### Academic Senate
#### December 4, 2007

**Present:** Bender, Bice, Borba, Brown, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Deaner, DeCocker, Dempsey, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Floyd, Garza, Grobner, Janz, Jibby, Johnson, Keswick, Manrique, Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O’Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Ringstad, Robbins, Sankey, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Stessman, Taniguchi, Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Younglove, Zong

**Proxies:** Floyd (Hejka-Ekins and Lawson)

**Guests:** Nael Aly, Carl Bengston, Carl Brown, Diana Demetrulias, Peggy Hodge, Marjorie Jaasma, Roger McNeil, Daryl Moore, Gary Novak, Ham Shirvani, Ted Wendt

**Recording Secretary:** Diana Bowman

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/AS/07/UEPC—BA in Gender Studies</td>
<td>UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/AS/07/UEPC—BFA in Theatre</td>
<td>UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/AS/07/GC—MS in Nursing</td>
<td>UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Online Elaborations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Additional Fees for MBA Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Academic Senate Meeting:**

Tuesday, January 22, 2008
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFD Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

---

1. **Call to order at 2:35 pm**
2. **Approval of Agenda - MSP O’Brien/Filling**
3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of November 20, 2007 – Page 3, c) under Discussion, third line, change ‘worst’ to ‘worse.’ Page 7, under Open Forum, change ‘relative’ to ‘relevant.’ It was MSP Taniguchi/Mayer to approve the minutes as amended.**

4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

   a) President Shirvani stated his appreciation for the commitment, hard work and dedication of the faculty, especially with limited resources. Students are happy and the institution is getting recognized. He stated his hope that faculty will attend the holiday luncheon this Thursday. Further, he will return some time in February to update faculty on the status of the budget and have a question and answer session afterwards.

   b) Eudey distributed three flyers: 1) Empire Conference Call for Papers and Presentations due December 15 (to be held March 13-15), 2) Gender Studies Faculty Associates and Friends of Gender Studies Program, developed to recognize the significant contributions made by faculty at CSUS and 3) Wanted, Faculty interested in sharing their gender-based research for GEND 3000, designed as a seminar exploring current research on gender and the methods utilized in gender-based research.

   c) Garza advised that faculty will be receiving a newsletter from the Library. The Library Strategic Plan will be included in the newsletter. He also mentioned that starting spring semester the Library will be hosting sessions on electronic journals, technologies like Google to help faculty understand what students are doing in the Library. They will also be evaluating Internet resources and also want faculty to understand the distinction between the Library and free Internet resources.

   d) Mayer announced this Friday through Sunday is the last weekend for Trojan Women. Also, he stated he is the faculty athletic representative on campus. If faculty have any issues regarding student athletes, please call. There was some discussion during the prior academic year about the university attendance policy and how it relates to student athletes. He stated he believes most people are now aware and understand the special needs of students involved in such activities.
e) Provost Covino stated the RSCA awards and Sabbaticals have been announced. People in Academic Affairs are in the process of creating an online catalog and hope to have it available by the end of spring semester. They have also revised the paper catalog and it will return to the previous shape.

f) Johnson advised that SEC reviewed the discussion the Senate had during its last meeting regarding inviting members of the Legislature and Board of Trustees to campus. SEC decided there did not seem to be any consensus, so SEC removed it from its agenda. She stated she also made a request to committee chairs (FAC, FBAC, GC and UEPC) to send out reports over FACNET, in addition to the ones going out to ASNET.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS - None

6. ACTION ITEMS

   a. 21/AS/07/UEPC--BA in Gender Studies

      Filling advised UEPC received no suggestions so no changes were made. There being no discussion, the question was called. Approved unanimously by voice vote.

   b. 22/AS/07/UEPC—BFA in Theatre

      Filling advised UEPC received no suggestions, so no changes were made. There being no discussion, the question was called. Approved unanimously by voice vote.

   c. 23/AS/07/GC—MS in Nursing

      O’Brien stated there was a minor change requested by the Sociology Department changing the name of the Concentration in Gerontology to Concentration in Gerontological Nursing. This was accepted by the Nursing Department as well as the Dean of HHS. This change was accepted as a friendly amendment.

      O’Brien stated the Sociology Department is in support of this program and he hopes the program gets the full support of the Academic Senate.

      There being no further discussion, the question was called. Approved unanimously by voice vote.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

   a. Online Elaborations

      Johnson stated at the last Senate meeting, Senators were requested to go back to their department to see how they felt about posting department elaborations. She asked for feedback.

         • History Department (Taniguchi) All right to post online.
         • Ethnic/Gender Studies (Eudey) Possibility of problems, but would go with the majority.
         • PE/Health (Deaneer) Ok to post.
         • Social Work (Ringstad) Mixed feelings, but if to be posted, should be for on campus viewing only.
         • Liberal Studies (C. Davis) Also conflicted. But all right for on campus posting.
         • Mathematics (Bice) On campus posting only.
         • CIS (Petratos) On campus posting only.
         • MOM (Brown) Generally in favor of posting.

      Eudey stated one thing became clear during their department’s discussion and that is they are more comfortable with department elaborations being posted than posting the comparative table. Demetrulias replied that it was not an attempt to prescribe what should or should not be. It is just a summary for WASC. The table is posted as one source of evidence they requested. She suggested differentiating what is available for WASC and what is available to the general public.

      Peterson stated her impression from the last Senate meeting was we were supposed to find out if it was all right with our department to post our elaborations. She asked for a show of hands to find out which departments are willing to have their elaborations posted. She stated she is okay if other departments want to post theirs, but we should not be required. Johnson stated some are saying the elaborations should not be available completely publicly. She hasn’t
heard anyone say they don’t want them up there in any form. What may come out of this is a decision to make elaborations available to WASC and to the internal campus. Also we need to address whether individual departments should have the right to opt out of the posting of elaborations.

Petratos stated as soon as you make elaborations public, they could be used as evidence against a department. Johnson replied faculty in the rpt process need to know what their elaborations are. Eudey stated in terms of giving WASC evidence to work with, it should be mandatory for departments, but they should be posted in a protected site. Nothing is stopping departments in posting their elaborations on their web page. It would be difficult to say to WASC, here is 70% of our elaborations. Johnson stated the issue is, should information be available to WASC but not to us?

Thompson asked who will take on the task of making sure the most current elaborations are posted. Who will take on the responsibility of updating the elaborations? Filling stated since WASC seems to need electronic information, how do we deal with digitizing and updating other things too? Demetrulias replied to Thompson’s question, it is her understanding the updates currently are being done by the Faculty Affairs Office and they would continue to do so. The WASC exhibits are currently all online. We are making electronic links that are posted on the accreditation website. Wendt added since his office and staff are responsible to provide information for RPT review, Faculty Affairs could work with whoever is physically posting to make sure they get the latest versions. Sarraillé asked whether we have established that WASC needs to see the text of elaborations and Demetrulias replied we must provide evidence for all of their concerns from the last accreditation and this is one of them. Schoenly asked if Demetrulias thought WASC will look at the table, elaborations or both and Demetrulias replied each team has different memberships and it depends. If it is a major concern from the previous visit, we need to provide a great deal more. The reason they ask us to summarize the data is because people do want to review, but they have the right to review the actual documents. They also may just look at the executive summary. Schoenly asked if one person could successfully summarize each department’s elaborations and Demetrulias replied that is what she did. Schoenly stated his curiosity about the process. How will WASC interpret that summary? What if WASC just counts check marks and makes some sort of conclusion based on that?

Petratos stated what is usually seen is summarized data so why are we considering posting such specific information? Eudey stated having seen the chart, it is a great tool to see the different department’s ways of doing things. It shows we are going above and beyond what is required and allowing diversity among departments. A responsible reviewer will be able to appreciate the content. S. Davis stated anyone could count the check marks, but he doesn’t know what it would signify. Elaborations are a product of department expertise. Also, he reported that the English Department did not reach consensus on this issue. Sarraillé suggested we should ask departments if they want to check the posted information for accuracy. That is standard practice if you have information in a data base. About the trust issue, we have been assured that this is not the same as an audit, so while we have to provide evidence, at some level WASC will have to trust us. Should we really have to prove everything? We should continually be considering what levels of evidence are appropriate and not appropriate. Mayer stated we don’t necessarily want to just lie down and give accreditors everything they want, however we should try to help them and make sure the necessary information is available to them.

Johnson asked for a straw vote: 1) posted for everyone – 11 in support, 2) posted internally and WASC so campus can look but not external – 20 in support, 3) don’t post at all - 0. Number 2 received the most votes.

Johnson asked for a straw vote: 1) all elaborations (mandatory) to be made available for internal review – 25 in support and 2) only those that opt in – 9 in support.

Filling stated he comes from a discipline that quantifies and summarizes. If you summarize, you lose information. He voiced opposition to the summary chart. WASC should be able to summarize for themselves.

Thomas asked when would this posting occur and Demetrulias replied they will be going into final production March then will make the links. But they have been posting along the way. If for internal use only, they have to figure out how to do it.

S. Davis advised there was a letter that went out to departments from the Chair of the URPTC alerting them that elaboration information was going to be posted and that they would need to provide their elaborations. He asked if it would help to ask the URPTC Chair to make the same announcement to all departments. Thompson asked why the original request came from the URPTC Chair and why did URPTC have a role in determining that elaborations would be posted for WASC? What do they have to do with whether elaborations are going to be posted for WASC or internally? Nagel replied that he is on an inquiry circle and the URPTC Chair was in on the discussion last year and came up with elaborations as a way of expressing how we define research. Thompson asked if we could draw a
line from the discussion about the decision at hand and URPTC. Part of the reason we are spending time on this may have to do with process. How do you make the connection with the URPTC having an advisory or determining role on this question? Eudey suggested since departments submit their elaborations to the URPTC, maybe it made sense to them to ask the URPTC. Nagel stated the process was very informal between the inquiry circle and the URPTC.

Johnson stated what is important is that the departments become aware that the information is going online and that they are aware of the restrictions that are to be put on access. She asked if she could announce to the faculty. There was no objection.

b. Additional Fees for MBA Students

Johnson stated that at the last Senate meeting Senators were asked to discuss this issue with their departments and return with feedback.

Dempsey stated that her department (Psychology/CD) considered abstaining from voting since the fee doesn’t affect them, and also her faculty were divided on the issue. Filling added that the fee would go into the general fund, would be fungible and could have an effect on other areas. It is a fee ‘sold’ to us for a specific purpose but there is really no way to restrict its use to that purpose. Johnson asked if Dempsey meant it didn’t affect us because we are a small campus or it didn’t affect the Psychology/CD department. Dempsey replied she was told the fee is optional for our campus. Janz stated he did research on this and didn’t see anything about us being able to opt out. Aly replied that among all the deans of Business, that was what was reported by the Deans of Fullerton and San Diego State. There is an exemption for small campuses. Taniguchi stated there is not sufficient transparency for money or accountability. Because numbers are not hard and fast, the History Department is not enthusiastic about this. Mayer added it encourages a broader discussion regarding fees and the question of how fees revenue will be distributed is vital. Eudey advised that the Ethnic/Gender Studies Department has lots of problems with this. There is the issue of forcing the fee increase just on the graduate students. We have to consider the effect on the state and the possibility of pricing some students out. It will create a real divide of those having financial backing of their employers and those that don’t. Borba stated he is personally against this concept. The Legislature has to take responsibility. It is wrong to put the burden on students. They have already undergone a significant fee increase. All departments are having trouble finding faculty. He added that these kinds of discussions and how to handle issues really have a small impact. We have to think outside the box in terms of addressing a much bigger issue and it is much bigger than the College of Business. We need to look at the big picture like our friends in K-12 and the community college system. They use the ballot box for change. He stated his disappointment that SWAS passed a resolution against the K12 initiative. We need to collaborate with them. We can’t do things by ourselves. O’Brien agreed we need to think big and systemwide as opposed to taking a parochial view. It would be interesting if we decided to opt out. If campuses in the Bay Area were charging the fees and we were not, then we might get a lot more students.

Dempsey clarified the view of the Psychology Department. She thought we were exempt and given that we should not vote. Some in her department were against the fees. However this is a system problem, not just a problem in the College of Business. The Psychology/CD Department also has difficulty attracting faculty. We have not talked about alternatives. Borba suggested approving an initiative like this would be sending the wrong message to Sacramento. Telling them we will take care of the funding problem lets them off the hook. We’ll just raise student fees. We are into this mode, but we need to make the state take responsibility for education in California.

Thompson stated although he doesn’t know much about the proposal, he doesn’t like the sound of it. If we want to have an impact, we can think big but our action arises out of this forum. We need to advise our senators. It appears we have not decided to take an action or put forward a resolution. We could urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to seek funding above the compact rather than increase fees.

It was MS Sarraille/Filling that the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate recommends to our Statewide Academic Senators to vote to approve the resolution now before the SWAS, which opposes the idea of having an increase in fees for the MBA.

It was decided to have a straw vote. Sarraille withdrew the motion on the floor.

Straw vote: To approve the resolution before the SWAS, which opposes the idea of having an increase in fees for the MBA. By voice vote, approved.

Sarraille proposed that the Academic Senate craft a resolution that takes a position on the question of these fees. Nagel asked if SEC doesn’t set the Senate agenda and if so, they could craft such a resolution. Covino stated he
respects the different points of view but is curious about our students because they voted in favor of this fee. He would like to hear from them. Janz stated that following the last Senate meeting, the ASI discussed the increase in fees and took a straw vote. The vote was 10-5 in support of the increase in fees. ASI Senate was concerned that MBA students draw more campus resources than other departments. The ASI also felt that students should pay more for a more financially valuable degree. Further, since CSU Stanislaus would have to opt into the fee; it would put us at a competitive advantage in regards to affordability when compared to our neighbors Fresno and Sac State. Those students that voted against the fee felt it limited accessibility for some students. Aly asked if the Senate will take such a position on all similar fees.

Taniguchi stated she was persuaded by what Borba said about the state. But she is also impressed that the students voted in favor of the fee increase. There was also such an example at the SLO campus. The students voting approved an increase in their fees. Our idea of a resolution is that the state has a responsibility but she stated it doesn’t preclude raising fees if the students decide. Borba added that students sometimes approve fees knowing that they are not going to be the ones paying them. Petratos stated that students may approve thinking they are doing something for the good. Mayer voiced concern how those fees are distributed. We need a clear understanding of the process. Janz stated he doesn’t think the students would have voted for it if they thought we couldn’t opt out. Students thought it would make us more viable. Bender added if this went to a general student body vote, he believes the vote would have been different.

Aly advised only 10 of 30 students in our Executive MBA Program have their company paying for them. No one is pushing them to do it. But they see value in getting it. Filling stated his respect for our student representatives. They represent students just as we represent faculty. We need to respect them even if we don’t agree.

Robbins stated she doesn’t like the idea of voting on something we have not been able to read. We have no assurances about where the money will go. We do have to worry about the slippery slope issue. Other degrees may follow. Also consider that the students who are approving the fee may never have to pay it. Employers in the area may be appalled to hear someone say that the increases don’t matter since the employers will pay. Borba agreed, it would be naïve to conclude the College of Business is the only college in this situation. Several other programs might think to benefit from this same type of approach. We open up the flood gates if we support this issue.

Eudey stated based on a straw vote, we are uncomfortable with this initiative. But SEC could develop a resolution along the lines that at least they recognize there is a funding problem, but it won’t be solved through an increase in fees. We need to push the Board of Trustees to have another option that helps all programs not just business.

Johnson recapped that we had a straw vote that says what the campus thinks and now SEC will bring forth a resolution at the next meeting to send to the Board of Trustees. In the meantime, she stated she will see if she can get a copy of the proposal so we can see what it looks like. Nagel suggested the resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Senate Chairs and Campus Presidents. Thompson suggested this can be like the FBAC Budget resolution. We can archive it and we will have a chance to use it again and again. Johnson recapped it will be resolution recognizing the funding needs of all programs including business, recognizing this is an attempt to address this but stating our opposition to increases fees as a means to address them.

Mayer stated we need to anticipate the reality of how we address concerns, assuring we have transparency so we can continue to give autonomy to our colleges and our students. Johnson replied when the resolution comes forth, you can speak to it and also, it doesn’t have to be approved. Borba stated a resolution directed to the Board of Trustees will have very little impact. We need to work around them because we can’t work with them. The bottom line is the impact is marginal at best. Tynan replied you say we can’t allow it to happen but then you say it won’t make a difference. She asked what does he suggest we do. Borba replied we have tried to be positive over the years. How many resolutions do we send to them that have an impact? O’Brien stated the resolution is expressing our voice and hopefully it will have an impact. The Board has the power to do what it wants, but we can still express our opinion. Sarraille stated that Borba previously mentioned exploring a working relationship with the legislature. Also some things are coming out of CFA. Regarding the question whether we do a resolution, Sarraille stated he thinks it is a good idea to do it, although he also sees arguments against doing one. Possibly doing this kind of resolution gives us an opportunity to take a position on what ought to be done and from there if we wish, we can decide tactics to further the goals of that position. Thompson reminded Senators that the Board of Trustees have changed their position after input from the campuses and the SWAS. We achieved removal of language about 120 units being normative and issues on a common calendar and merit pay. The idea that we are interested in saying things pleasing to the Board of Trustees does not represent well what we are trying to do. The choices are not either-or. There are different avenues and we can pursue them all.
Moore stated we should think about students and sustainable programs. If we are just stopping things, we should consider the effects on students. We need to make sure that we have enough options on the table. Let’s not ignore the students in the equation. We don’t want to limit the possibilities of the students. Borba stated his position is based on what is best for the students, and that is positive. He stated his concern about business-as-usual should be considered. We need to bring about change in the best interests of students.

Adjourned at 4:27 pm