the Applied Studies Program, Coordinator of the Social Science Program, and the Coordinator of the Cognitive Studies Program, APPROVED

19/AS/03/UEPC--Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs, TABLED

2/AS/04/UEPC--Summit Program Proposal, FIRST READING

Discussion: Carryover Funds and UEE Director

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, March 23, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

Speaker-elect Filling called the meeting to order at 2:37 pm. The agenda was amended to add Open Forum as 8) and Adjournment to 9). The agenda was approved as amended. The Minutes of February 24, 2004 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Filling asked for a moment of silence for long-time CSU Stanislaus employee Mary Ozuna and for Dr. Dauwalder’s brother Fred, both of whom passed away recently.

2. Call for faculty position fellowship in teaching and learning. It is the revised Director of Assessment of Student Learning position. Please feel free to submit an application or nominate a colleague.
3. COC is seeking committee nominees for the 2004/05 academic year. If you get a call, please do not say no or hang up. We need your participation.

4. CSU Legislative Day is March 22 in Sacramento. Please participate to the extent you are able.

5. Regalado advised that the History Department is sponsoring the 50th anniversary of Brown vs. Board of Topeka celebration on April 29 at 7 pm in DBH 167. Keynote address will be given by Dr. Peter Irons from UC San Diego.

**QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS**

None.

**ACTION ITEMS**

a. 16/AS/03/FAC–Policy for Review of the Chair of Agricultural Studies, Director of the Honors Program, Coordinator of the Applied Studies Program, Coordinator of the Social Science Program, and the Coordinator of the Cognitive Studies Program

Floyd reported that changes FAC made are based on input from the last Senate meeting. There was discussion about the definition of what an interdisciplinary chair is, so the document identifies specific positions affected by this review. Also, since the programs are all in the College of ALS, the document has been specialized so it addresses reviews in ALS.

Nagel suggested a friendly amendment to change the rationale deleting ‘across college boundaries.’ Floyd added if at some point an interdisciplinary program crossed college boundaries, the policy would have to be amended. At this point the phrase is irrelevant. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Sarraille suggested since the title of the resolution has been changed, so should the policy heading. This was also accepted as a friendly amendment.

Watkins questioned whether the policy would have to be changed if the Summit Program was approved. Floyd indicated that FAC will be drafting a Policy for Interdisciplinary Chairs that will parallel the Department Chair Policy, so this could be looked at at that time. FAC was hoping after the last meeting that the definition could be incorporated into such policy. But there was concern it might not pass if we didn’t know who it applied to.

Vote on 16/AS/03 passed by voice vote. This will go to the President for approval.

b. 19/AS/03/UEPC–Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs

Watkins explained the changes were based on the discussions from the Senate. The purpose for amendment to this policy is to clarify and make the process work more efficiently.

Thompson asked the reason for a new 1 e) and Watkins replied that it had to do with not wanting to wait for the five year cycle to end in order to start the discontinuation process.
It was MS Thompson/Sarraille to strike 1 e) "by a majority vote of a department curriculum committee, college curriculum or planning committee, or relevant department or college committee". Thompson stated that this was under consideration in SEC last year at the same time SWAS was reviewing Discontinuation Policies on campuses. Part of the reason for the review was to make sure faculty had a lot of say about the process. It was a goal to make it more difficult to discontinue a program in times when budgets are tight. It seems this policy might make it easier to discontinue programs. Further, he stated that he feels a department curriculum committee should not be able to start the discontinuation process. There is the possibility that a committee might be ‘hijacked’ for the purpose of requesting discontinuance. Watkins stated that if we approve to strike 1 e) the old 1 e) should be put back in: "As a result of the five year periodic review process so long as the general provisions of EP&R 79-10 are followed."

Sarraille questioned what EP&R 79-10 was and Demetrulias replied she thought it had to do with five year program review or programs essential to core functions.

Vote on amendment to strike revised 1 e) passed by voice vote.

Back to resolution as amended. It was MS Watkins/Cunha to add the original 1 e). Watkins explained that doing five year program review is to see if you have a healthy program.

It was MS Sarraille/Nagel to table until the next Senate meeting. He asked that Watkins find out what EP&R 79-10 is and what is involved if we add the original 1 e) into the document. Riedmann stated it is not clear who can initiate action as a result of the five year review.

Peterson said it could be any of the other groups named in 1 a-d and 1 f). Demetrulias stated that striking 1 e) eliminates the role of the college in initiating discontinuance.

Vote to table to the next AS meeting passed by voice vote with one no vote.

**FIRST READING ITEM**

a. 2/AS/04/UEPC–Summit Program Proposal

It was MS Watkins/Poole

WHEREAS The General Education Review Task Force (GERTF) was appointed in Fall 1997 to review the General Education program and make recommendations to the University Educational Policies Committee for a general education curriculum plan and propose a structure for implementation and evaluation; and

WHEREAS The input solicited by GERTF at two All-University workshops indicated a willingness to experiment with upper division G.E.; and

WHEREAS The cluster model was preferred as a way to create greater coherence in the upper division General Education program; and

WHEREAS The Summit Program Pilot for upper division general education developed by the General Education Review Task Force was approved by the University Educational Policies Committee, the Academic Senate, and the President for implementation in Fall 2001; and
WHEREAS The Assessment Report: Summit Program Pilot, Fall 2001-Spring 2003, supports continuance of the Summit Program and was approved by the University Educational Policies Committee; be it

RESOLVED That the current G.E. program be continued and the Summit Program be approved for implementation effective fall 2004 as an alternative way to fulfill 6 of the 9 upper division G.E. requirements; and be it further

RESOLVED That an assessment report be prepared in fall 2007 and forwarded through the appropriate faculty governance committees (i.e., General Education Subcommittee, UEPC, and Academic Senate).

Jaasma, a member of the Summit Program and UEPC, explained the program and distributed a handout explaining what they did for 03/04. The program was developed in response to faculty’s desire to have more experimentation. The greatest success is student/student interaction as well as student/faculty interaction. Independent learning by students was also noted. Jaasma advised that of the students who began the program, there was a 77% success rate for completion. When talking to faculty that participated in the program, they stated that they expected more from their students and students indicated they worked harder. Students and faculty felt that more scheduling flexibility was needed in the program, so the program has been changed from linked set of three courses to linked pairs. The plan is to come back in three years and do an assessment to see how it is working, how it impacts faculty and their departments. The proposal is to maintain the program without growth and just a little money for advertising. When the budget crisis is over, they would like to grow.

Questions and concerns:

--Who will coordinate if there is no release time? Jaasma replied that part of her assignment in the Dean’s office is to coordinate the program.
--Did those that went through the program have a better or equal retention rate in the University? Jaasma replied the desired information could not be obtained from IRPA, so her secretary tried to get information through Banner. She’ll try to get the numbers and bring back.
--It was noted in the Summary that those that didn’t make it in the program also had a hard time staying in the University.
--Would faculty have to be trained continually? Jaasma replied that training is for faculty new to the program developing new pairs. Those that have been trained will train others.

It was MS Watkins/Poole to waive the rules and go to second reading.

Oppenheim questioned the arguments in the report that indicate the program is successful. He pointed out that it is a problem that students who drop out of the program have to start over on their GE courses. He noted that the students are significantly less satisfied. Further, the summary states that students in clusters are learning more deeply. How do you determine that unless you check with the traditional students? The summary also states that those students also work harder. How do you know that? There are too many unanswered questions. We are not ready to go to a second reading so he does not support the motion.

Jaasma stated that a comparison was not done. The goal of the program is an alternative path, not a better path. They asked students in the program how many hours they worked, and they also asked faculty teaching in the program their expectations.
Cunha said she thinks the program is a good alternative for students.

Thompson voiced that the way the report is written, it gives the impression a comparison has been done with regular GE. He questioned if item 4 states ‘increase in student interaction’ is just students comments, not a comparison. Jaasma replied yes. He asked if other factors besides student workload were considered as possibly explaining why the satisfaction scores were lower for the summit students.

Peterson said it seemed odd that these students in smaller classes getting deeper into a subject were less satisfied. You need to think more about whether this method is really better. We have to consider that students may wind up paying more fees under this paradigm.

Nagel stated that his class was the only way for the honor students to do their upper division GE, but they were not told that in advance, so they were very unhappy. He suspects that much of the measured dissatisfaction stems from this.

Feldman thinks the program has potential and that 85% is a reasonable success rate. If we lend our talents to it, we can make it do well.

Oppenheim stated that the students who did not want to be in the class should have been able to work out their problems with it after one or two classes. It seems odd that 45% of the students who failed to progress through the three classes dropped out of the University. Jaasma replied that just looking at banner does not tell you they have dropped out. They might have registered late.

Watkins stated that the ratings of the Summit courses were high in her opinion (4.03%) and that she is in favor of the program. Also, keep in mind we should not look at it as a better program, but an alternative. Sarraille stated it is really just a question of whether we want to teach with this alternative. Thompson suggested that we don’t need assessment if Sarraille’s notion is correct. We should just do the work.

Oppenheim stated that it is clear from our discussions there are concerns and questions. We need to go back to our departments and ask our colleagues how they feel about the program.

The question was called. Vote on the motion to go to a second reading failed by voice vote.

Cunha voiced that advising is more of a problem than students dropping out of classes. Maybe we should focus on that. The program is a good alternative.

Demetrulias noted that assessment in some form is required by WASC. Also, the GE program in totality has to be assessed, including Summit if it is used to satisfy GE. Nelson stated he would like to have more information on the assessment portion.

Tan questioned if it will be a problem for students trying to find classes because there are enrollment caps on Summit courses. Cunha stated that was not her experience, but she did not know about other students. Upper division GE has been easier to get into than lower division GE.

Jaasma stated she has gotten very little help on assessment, so there would need to be resources allocated to the task of doing assessment and providing help.
Peterson asked why the Summary states the need for 6 units of release time for a faculty coordinator as well as a budget of $6,000 per year. Jaasma replied that because of the budget crisis, we cut it. If it grows, we will need release time. Peterson asked about the $1,300 listed in the proposal. Jaasma replied that is for supplies, advertising and assessment for 04/05.

Tan questioned if the assessment data includes this term and Jaasma replied no. They are working on an extension waiting to see if they get approval. Poole advised there does not seem to be a strong reason for discontinuance in the information we have, so why not give them the green light. If we are not willing to do this, it encourages no innovation.

Cunha questioned why this program has to be better. It is just an alternative for students.

This will be action item at next Senate meeting.

OPEN FORUM

a. Carryover funds

Peterson explained that in her department, faculty are upset about getting mixed signals from the Administration, especially as we approach the end of the semester. It has been suggested that Deans are being told to use the remaining funds in their budgets while also they are being told that they will have deficits next year. A ‘use it or lose it’ mode. She asked for a sense if this is happening in other departments.

Sarraille advised that FBAC has been discussing the issue of carryover funds. Some departments felt money was stolen from their budgets last year when it was carried over, but not given back to them. But, when chairs were given the opportunity to come to FBAC and air their concerns, none did. He stated he would like faculty to be involved in trying to put the carryover funds to the best use.

Demetrulias stated that the message that Peterson refers to are not what is being said at the level of the Provost. Deans are being told to be prudent with their money, and project what they will need.

Stephens gave a broader perspective of the issue. There are competing tensions now that we are moving to deeper cuts. There is the belief of staff that colleges are on a spending spree when there are considerations to cut staff positions. If funds in departments are not needed for the purpose they were allocated to the departments, then she feel they should go back to be used for other things that are more important. On the other hand, there are things that have to be bought, purchases that need to be made. You have to justify what you buy and justify if you hire someone. Purchase requests coming out of departments still have to be justified, despite the current call to get the requests in before May. Peterson stated they are being told certain expenditures can’t be made. If we have money, why not carry over to pay for a part time lecturer for next year? Stephens replied that funding for part time faculty is an institutional issue. We may need the money for non-instructional purposes.

Oppenheim stated that we have not been allowed to carry over funds until fairly recently. Money rolls back from other branches and departments on campus too, so the academic departments are not in a unique situation. Stephens agreed, stating there are also government rules about what can be encumbered. Demetrulias noted that carryover funds were used in part to cover the mid-year cuts.
Filling asked that Vice President Stephens and Provost Dauwalder make a presentation at the next Senate meeting on carry over funds. Stephens agreed.

b. UEE position

Feldman asked if there will be a UEE dean hired. There have been many UEE deans over the years. High turnover makes it difficult to get the operation running efficiently. He suggests running UEE with a governing board made up with substantial faculty representation. He would like to introduce a motion to develop a proposal for doing this.

Floyd stated there is a Committee on Reorganization that perhaps should be looking at this issue as well. Floyd would like to see this notion integrated there.

Oppenheim stated that UEE needs to carry its own weight. Moving to YRO has been a disaster for UEE. The situation is now precarious. Maybe that has something to do with the turnover in the leadership. It is causing problems when faculty teach 24 units over 9 months and then do extra teaching for extra pay in the summer. He stated he is not convinced that faculty should get involved in running UEE.

Filling stated that he believes the plan for UEE is to house it partly under Roger Pugh and partly under the Colleges. He suggested Feldman forward his proposal to the Committee on Reorganization. Faculty representatives are J.J. Hendricks and Speaker Aronson.

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 pm.