

<p>Academic Senate November 20, 2007</p> <p>Present: Bender, Bice, Borba, Brown, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Deaner, DeCocker, Dempsey, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Floyd, Garza, Grobner, Hejka-Ekins, Janz, Jibby, Johnson, Keswick, Lawson, Manrique, Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Ringstad, Robbins, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Stessman, Taniguchi, Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Younglove</p> <p>Proxies: Renning (Manrique), Filling (Zong)</p> <p>Guests: Nael Aly, Carl Brown, Diana Demetrulias, Clay Everett, Peggy Hodge, Marjorie Jaasma, Roger McNeil, Carolyn Mercier, Daryl Moore, Armin Schulz, Ted Wendt</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</p>	<p>21/AS/07/UEPC—BA in Gender Studies, FIRST READING ITEM</p> <p>22/AS/07/UEPC—BFA in Theatre, FIRST READING ITEM</p> <p>23/AS/07/GC—MS in Nursing, FIRST READING ITEM</p> <p>DISCUSSION: Ownership of Assessment Information</p> <p>DISCUSSION: Diversity Committee</p> <p>DISCUSSION: Additional Fees for MBA Students</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, December 4, 2007 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>John Sarraille, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order at 2:34 pm
2. Approval of Agenda-MSP Mayer/O'Brien.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of November 6, 2007-MSP Nagel/Mayer.
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - a. R. Floyd, Chair of the FAC announced the Post Tenure Review Policy has been approved by President Shirvani.
 - b. Schoenly, Chair of the FBAC announced he has received the MPP list of positions that the Senate requested per Sense of Senate resolution at its last meeting. FBAC will begin its analysis. FBAC is also asking for student enrollment numbers and other pertinent information.
5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS - None
6. FIRST READING ITEMS
 - a. 21/AS/07/UEPC--BA in Gender Studies

It was MS Filling/O'Brien

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in Gender Studies; and be it further

Resolved: That the Bachelor of Arts in Gender Studies take effect Fall 2008 upon approval by the President and the Board of Trustees of the California State University.

Rationale: The Gender Studies program at California State University, Stanislaus currently offers a minor, and through planned program growth is now prepared to offer a major. Since 2003, enrollments in Gender Studies courses have increased steadily, as has the variety of courses offered. New Gender Studies courses have been added to the General Education and Liberal Studies programs, Gender Studies is part of the First Year Experience program, and a new Concentration in Gender Studies has been added to the Social Sciences major effective fall 2008.

The Gender Studies major will provide students with an interdisciplinary, liberal arts education that will support them in a wide range of careers and enhance their ability to actively participate in diverse communities. The required courses in the major build understanding of the core concepts in the field, the theories and methods which guide gender studies inquiry, historical perspectives on gendered experiences, multi-ethnic and transnational contexts, and means to apply knowledge and theories in community settings.

The program is part of the Department of Ethnic and Gender Studies, located in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. The program has faculty support from across campus, received approval from the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), and addresses the University's Vision Statement of serving "our diverse student body, communities and state by creating programs, partnerships and leaders that respond effectively to an evolving and interconnected world."

Discussion:

O'Brien stated he is happy to see this proposal come forth. He is on the Gender Studies Advisory Board and throughout the process, Eudey has been open and transparent. This program will benefit our students.

Eudey explained the BA in Gender Studies is 51 units. There are no prerequisites to the major, and no new courses are to be designed. There are 9 CSU campuses that have this type of major, but ours is the only one titled Gender Studies. There are 3 concentrations and students are required to complete one. Completion of a minor is recommended, but not required. There is the opportunity to have a Women and Gender Studies Honor Society. There are 19 faculty across disciplines that teach in the Department of Ethnic and Gender Studies, so there is no request for additional faculty at this time.

There being no further discussion, Johnson advised this will be second reading at next meeting.

b. 22/AS/07/UEPC—BFA in Theatre

MS Filling/Mayer

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Proposal for the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theatre; and be it further

Resolved: That the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theatre take effect Fall 2008 upon approval by the President and the Board of Trustees of the California State University.

Rationale: This innovative BFA in Theatre is a multi-disciplinary program composed of 72 units, with an emphasis in performance or emphasis in design and technology. The BFA in Theatre covers the arts of acting, directing and theatre history, as well as scene, costume and light design, stage management, technical direction and design technology. The program provides a balanced foundation, both in academic and practical aspects of theatre production, and serves as a platform for further post-graduate studies or employment in professional theatre.

The Department of Theatre has seen an appreciable expansion of its student population in the last five years. Presently, the department's faculty are focused and energized in major efforts to accommodate better the needs of Theatre majors. More and more of those students declared an avid interest for specialized acting as well as technical and design courses. Within this perspective, the next logical step is a more intensive and specialized degree. The students will take courses in the major all four years while steadily fulfilling their general education requirements as prescribed by the University. The complexity and academic rigor of the BFA program will mirror the skills acquired through the general education curriculum and is meant to work synergistically with the overall educational goals and objectives of the University. An absolute premium will be placed on developing the inquisitiveness of the students in this program to instill in them the interest and necessity of life-long learning.

The program is part of the Department of Theatre, located in the College of the Arts. The program has received approval from the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC). There are no equivalent programs in any of the institutions in the adjoining counties in the Central Valley.

Discussion:

Mercier advised we will be the only one in the system to offer this degree. There is no need for any new faculty now. We have resources to offer this program without asking for more money at this time. Mayer added that this will only make our program better.

Eudey agreed, stating it is a great proposal and students are very excited to have this program. This is filling a strong need students have.

There being no further discussion, Johnson advised this will be second reading at next meeting.

c. 23/AS/07/GC—MS in Nursing

It was MS Tynan/Schoenly

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Proposal for the Master's of Science in Nursing Program; and be it further

Resolved: That the Master's of Science in Nursing Program take effect Fall 2008 upon approval by the President and the Board of Trustees of the California State University.

Rationale: Given the well documented need for nurse educators and the fact that Master's prepared nurses are needed in all specialty areas, the Graduate Council of California State University, Stanislaus approved the Proposal for the Master's of Science in Nursing Program on September 20, 2007. "The purpose of the proposed program is to develop skilled professionals able to assume positions of leadership, which contribute to the health, education, and social structure of the community, state, and nation. This program is consistent with the mission and goals of the University, the College of Human and Health Sciences, and the Department of Nursing." This 36-unit graduate program will consist of a "15-unit didactic core and two concentrations. The core provides advanced knowledge in pathophysiology, nursing theory, health policy, issues and strategies to address health disparities, and research. Students select a concentration in either education or gerontology."

Discussion:

Peggy Hodge, Chair of Nursing briefly described the MS in Nursing Program. She stated there is a nursing shortage in the US and California is ranked 50th in the number of nurses per 100,000. The CSU system put a lot of resources into nursing programs. Faculty shortage is worse than nursing shortage. The purpose of this proposal is to address the need to graduate prepared nurses. There are 32,000 qualified students that are not accepted into the nursing program because of the shortage of nursing faculty. In the Central Valley, it is even worse. Students would select a concentration in either education or gerontology. Both concentrations facilitate advanced study in an area of nursing practice. Nurses with a Masters can teach in community colleges. But we encourage students with great promise to get their PhD. Further, we do not need to develop new courses for this program.

Tynan added that a lot of work has gone into this proposal and the focus on gerontology is important.

There being no further discussion, Johnson advised this will be a second reading at the next meeting.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Ownership of assessment information

Johnson advised that she became aware of this issue when her dean was requested to provide assessment data so it could be accumulated and posted for WASC. It sounded like we had to comply. She wants everyone to understand that faculty have ownership of their data. You may share if you wish, but you are under no obligation to share. You can provide information in other ways like indicating sorts of assessment process we engaged in and actions we decided to take, so we can demonstrate to WASC we are actively involved in assessment but are not providing test scores, graded rubrics, because they belong to us. There is danger that taken out of context without knowing the

difficulty of questions, one could draw conclusions that are not valid and can lead to assessment that is not meaningful.

b. Diversity Committee

Johnson advised that last year's Speaker Sarraille appointed an Ad Hoc Diversity Committee that was suppose to last for one year. So, we need to decide if we wish to have a permanent Diversity Committee associated with the Academic Senate or General Faculty. The current charge has been distributed. So, the question is: is there faculty support for a permanent Diversity Committee and is this type of charge acceptable? If so, we will refer the matter to the COC to consider what the makeup should be and finalize the charge. It would also require a constitutional amendment, so would also be referred to FAC.

Flores stated that he has been on campus 19 years and there was a very active Diversity Committee at the beginning. We had a diverse faculty and staff, but over the years, there have been a steady decline in diversity. He is very concerned that as a society, we have become less diverse, so he stated he strongly supports this committee.

Tynan voiced her support. Especially in this region, we have a diverse population and student body, so we need to pay attention to them, including hiring diverse faculty.

Eudey added that she is serving on the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee along with Lilia DeKatzew and Pam Russ and we want it to continue. She stated we believe faculty should be working as a faculty to address diversity issues. We are talking about male and females, raw numbers of ethnicity. And faculty through their research and scholarship in teaching are responding to these issues. The hope of this committee is to provide resources supporting workshops and more opportunity for people to do what they need to do. This includes helping to have successful searches keeping diversity in mind.

Nagel questioned what happens next? Secondly, does part of the diversity mission take into account sexual orientation and gender identification? Thirdly, can we have a straw vote to see if the Senate supports the permanency of the committee?

To answer the first question, Johnson advised the process would require a constitutional amendment. But if the Academic Senate supports the permanency of the Diversity Committee, the request would be sent to the COC so they would consider membership and charge in cooperation with FAC which would bring forward to the Academic Senate a resolution and constitutional amendment, and if approved, on to a General Faculty vote. The second question had to do with what types of diversity it deals with. The COC and FAC would consider this. Anyone interested could provide input what they feel the charge should be. And when the resolution and constitutional amendment comes to the Senate, there is another opportunity to suggest revisions. Answering the third question, yes we can have a straw vote.

Eudey stated the Ad Hoc Committee has looked at diversity in broad ways including sexual orientation but also age. Our campus has not had problem hiring older faculty, but other campuses have.

Tuedio voiced support for the committee but also suggested it be called the Diversity Advisory Committee. He added that it is not clear whether campus decision making has been consistent with respect to diversity issues. But we need to be careful how to frame the charge and he recommended it be a small committee. Johnson shared that we had a Diversity Committee in the past, but it was a committee of the President.

Johnson asked for a straw vote supporting the idea of a permanent Diversity Committee. It was unanimously approved. This will be referred to COC and FAC to come back with a recommended charge and membership.

c. Additional fees for MBA students

Johnson advised there is a proposal that MBA students be charged an additional fee on top of the regular tuition. It is a statewide proposal. The reason it has been brought here is that it is on the SWAS agenda as a first reading and our SWASenators want our input before voting. The SWAS resolution would urge that the Board of Trustees not accept the proposal. It is a controversial issue and SWAS opinion is divided. Dean Aly has been invited to explain the rationale for this fee.

Aly explained that it is very expensive to get the College of Business Administration accredited. Part of the issue is hiring faculty. Hiring is very expensive. We are tied by the bargaining agreement. It's getting harder to compete because we can't afford to hire faculty. The question comes up how can we fund it. It has to come from somewhere else. We don't get enough funding. Aly shared that the MBA is the largest major here. Accreditation is very important. Students are savvy and they ask if we are accredited. We can't afford losing it. We need to find another source of funding and that will free other money up. The proposal asks for \$210 per unit only for MBA students. This degree will open doors for students and allow them to make a lot of money. It is prestigious having an MBA. The trend the last few years across the country is that fewer students are getting a regular MBA and more are going to an Executive MBA because it is a fast-track program, and many times it is fully funded or partially funded by employers. Some get financial aid and some are paying for themselves. Having an MBA affects the student's potential earning capacity. If this passes, we will be able to give travel money for faculty, teaching assistants and help with recruiting.

O'Brien stated he is not arguing against the Dean of Business because there are pro arguments for the MBA. But when this was at the SWAS as a first reading item he stated he's not sure what they will do with it. San Jose State and CSU Sacramento passed a resolution and East Bay is thinking about it. But the SWAS is divided. He stated his concern this is a slippery slope; today business, tomorrow nursing, next social work etc. Are we opening a door we can't close again? The other fear is that we get into a scenario like the lottery business years ago. Those funds were to go to education, but it didn't happen. Once we got the money, the CSU general fund was cut back that amount. If it does pass and students pay, he stated his hope the business faculty get it.

Janz advised the ASI is having this conversation. He asked if Aly has data on what salaries Stanislaus business graduates make. Aly and Brown replied that they did not know but would follow up.

Aly stated that even with the increase of \$210 per unit, it would still put us at about 1/3 of what the UC charges. All UC campuses have special fees for their MBA program. We are about 50% for public institutions. Aly stated he attended a meeting of Business deans in the CSU system. They said small campuses (that's us) do not have to impose this fee. Brown and he think it should be left to every campus how much they want to charge. He stated even though we have more MBA students than some of the larger campuses, we still have the option. They do not.

Sarraille stated there is a financial aid issue involved. It's one thing to say you will set aside a certain percentage of the fee revenue and another thing to carry the process through. He stated his concern such policies tend to create a class system, or a rich person's degree. Also the rationale in the SWAS resolution pointed out that the proposal was hatched with very little consultation, except among members of business colleges and high ranking members in the CSU. It was not looked at from lots of view points and we don't know what we are getting into if approved. Finally, Sarraille questioned Aly's comment about being tied to the contract, saying the collective bargaining agreement between the faculty and CSU administration does not prevent the CSU administration from giving higher salaries to business professors.

Aly replied the College of Business can't pay market value. Although that language is not in the contract, we are limited to what we can offer. There are 200 unfilled positions across the CSU. On average, there are 10 open positions at every campus. 120 positions have been authorized this year on top of the failed 200 searches. We cannot recruit because we can't afford them. Aly also pointed out that the College of Business faculty didn't know about this proposal. They are having focus groups now made up of students and faculty. They will be gathering information and will put something together by January before a decision is made.

Filling noted we are here for something other than money. It's an interesting notion that we would raise money for "the good stuff", but then have to negotiate the money with the Provost. He stated he doesn't have a good feeling about that. He pointed out that apparently they are comparing our students with Stanford and other like institutions, so we should also compare our faculty salaries with them as well and start up the equity program. Further, if this was passed, we would only be getting about 1-7/8 of a faculty position. He urged our SW Senators to vote no.

Thompson wondered if our students have addressed this issue, want to, plan to or want us to respond. Janz stated the ASI will be discussing today and students have also discussed it at the State level. Students have not formed a position yet. He stated he is hoping the Business Dean can attend today's ASI meeting. Aly replied yes.

Thompson stated since it is an opt in or out for us, how will the campus go about deciding to adopt the fee if approved by the Board of Trustees? Aly replied we can bring the issue back here (Academic Senate) for discussion. Provost Covino added there are no specifics of the process to be used yet. Thompson asked how the money would be identified going to Business, and would it be different than how money is usually allocated. Aly stated the

university would have the money. It does not automatically go to the College of Business. It is assigned to the College of Business but goes to the President.

Eudey stated in terms of doubling fees, it opts a lot of students out or they go in debt. Not all will make a lot of money when they graduate. Some may want an MBA to open a small business. She voiced concern how grants and scholarship will make up for doubling the fees. Further, we are talking about thousands and thousands of graduate students in California. We need to think about those students whose campuses will not be able to opt out. We may have the benefit of choice, but they do not. And there will be arguments from other programs with accreditation wondering why they don't have this opportunity to increase their fees. There is also the larger issue of programs being held hostage by accreditation agencies. We should work on that problem. Aly stated the CSU Fresno Business Dean did not support the opt in/out for small campuses (namely us) because he wouldn't be able to compete with us if we didn't have to increase our fees.

Taniguchi stated there are two issues that are troubling. All campuses are different. At Cal Poly, the College of Business voted to raise fees. There is precedent for making decisions on the local level. She asked the SW senators to go back and suggest we allow each campus to decide whether or not they want to opt in, out, or partially opt in. Aly stated that Brown and he wanted to leave it to each campus how much they wanted to charge up to the \$210, but received no support. But he stated the Senate could propose that in a resolution. It seems much fairer to students.

Thomas stated there is a broader question on student fees. He just heard there is a moratorium on student fees. Aly replied he has also heard everything is on hold. Provost Covino agreed that on any new student fees, there is moratorium.

Nagel asked when the Board of Trustees will vote and whether the action by the SWAS would have much of effect on the Board. O'Brien stated that the moratorium is statewide and that the Chancellor declared it in order to analyze the fees currently in place. Once fees are understood more comprehensively, he will make policy recommendations. Also, in answer to the question of whether the Board of Trustees pays attention to what the SWAS approves: yes it does have an effect. However the Board can and does act contrary to resolutions of the SWAS. However, if the SWAS says all faculty are opposed to this proposal, it would be hard for the Board to go ahead. SWAS and BOT meeting schedules are set up so that the SWAS meets the week prior to a meeting of the BOT. SWAS meets next on January 16-18. The Board meets the following week. Whatever SWAS votes on and passes can be forward to the Board for their next meeting.

Brown advised that many of the corporations pay all or part of the tuition for our students. The increase in fees may affect a third of the class. We would probably break even with the increase in fees. The ones that stay will be unhappy. In terms of our graduate's starting salaries, they won't get what students at prestigious business colleges would get. Regarding "opening the door" and "the slippery slope," if we do what Taniguchi proposes, and let campuses decide what they want to charge, we will get a menu system.

Peterson stated she believes the College of Business Administration and other colleges need resources. But she voiced concern part of what is at issue is whether we as citizens and the state want to support higher education. There will be budget problems again. If our reaction to decreased funding is to bump fees, then it is not consistent with the concept of public education. We will cease to provide access to people who want to lift themselves by their own bootstraps. We are moving away from the mission of being a public university. Further, she stated she is worried we won't get as much [other] money from the state if we do this.

O'Brien asked if our business students are aware of this and if so, what do they think, and do business faculty fear a backlash from students demanding performance. Brown replied he hasn't told anyone. It's not a secret, but we view it as confidential. Aly added that the Chancellor is responsible for gathering information from the students. O'Brien noted if you pay more, you demand more.

Brown explained that there is a 14-to-1 ratio of undergraduates to graduates in the College of Business Administration. The proposed change would not increase undergraduate fees, so under its terms, graduates would be paying a subsidy to undergraduates. Brown also commented that accreditation bodies are like unregulated monopolies - which should come under increased scrutiny.

Colnic said that one tends to create problems when one divides groups. This proposal would divide students, making one class more important than another. Our mission is to serve the market place, to serve artistic and cultural needs - so this is very troubling.

Thompson said he was gratified to hear the great discussion. But, what action should we take? Just discussion? A resolution? Make a statement? Should we refer to committee? SEC needs guidance. Eudey suggested that the AS consider a resolution. It is important we hear from the students first, and also important for the campus to take a stand. O'Brien stated he will try to get resolutions from other campuses so we can work off their ideas.

Moore stated it is clear that student fees are a hot button issue. In his experience, such fees do go to support the students in the programs that levy the fees.

Nagel questioned if we have time to pass a resolution before the SWAS acts in January. We only have one meeting left in December, and one in January. We might have to waive the rules [normally requiring two readings]. Johnson replied that given the timeline, if we do pass a resolution, we would not be advising SWAS so much as advising the Board of Trustees how our university faculty feel about this proposal. Peterson pointed out that we also have to advise our statewide senators on how we want them to vote on the resolution.

O'Brien advised that SWAS meets on January 16-18, and the Board of Trustees the following week [Jan 22-23]. Johnson suggested we do not need a resolution to advise them. We could do a straw vote.

Bender suggested since we have one more meeting before SWAS meets, we can have a straw vote at our next meeting stating how we feel about the SWAS resolution and our representatives can take that back. Johnson agreed. Further, she stated that approving a resolution is a different issue. Our campus can independently choose to advise the Board of Trustees, although at this point, we're not sure what we would be advising. Many concerns were voiced today. We need further feedback before developing a resolution. We can decide at the next meeting if we do so. Aly stated that we are trying to influence something that won't affect our campus. We have the option to do it or not. Sarraile replied that the validity of Aly's notion depends on how you define "affected". If we feel strongly about it, for ethically or socially motivated reasons, we should take a stand. We are part of the CSU system, and we should think globally.

Thompson stated there is a huge difference between a straw vote and a resolution. We already have a history of disagreeing with SWAS.

Johnson stated she doesn't think we should limit ourselves just to what affects us. If we feel there is an access issue that negatively affects students, it doesn't matter if they are not our students. We have to watch out for all students. Also right now they say a small campus can opt out, but when things are written up, can we be sure that will not have changed? Aly replied he doesn't know. He hasn't seen a draft of the proposal. But, he stated he wants to be able to compete with the other campuses. If they get the money and we don't, they will have an advantage.

Johnson asked senators to go back and talk to their faculty to find out how they feel about this, come back, have a discussion, and participate in a straw vote to inform O'Brien and Hejka-Ekins. Any senator who might wish to bring forth a resolution will be free to do that. This issue is also on the FBAC agenda for November 28. Tynan advised that GC is also discussing this.

8. OPEN FORUM

Borba advised that in 1988, Proposition 98 passed. It guaranteed minimum funding to K12 and Community Colleges. About 40% of the state budget goes to them. There is a new measure, Proposition 92 and it would further increase community college minimum funding. It will be voted on in the spring. If it passes, it will raise minimum funding for community colleges, reduce the student fees from \$20 to \$15 per unit and make it much more difficult for governance structures to raise student fees at the community college level. Where were our CFA and State leaders? Where were our Academic Senate leaders when the proposition was written? We should be a part of processes that determine minimum funding. We talked about building a relationship with the Board of Trustees. Maybe we should build a relationship with the community colleges. It would be much more powerful in terms of securing additional resources than talking points to please the Board of Trustees that are about as relevant as furniture in a board room. He stated his disappointment we were not on board in 1988 or 2007.

O'Brien replied as far as he knows, Proposition 92 was a product of the community colleges. They gathered signatures to put it on the ballot. SWAS was very concerned. It puts the CSU and UC in danger. SWAS passed a resolution at its November meeting opposing Proposition 92. In addition, John Travis, as CFA representative, reported CFA is opposed to it. However O'Brien agreed: everything should have been done differently from the beginning. Borba suggested we should have a relationship with the community college system so we can partner on measures that guarantee funding for us as well as them and the K12 system.

9. ADJOURNMENT 4:25.