1. The final academic senate meeting of the year was called to order at 2.35pm.

2. The agenda was amended to include President Shirvani’s comments at 6b, and approved as amended.

3. The minutes of 4/25/06 were amended to insert bracketed information as follows: Page 4, 2nd paragraph from bottom, last sentence "... if you are using data from a [public,] archived data set, you would [not] need IRB approval." Page 6, our packet, 3rd paragraph from top, last sentence "... any use of vertebrate animals [and hazardous materials] demands approval." Minutes were approved as amended.

4. Announcements
a. Speaker Petrosky announced he had 47 hours (and counting) remaining as Speaker.
b. Speaker Petrosky announced that the period for student evaluations begins tomorrow (5/10) and extends to 5/23.
c. Speaker Petrosky announced the General Faculty meeting this Thursday, 5/11, 2.30-4.30pm in the Faculty Development Center.
d. Speaker Petrosky announced Warrior Day is this Friday (5/12), beginning at noon.
e. Speaker Petrosky announced that Wednesday, 5/24, is a Reading Day.
f. S. Davis announced the 35th Annual Faculty Beer-B-Q, May 20, 4pm, in Teague Park. Tickets and additional information are available from the usual suspects in the Culinary Alliance: Cherukuri, S. Davis, Doraz, Erickson, Filling, Mayer, Pierce, Stone.

5. Questions About Reports
None.

6. Information Item
a. Education Doctorate Needs Assessment Committee (Borba)
Borba advised on the results of recent focus group meetings regarding potential Ed.D. programs at CSU Stanislaus. Twenty-six people participated in several focus group meetings around the service area. Responses were shared in a handout; distillation follows: Equal distribution of people representing areas of education, business, and nursing in attendance. Leadership & pedagogy should be high interest areas. Many attendants felt there should be a strong field work component, and recommended an equal distribution of scholarship, theory, and practice. Respondents felt they should be able to apply credits for Ed.D. toward professional credential requirements. Most respondents did not want to be involved directly in writing the program, but indicated willingness to serve on advisory board, to review and provide input on components of the program as it nears completion.

Borba also advised he has received word from Statewide Academic Senate and the Chancellorís Office that the Chancellorís Office will take strict constructionist approach to the development and implementation of doctoral programs in the CSU. They want to standardize the process and they want a standard final product, with no deviation from one Ed.D. to another within the system. Theyíre just not into creative new thinking.

b. ECollege and Rate of Change (Shirvani)

Shirvani thanked the body for the opportunity and shared his appreciation for the opportunity to serve the institution this first year. He reported that we have had a good year, a productive year. He has heard the message that he is moving too fast, and wanted a moment to respond. He noted that the campus is the best kept secret in the Valley: first rate, and superb. But it has not received the recognition it deserves. The college is the same age as Sonoma and Fullerton. They have had resources, have been a little avant garde and entrepreneurial in approach. We need to catch up, and to do that takes a lot of money. We will get some of that from increasing enrollment, but that wonít be enough. He is trying to propose ideas that we be more entrepreneurial, and more efficient, to gain more revenue for salaries, dept budgets, new faculty lines, labs, research support, etc. We need to be more efficient structurally, but also entrepreneurial. E-Learning is one way to do that.

Back in 1956 the Orange Book detailed campus distributions. Many small institutions would get less money. And schools with professional programs would get more money. Us, Bakersfield, Sonoma, Humboldt, all
got less than we needed. But now their budgets are substantially higher. Not saying they donít deserve it, but weíre much lower. When the system went to budget by FTE, they didnít backfill and start off level. We will catch some of that difference with enrollment. Now, as other places go down, they lose money, and it goes to us, because weíre going up. He thanked everyone for their work in this endeavor; we were one of six campuses with enrollment growth.

But we also have to be alert to major competition down the road. Donít take them lightly. We have five recruiters; they have thirty, with budgets proportionally different. They are moving into fields traditionally associated with the CSU: MS Nursing, eg. If they go to Education, we canít stop them. But we also have major competition from the for-profit universities all over the valley. We are unique, and different, but have to do things that get us the recognition we deserve, that represents the quality of the institution.

Thatís the rush: weíre trying to take care of that. He thanked the Senate Executive committee, and all the faculty, for our work, and reminded us we have lots to do. He is here for you. We could cry about not having money, but he would rather move on and do it ourselves. We have the opportunity. He will be back to share options and ideas. He stated that when he has an idea, it is not a mandate or a directive, but a set of options. If a department doesnít want to do it, no problem. His job is to create opportunities, yours is to pick it or dump it. College restructuring is all about developing clusters that can operate entrepreneurially in their own way. He invited faculty to call or email or simply grab him in the yard and feel free to criticize or to ask questions.

7. Action Items

a. 06/AS/06/RSCAPC ñ Amendment to 5/AS/01: Human Subject Research Policy
Schoenly urged the passage of the resolution as a replacement to present policy. He reiterated the main points covered in RSCAPC and UIRB discussion. He noted the policy draft has been vetted by UEPC and GC. Although there have been concerns raised about not enough vetting, this draft has been around with a lot of opportunity for input. They have made changes to make it more faculty friendly. Many procedures were streamlined and made straightforward, including definitions of research and vulnerable populations. The revision clarifies voting rights, lists explicitly several exemptions to IRB review, covers non-compliance, and defines oral history research with procedural language. If the resolution does not pass, he invited the consideration of what will happen to this with a new compliance officer. This process is more useful and faculty-friendly.

Nelson advised that the Psychology Dept. met and opposes further movement, they believe the wording of "research" and the debate on action research will impact how they do research, graduate and clinical programs. These may fall under action or applied research, and all would have to be submitted. Their feeling was unanimous that we are not in a position to proceed without further discussion.

Garcia, speaking as both GC chair and SW faculty, noted that we have many graduates doing work, and nothing here could define clinical work as research.

Afonso raised a point about the identification of vulnerable populations under Federal guidelines. Considering that these identify both located and local struggles, this document could address sexual orientation as a vulnerable population as well. While it is difficult to determine how to proceed, the GLBT population would benefit from inclusion. UIRB does consider it, according to Nagel, but it would be more useful to include it in the guidelines.
DeCaro raised a point of order, noting that the body can suspend rules to discuss the issue; it would take 2/3 majority to approve. The Parliamentarian concurred.

It was MS Afonso/Peterson to suspend.

Motion carried by voice.

It was MS Afonso/Mantz to amend page 6 in the outlined box to include "Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered (GLBT) populations."

Novak noted that federal regulations mark the ones we currently have, and it is important to stay with those federal regulations here, as elsewhere.

Weikart noted in looking at categories, that all of them (save "pregnant women") have a lesser ability to make autonomous choices, and asked what would reduce autonomy in the GLBT population. Also on page 8 it specifies about whether research "involves" people in the named category. How could someone be sure of that beforehand?

Garcia said UIRB notes "if focus of the study is on the vulnerable population, then UIRB gives greater scrutiny." The applicant would need to detail the risks and benefits of the study. If "pregnant women" were simply included in the study, the rule would not apply.

Burns said one reason IRB policy uses federal regulations to define vulnerable populations (especially "pregnant women") is that lots of research parameters came out of biomedical research. There, these populations are especially vulnerable.

Schoenly supported the motion, adding that he wanted the policy document to be as inclusive as possible, even if we deviate from federal regulations.

Afonso replied it would mean more trouble to remove, than to add. There is a risk involved in identifying as GLBT, even if people don’t do it themselves. Don’t see it as much here on campus, we’re shielded, but the community offers a lot of risks being GLBT, and he is trying to raise awareness.

Garcia was also in favor of the motion, despite a fear of "IRB creep," and added this would indicate in practice that if a study focused on this population, it would mandate a full board review.

DeCaro noted that Communications is developing a BA in Health Education, and would be funding research on GLBT populations and issues, and the policy would be good protection.

Mantz noted that he seconded because we do need dialogue on the issue. Especially concerning transgendered individuals. SF has a large TG population, currently the target of analysis and study. He has some concern this would complicate matters for Gender Studies folks doing demographic research, but felt it better to err on the side of the population.

Nelson has concerns. He’s a liberal, and this sounds like a good idea, but in practice he hasn’t heard a compelling rationale for the addition. Why not older people, why not people of middle eastern descent? They’re all vulnerable.
Zarling believe language addressed on page 6 needs to be done at page 8 in the bulleted list as well. Accepted as friendly.

DeCaro said a compelling reason is that we'll have MA students working on high-risk populations. There is a rampant rate of AIDS and other STDs in these populations in SF, and when we conduct research we have to be careful with populations we're interviewing. People have to be very sensitive to the environment, especially in health communication.

Schoenly called the question.

The amendment carried by voice.

The body returned to the main motion.

There was no discussion.

Main motion was carried by voice, and the resolution will be forwarded to the President.

b. 7/AS/06/UEPC/GC ť Gerontology Graduate Certificate

No discussion.

Motion carried by voice.

OfBrien noted that working two years doing program development is often full of frustration and despair, but at the end, he felt pure joy. He acknowledged the many contributors to this project in and out of the Sociology department and faculty governance, and gave a special thanks to Demetrulias for helping the process.

8. First Reading Item
a. 08/AS/06/GC ť MS Genetic Counseling

It was MS Garcia/DeCaro

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate endorses the Proposal for the Masterís of Science in Genetic Counseling Degree Program; and be it further

Resolved: That this be effective for Fall 2007 upon approval by the President.

Rationale: On April 27, 2006, Graduate Council approved the Proposal for the Masterís of Science in Genetic Counseling Degree Program. The purpose of the proposed program will help to meet the increasing demand for genetic services throughout the state of California and at the same time actively recruit individuals of diverse ethnic backgrounds. This two-year graduate program will consist of a minimum of 42 units that involve a highly interdisciplinary curriculum that includes courses in Principles in Human Genetics, Cancer Genetics, Clinical Embryology, Molecular and Biochemical Genetics, Advanced Medical Genetics, Clinical Cytogenetics, a series of four courses entitled "Principles and Practices of Genetic Counseling" that cover a range of psychosocial and ethical issues, Research Methods and Professional
Skills, and Graduate Seminars in Genetics. In addition to completion of course work, clinical internship requirements and a research project, candidates also must complete at least the required minimal number of approved cases for clinical experience.

DeCaro said he has worked with Professor Janey Youngblom on this program for two years. It is a great program, intercollegiate, and will bring recognition to the university.

It was MS Schoenly/DeCaro to suspend the rules to move to a second reading.

Parliamentarian reminded the body that the suspension needed a 2/3 vote, and was not debatable.

Vote by ballot 21 for, 21 against, with 1 abstention; the motion to suspend fails.

Peterson asked if the body can discuss it now, and move later to suspend if the body is satisfied with it. Parliamentarian noted that the motion to suspend is not reconsiderable, and we canít impose an agenda on next year. DeCaro countered that the motion to suspend may be renewed by unanimous consent.

Youngblom synopsized. She tried to make the process as inclusive as possible, as it moved through Biology, ALSCRC, GC, ALS Core Planning, the Deanís Office, FBAC, UEPC, everywhere. Committee reviews prompted many changes. There are some issues; for example why it is located in the Bay Area. This is mainly because faculty expertise resides there, and we need affiliation with faculty who are resident at medical centers. We are partnering with Oakland Kaiser and UCSF Medical Center. We have internships in Sacramento and Fresno. There are no genetic counselors in Stanislaus County, and we need to recruit them. We hope this will allow them to be here. The expertise is not here, and we hope to combine graduates with services to do so.

Peterson reported that UEPC recognized the program as very unusual, and read it at length. By offering it through UEE, the risk to other departments are substantially reduced. There was concern about shared power, but it is necessary for accreditation. She thinks there will be a demand for the services. UEPC would like the program to be reviewed in the future to transform into a regular program. They need approval now to begin attracting money for grants. UEPC supports it.

Bruner advised the Biology is totally behind it. The two other health care programs we have both require other facility collaborations to work. This is taken one more level. From her perspective, with a background in medicine, this is great. There is nobody here doing it, and it would bring another professional population to the valley, and would give our students another option.

Youngblom added that the origin of the program was student demand to be able to utilize knowledge and apply it to benefit the population. The program is one of several being developed in the Northern California Professional Science Masters Consortium. San Jose and San Francisco are starting programs as well, and this is a good fit with theirs. The common component is considerable input from people in the profession, people actually involved in genetic counseling to make the discipline current.

Weikart reported that FBAC reviewed it and recognized the fiscal aspects are in order. Cost is paid through tuition raised. The university gets no stateside funding and no FTES for the program; as long as students pay, it flies. Aside from that, there are three other issues to consider, all related: one concerns the Bay Area,
and is not just a space issue, but one of institutionalization and continuity. We donít have the expertise, there are only four faculty from our institution, the other ten from outside. At the moment, with these 14, this is fine, but these folks are doing it as an overload. What happens when they decide not to? How do we guarantee the continuity of the program? The second is how to maintain oversight of faculty outside the Biology department. Third issue is the heavy corporate involvement in the program. Four Kaiser personnel are involved, and they have a vested financial interest in the direction genetic counseling will go. The co-director is Kaiser, and can overly influence the program.

Bruner noted that Kaiser is non-profit. Weikart stands corrected, but adds that physicians who worked with Kaiser reported they were compensated by how much money they saved Kaiser. They are certainly interested in the bottom-line.

Demetrulias noted that we have had consortium programs, such as at Moss Landing. We wouldnít be able to do so without cooperation with other institutions. We have strong faculty here. This is a professional science masters, and needs a strong alliance with the practitioner community and the employer community. Also, the timing has been raised, there has been much oversight, with a lot of questions raised, and responded to. But we need to approve by June date. A delay would delay the start of the program for at least a year and a half. Unless there are specific academic curricular objections, we shouldnít tie it up for another year.

Sarraille observed that on page 19, part 2c, the form is not properly filled out. If we have courses here on campus related to it, these should be listed there. Also, he questioned the new courses. There are 42 units in the program, with ten new courses. Are these actually new? How will we develop these so quickly, and who will develop them? Youngblom assured him they will be developed. She has a grant, with tentative approval, that will help with development and initial implementation.

Poole asked about the process through appropriate committees, and issues related to actual paperwork. Here we need to think whether we want to support a graduate program, offered through UEE for the first time. This is an innovative way to do this, when we couldnít do it otherwise. Any innovation will be stifled if we stuff it up here. She understands that parliamentary procedures are at stake, but fears opportunities will be lost if we donít address this. DeCaro said it was all those committees asking all those questions.

Weikart asked about the Moss Landing parallel. Does it have permanent faculty there, or rotated? Youngblom said they have faculty. We are in process of developing an institute; they went through the same process weíre going through. They have faculty affiliated with it. Pam Roe is our affiliate. No student there takes our courses. Biology has no oversight of courses taught there. This program would have more oversight than that.

Nelson asked if she could explain what genetic counseling is to begin with. What sort of psychology background would they need? Is this more biology based? Youngblom replied that the vast majority of students will come from Bio; some from Psych and Anthro, but even these would need a heavy Bio background, at least a minor. Novak asked, since this is a vulnerable population, where they would get their counseling skills; it seems like a mechanics of genetics, not the human side of counseling program. Youngblom noted some counselors are from a Social Work background, and are able to teach these kinds of courses. The Co-director has taught at Berkeley in related areas, and has a background in genetics and in practice. They also have faculty in social work, with workshops for the delivery of this part of the curriculum.
Nagel observed that genetic counseling raises some of the most serious and profound ethical questions that we face right now, and asked if the emphasis on ethics was appropriate? Are the directors confident it is? Does it parallel similar kinds of programs with this kind of emphasis? Youngblom agreed and advised there is a list of content you need in accreditation. They list the ethics coverage you need. Some programs respond by with a course in general ethics, others list the specific area. It is a perplexing area, and a proportion of issues will need to be addressed in every cohort. Bruner added that the federal guidelines ñ HIPPA ñ dictate a higher ethical demand than even the professoriate. The field of Genetic Counseling also has moved from psych/social counseling areas to science. Biology would never have done it before, but the discipline is now so attuned to genetic information. Counselors interface between lab techs and the patient, and need the science to talk the talk. The program is a very innovative response to that part of the industry.

Schoenly asked to revisit the motion to suspend the rules. The Parliamentarian advised that the motion to suspend can be revisited at another meeting of the same session, but the chair can rule it in order if thatís what we want to do. Nagel asked if we do not suspend and act, will it be tabled indefinitely?

Speaker Petrosky ruled that we canít force an agenda on the next session, and asked for a ballot to suspend the rules.

Vote to suspend was 35 for, 7 against, with 1 abstention, and carried.

Schoenly called the question.

Vote by ballot on the main motion was 36 for, 7 against.

The motion carries, and will be forwarded to the President.

9. Open Forum

DeCaro followed up on the Full-time VLs. At first meeting back, he will propose that VLs having served at a department for six years should come in line for a tenure track position.

Stone asked if there was an update on the eCollege experiment. Petrosky reported that at last SEC, we agreed with the President to experiment, with limits: perhaps a dozen courses, we will collect information toward making final policy. Stone asked who will teach, who decides? Petrosky said he understood that FT (regular) faculty will teach regular courses. There was a question of interpretation, as some lecturers are full-time, and we will use ACR73 as governing language: 75% FT/TI, 25% FT/VL. No part time faculty in either development or delivery. Regular processes through regular departments, and no Stockton bifurcation.

Garcia added that his understanding was that agreement was more than experimentation. There was discussion of eCollege, but also of the process of moving to a faculty decision. We still need a process for that decision-making. This experiment gives us data to decide. And we have committees in place: AT Sub and OCDML. The other agreement was to make public announcement first in Senate, then go public, so that misinformation would be kept to a minimum. Shirvani agreed, and acknowledged there was a snafu with a specific unit. Petrosky and he will send a joint email.

Pierce congratulated the body, especially for letting subcommittees do their work, an exemplary practice.
Speaker Petrosky, tears in his eyes, thanked the body as well, saying we were not only the best and brightest as he had ever seen, but also the sexiest, and brought the turkey leg down on another year.

The meeting was adjourned at 4.30pm.