

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 4, 2006

Present: Andres, Brown, Dauwalder, Davis C., Davis S., DeCaro, Garcia, Hall, Janz, Kim, Lawson, Manrique, Mantz, Mercier, Minor, Nagel, Nelson, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Reneau, Riedmann, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Senior, Shawkey, Stone, Tan, Tavernier, Thompson, Werling

Proxies: Eudey (DeKatzew), Garza (Jacobs), Noble (Morgan-Foster), Thomas (Zarling)

Absent: Afonso, Sanchez-Walker, Weikart

Guests: Boffman, Borba, Bruner, Burns, Coughlin, Elmallah, Filling, C. Floyd, Helzer, LaFlamme, Marshall, Murray-Ward, Novak, Pivec, Shirvani, Stephens, Tynan, Wendt

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman/Margaret Ramos

REPORT: Education Doctorate Needs Assessment Committee

3/AS/06/RSCAPC--Amendment to 12/AS/83/FAC--Sponsored Programs Administrative Policy--APPROVED

4/AS/06/FBAC--Resolution for Fee Structure for Winter Term, FIRST READING

5/AS/06/FAC--Courseload for Lecturers, FIRST READING

DISCUSSED: eCollege and Strategic Planning

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, April 25, 2006
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Meeting called to order at 2.35pm.

2. The agenda was approved.

3. The minutes of 3/21/06 were approved.

4. Announcements

a. President Shirvani advised on progress in college restructuring. After approval by AS, upper

administration met with faculty of colleges, and asked for recommendations for acting deans and decanal search committees. The President received these recommendations and has named acting deans. He met with them briefly on Thursday, and they will continue meeting with Demetrulias and Wendt to reorganize and restructure office space and staff. As they do that, they will inform AS and college faculty on progress, and consult as appropriate. Search committees will form this Spring as well. Searches will start probably in May. Don't anticipate appointments before January. Until July 1, ALS operates as it is; on July 1, the new structure goes into effect.

b. The President took advantage of his open mic by offering some remarks on eCollege. First, it's a platform; they don't teach, they don't have curriculum. Second, no decision has been made, no contract signed; their visit is just an exploration. If faculty are interested, then we can talk about it. DeCaro is interested and involved in distance learning; he has been asked to coordinate the visit. We can't offer full degrees online; only courses (up to 50% of degree). This is an accreditation requirement. Thompson noted it was good to hear this, and it would be nice to hear it in the emails. A man of action often acts through announcements, but it's good to get information on process while we're getting the announcements. Shirvani acknowledged the lapse.

5. Questions about Reports

No comments.

6. Information Item

a. Education Doctorate Needs Assessment Committee—preliminary results of the prospective student and employer surveys conducted by an ad hoc feasibility study committee (Borba)

Borba advised that COE established an ad hoc committee to study the feasibility of EdD degrees. The committee was charged with two questions: first, to verify the need for EdD degrees in the service area, and second, to identify potential sources. First phase was a survey, a brief of which was distributed; the second phase will occur in four focus group forums inviting the community for input throughout the service region occurring the two weeks after Spring Break. 20000 surveys were distributed, about 1000 were returned. Responses formed roughly two major groups. One group is highly interested in K-12 and CCC administration, the other group highly interested in pedagogy and want to stay in the classroom. Respondents evinced a high interest in traditional program delivery, although some small percentage identified "other alternative" models of delivery to augment traditional approaches. A majority of respondents indicated regional proximity as a leading factor in determining where they wish to enroll in an EdD program. The majority of respondents are currently K-12 and CCC instructors. The highest percentage reside in Stanislaus County, 45% of respondents currently hold a master's degree, 2/3 are female, almost 2/3 identify as white nonhispanic. Borba feels a need for a marketing mechanism in place to recruit San Joaquin County, with a high premium on male and ethnically diverse candidates.

In addition, the ad hoc committee compiled a prospective employer survey. All respondents reported that they currently have no policy mandating an EdD, although 1/3 indicated a preference for employees with earned doctorates.

After focus group meetings, Borba will share the results.

Petrosky thanked Borba for the update, and acknowledged his superior wisdom in recognizing the need for effective marketing.

7. Action Item

a. 3/AS/06/RSCAPC ó Amendment to 12/AS/83/FAC ó Sponsored Programs

Petrosky reminded the body about process: the resolution was returned to committee for two weeks to revise policy language, and is now submitted to the committee of the whole for action.

Schoenly reported that RSCAPC met last week with Stone and O'Brien, and revisited items of concern. They have new wording, and hope it is acceptable.

O'Brien spoke in favor of the resolution. His department had concerns, and they were promptly addressed. He thanked all involved.

Resolution was approved unanimously by voice.

8. First Reading Items

a. 4/AS/06/FBAC ó Resolution for Fee Structure for Winter Term

It was MS Sarraille/Thompson

Resolved: The Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus, suggests that the Board of Trustees alter the fee structure for CSU Stanislaus, so that the fee for Winter Term would be 5% of the annual fees for full-time students (6.1 units or more). And be it further

Resolved: Should implementation of this resolution cause financial difficulty for individual students, we urge Financial Aid to help affected students in whatever way possible.

Rationale:

The chart below provides a comparison of the current fee structure with the proposed one, using 2005-06 fees:

Current (2005-06)

Units Per Semester Winter Term Per Academic Year

Undergraduate

6.1 units or more \$1147 \$226 = 9% \$2,520

0 to 6.0 \$619 \$226 \$1,464

Credential

6.1 or more \$1331 \$260 = 9% \$2,922

0 to 6.0 \$719 \$260 \$1,698

Graduate

6.1 or more \$1413 \$276 = 9% \$3,102

0 to 6.0 \$762 \$276 \$1,800

PROPOSED FEES

Units Per Semester Winter Term Per Academic Year

Undergraduate

6.1 units or more \$1197 \$126 = 5% \$2,520

0 to 6.0 \$669 \$126 \$1,464

Credential

6.1 or more \$1388 \$146 = 5% \$2,922

0 to 6.0 \$776 \$146 \$1,698

Graduate

6.1 or more \$1473 \$155 = 5% \$3,102

0 to 6.0 \$822 \$155 \$1,800

Please note that we are not altering the annual fees for students.

Each year CSU Stanislaus loses revenue, because it enrolls over 1400 fewer students in the Winter Term than the average number of fulltime students (6.1 units or more) for the Fall and Spring Terms. We also have no students paying part-time fees for Winter, while the average for Fall and Spring Terms is over 1600. (Note: for fee-paying purposes, full-time is 6.1 units or more in fall or spring, and part-time is 6.0 units or less; in winter term everyone pays the same fee).

Full-time undergraduate students who do not take Winter Term are only paying 91% of the fees they would pay at any other CSU, meaning we are losing fee revenue from those who do not take Winter Term. Part-time students who do not take classes in the Winter Term are only paying 84.6% of what they would pay at other CSUs.

The total revenue lost to CSU Stanislaus because of this differential is estimated at \$779,800 for 2005-06.

Discussion:

Sarraille reported that the University is losing fee revenue. We have approximately 3500 students who attend Fall and Spring but not Winter, every year, and so don't pay the full yearly fees. This loss represents a difference in student fees of as much as \$780k annually. Rather than force Winter enrollment, FBAC suggests reducing Winter fees by \$100, and redistributing that \$100 over Fall and Spring. FBAC estimates approximately \$300k recoupable by this action.

DeCaro asked how we are currently covering the shortfall. Sarraille replied that it isn't a shortfall, it's revenue we don't collect.

Shawkey asked if the cost of winter is the only reason they don't come. Sarraille said sure. Garcia added that the Winter Term Revitalization Committee had another take on it. Part of it is what's offered during winter. They are apparently coming forth with a proposal to strengthen Winter term.

Eudey noted that 3500 students don't enroll, and asked how many are waiving, and how many are simply following the catalog as written. Sarraille replied that you would expect 25% just not to be around, following the catalog.

Janz asked if the measure was to make up revenue but also to manipulate enrollment. Sarraille said he saw no reason why it would change enrollment. Estimates were not based on that change. Lowering cost might increase enrollment slightly, but it shouldn't be a strong factor.

Mercier asked if a student doesn't normally take winter session, would their fees raise. Sarraille said if a student doesn't go, that student will save fees. With this change, that student will pay another \$100, but still save \$100 on the system fees for not enrolling in winter.

Poole asked for the student perspective. Sarraille quoted LaFlamme, student representative to FBAC, as being cool with it. Janz added that they would have a better idea next week after they talk to ASI. Sarraille said he got the impression that ASI had already reviewed it and LaFlamme conveyed that sense to him. Janz said they still needed to talk to him about it.

Noble advised checking with Financial Aid to ensure that there would be no adverse effects. Aid is based on attendance per term. Sarraille said they certainly would do that.

The item will return for action next AS.

b. 5/AS/06/FAC 6 Courseload for Lecturers

It was MS Stone/Nagel

Resolved: The courseload of full-time lecturers who are performing indirect instruction, such as office hours, advising, university and department service, course development, and performing scholarly activities to remain current in their field, be given up to 6 WTUs of assigned time; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be sent to all Academic Deans and Department Chairs.

Rationale: Lecturers are valuable contributors to our institution and their efforts deserve to be recognized. They are often denied assigned time for indirect instruction, despite providing advising, office hours, university service, course development, and performing scholarly activities to remain current in their field.

A large proportion of GE courses are taught by lecturers who are teaching more than 24 WTU's. Many of these courses have large enrollments. This makes it difficult for the instructors to provide developmental feedback. Assigned time for indirect instruction is especially critical for lecturers who use writing assignments or problem solving methods to teach their courses. Also, University level courses require continuous updates of information and/or examination of recent advances in pedagogy. Thus, assigned time for performing scholarly activities should be considered.

Erosion of tenure and tenured positions is advanced by policies that treat "temporary" faculty as a cheap and convenient labor pool, as second-class citizens of the University, and as substandard colleagues. Any measure that improves the status of lecturers, incorporates them more into the life of the University, limits incentives to rely on lecturers as a source of cheap and disposable labor. Our commitment to quality education is reflected by our resolve to increase our tenured faculty ranks and ensure an equitable workload for all instructors.

Discussion:

Stone advised that with this Sense of Senate resolution, FAC wants to recognize the work done by full-time lecturers, who currently are not given assigned time nor credit for office hours, course development, scholarly activities to remain current in their field, and other activities. In addition, this measure would begin to regularize the inequity in assigned time across colleges. She reported that the resolution tries to define "assigned time." She reminded the body that 35-40% of GE courses are taught by lecturers, which has an effect on the quality of education. Lastly, they currently are not given credit for contributions to campus.

Mantz declared that a 5/5 course load hurts our credibility nationwide; that part needs amplification. O'Brien added that this is a money issue. We have a two-class system, and need to speak out against it.

Dauwalder said he still thought the resolution speaks to terms and conditions of employment, and is hence part of contract/collective bargaining. However, if it goes forward, he suggests replacing language of the first resolved with language either from the contract or the workload agreement to stay consistent.

Sarraille took exception that Senate should stay away from recommendations about course loads for instructors; it is within the purview of Senates to recommend, with ample precedent. He supposed we could regularize the definition of indirect instruction. But that's a side issue. The resolution adequately describes what it means, and shouldn't be amended.

Petrosky iterated that this is a sense of senate resolution.

Manrique observed that as a long-time VL, she did all kinds of work, including Clerk of the Senate, without any kind of released time. For quality of education alone this is a good statement to make.

Eudey declared she was 100% behind the sense of senate, but recommended that the language be amended to say that courseload be reduced by 6 WTUs. Or simply replace first clause, first three words with "that."

The item will return for action next AS.

9. Discussion Items

a. eCollege (DeCaro)

DeCaro advised that once he was dead set against eCollege, but he did some research, and found out that the anecdotal evidence was wrong. eCollege is a platform, like BlackBoard, except that eCollege gives 24/7 tech support, and regularly upgrade the entire system. They assist and facilitate, and train instructors to develop online courses. Using the system would be strictly voluntary, and faculty would have to go through departments, just like anyone else. Representatives from eCollege will be here in Turlock 4/11, and in Stockton 4/12, to demonstrate the system and answer any questions.

Notwithstanding that offer, there were still some questions.

Nagel asked if Stockton was already using it. DeCaro claimed that the Stockton faculty want this, and their session will be more about how to develop it than the simple overview Turlock will get. Poole asked who exactly accepted it, since Teacher Ed doesn't know anything about it. DeCaro revealed that Dave Hamlett told him that faculty in Stockton were all for it.

O'Brien asked if the cost was comparable to BlackBoard. DeCaro had no clue, but offered that he was working with Thompson on faculty rights, and eCollege says faculty retain 100% of property rights to any course they offer online.

Peterson confessed to being fundamentally confused, and asked whether Stockton is a separate campus who can make a separate deal. Tynan offered that no one in Social Work had heard of this, and added that if we currently have a contract, she would like to know about it. DeCaro replied that he wasn't involved in Stockton, and didn't know anything about it.

Thompson suggested that if the President likes it, he might incentivize it. He then asked for a description of the platform and usability, and a comparison to BlackBoard. DeCaro replied that that was the focus of the 4/11 demonstration. He revealed that the President is considering assisting the development of online courses, to which faculty would retain rights, in return for which faculty would be compelled to teach the course in that version for a specified length of time.

Mantz asked if this does not indeed open up the floodgates to a new kind of enrollment perspective, moving us from a Liberal Arts college to Phoenix. DeCaro replied there were two different kinds of curriculum. UEE will work the way it does now. The regular curriculum will need to reflect the requirements of the new workload agreement, and this will help implement it. But he maintained we could not have more than 50% of courses toward a degree offered online.

Poole asked what we are currently doing on UEE, and what we were approving here. DeCaro replied we were currently only looking at the utility of eCollege. We're just exploring at this time.

Eudey offered that she had used eCollege, and it compared favorably to Blackboard. It's just a different system for posting things. We use BlackBoard as a supplement now, and students really like it. We should be looking at alternatives. She didn't see a flood, noting that we're too savvy and students actually like face to face instruction. This isn't a change to the mission. Students are looking for the service, and we don't offer it. We should be looking at ways to address that.

Sarraille asked how online courses currently get approved. DeCaro replied that it is the same as other courses, through department and college approval.

Floyd asked how we came to this level of murkiness, and asked for a coherent, open, visible process. DeCaro offered that now that he was involved, we can open communications.

Stone asked which departments have embraced it, and also expressed concern about the quality of instruction. Thompson added that we need information on the budget, and a way to make a reasonable assessment. He added that this is another pedagogy, which may raise implications for how we handle the courses. And lastly, he asked if eCollege and BlackBoard would coexist. DeCaro raised the last issue with them already, and they say they coexist with them all the time.

Riedmann asked whose decision is it ultimately to buy this product. DeCaro replied that we would pay by the course for it to be housed in the eCollege system. Peterson asked who decides if the platform will be available. DeCaro said the departments. Peterson asked where the money would come from; DeCaro didn't know.

Sarraille said that money is one thing, but people are concerned about being pushed into a mode they're not familiar with in their courses. He is worried about a scenario where someone puts pressure on a department to put courses online; what if you don't want to? What checks and balances exist? O'Brien added by asking how subtle eCollege would be.

O'Brien observed that he keeps hearing this is a faculty decision, but hasn't heard whether students are for it. Janz said it was the first he'd heard of it. Minor added that ASI will encourage students to go to the demonstrations.

Floyd noted that there is no freestanding department up in Stockton; how can they do this if faculty are part of departments here? DeCaro said they can't, but their vision is beyond where we're at here. But they can't do anything with it until we decide. Boffman clarified that Stockton is interested, and Stockton faculty have a legitimate interest in finding out about this option, but departments have to approve whether a course is offered online.

Tynan, finally, asked who signs the contract. DeCaro replied that there is a difference between those who use it and who authorize it, but ultimately, the President decides.

Petrosky observed that the most sagacious course of action consists in attending the demonstrations and asking further questions.

b. Strategic Planning (Davis)

Davis advised that the four Open Fora had been completed, and that they had received a wealth of information for the revision. He will post the revision on the threaded discussion site (panopticon.csustan.edu/stratplan/) as soon as it is available.

Stone added that there was little participation by faculty, and urged her colleagues to get involved with the process.

10. Open Forum

Sarraille pointed out that arrangements were made rather easily for a \$75 fee enhancement to finance an athletic facility. Library has been trying to do that for years. What do you have to do exactly to start a fee referendum?

Minor clarified that ASI is not putting out this referendum, just supporting it. It is a University fee, not part of the Student Center fees. She recommended starting with the Student Fee Advisory Committee. Stephens added that students have been talking about this for a long time; it's not out of the air. LaFlamme noted that library expansion is on the capital plan for 2012, and funds for library still on governor's budget, but fragile. Whether these funds will reach CSU Stanislaus or even the CSU is still to be determined. Our expansion is certainly low on the list.

Meeting was adjourned at 4.30pm.