

<p>Academic Senate April 28, 2009</p> <p>Present: Bell, Bender, Bice, Black, Brown, Campbell, Colnic, Cotton, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeVries, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Garcia, Hall, Hejka-Ekins, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Kavasch, Keswick, Manrique, M. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Russell, Senior, Silverman, Snizek, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxies: Broadwater (J. Mayer), Demetrulias (Covino),</p> <p>Guests: Lisa Bernardo, Lelia DeKatzew, Brian Duggan, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Dean Roger McNeil, Sari Miller-Antonio, Dean Daryl Moore, Gary Novak, Roger Pugh, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Steve Stryker, Flora Watson, Associate Vice President Wendt, Kou Yang</p>	<p>5/AS/09/FAC—Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes, REFERRED TO FAC</p> <p>6/AS/09/SEC—AB 390, APPROVED</p> <p>7/AS/09/UEPC—BA in Ethnic Studies, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>8/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Amendment to Principles, Criteria and Procedures for RPT Review, Section II, FIRST READING</p> <p>9/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Process for Review of Elaborations (sense of senate), FIRST READING</p> <p>10/AS/09/FBAC—Local Policy Governing Special Session Program operated by UEE, FIRST READING</p> <p>11/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 5/AS/04/UEPC—Academic Program Review Procedures, FIRST READING</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, May 5, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p>
<p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>

1. **Call to order**
2. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 7, 2009**

DeVries page 7, item 8a, paragraph 3 to read “He doesn’t think any future public events or faculty doing these kinds of events should have to go through arbitrary administrative requirements or policy changes.”

4. Announcements

Taniguchi announced that Phi Alpha Theta had its regional conference at CSU Stanislaus last weekend. Seventy universities from Northern California participated, and 6 awards were given for papers – 3 for undergraduates and 3 for graduate students, and CSU Stanislaus students won half of them. Also, it’s Phi Kappa Phi week, and Taniguchi hopes others will attend the various events around campus. The play Galileo is on Friday, and new member initiation is Friday, and next Thursday at 5:30 they will co-host a program on anarchism.

Nagel noted this Thursday from 11:30-1:00 a CFA-sponsored campus-wide budget summit will be held in the Event Center.

Snizek announced that on Tuesday, May 5 campus lost and found items will be auctioned on the quad from 10-2 by the Hunger Network. Proceeds from the auction will help feed the homeless.

Duggan announced the Tech Fair will be held in MSR tomorrow. There will be some nice giveaways including a minicomputer, digital photo frame, printer, etc. Two faculty will be demonstrating technology projects.

Bell advised that the Anthropology club is sponsoring a lecture on research in N. Italy.

Kavasch announced there is a music /orchestra concert featuring two student winners of the annual concerto competition. The performance will include the premiere of a new composition by Kavasch.

O’Brien followed up to Taniguchi’s emailed announcement about a conference in Dabos, wondering if there is funding. Taniguchi says

she just forwards the announcements, she'll keep money if she has it.

Thompson announced that 21/AS/08/FAC was approved by the president.

Thompson announced forums by SEC on UBAC recommendations will be on Tuesday, May 5, 11:30-1:30 in MSR 130 and Wednesday, May 6, 1-3 in South Dining. A reception follows the General Faculty meeting on the 14th. He hopes all have looked at ballot results from the elections. Runoff ballots are due by 1pm this Friday.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

None

6. Action Items

a. 5/AS/09/FAC—Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes

Hejka-Ekins explained the FAC amended the policy and resolution as follows:

Audio recording or any other form of recording of classes is not permitted unless expressly allowed by the faculty member as indicated in the course syllabus or as a special accommodation for students who are currently registered with the Disability Resource Services Program and are approved for this accommodation. The following sample language for syllabi on the recording of classes is suggested for faculty use:

1. No recording at all: Audio recording or any other form of recording of classes is not permitted under any circumstances. If you feel you cannot comply with this policy, please discuss this with the instructor.

2. Allowing limited recording: Audio recording of classes is permitted with prior permission of the instructor; video recording or any other form of recording is not permitted under any circumstances. Authorized recordings are for the personal use of the student, and may not be distributed to others without permission of the instructor. If you feel you cannot comply with this policy, please discuss this with the instructor.

3. The exception to this policy is made for students registered with the Disability Resource Services program, who are approved for this accommodation. Authorized audio or video recordings are for the personal use of the student, and may not be distributed to others without the permission of unless approved by the instructor DRS program. Any other form of recording of class lectures is prohibited. Faculty may require the student sign an Audio/Video Recording Agreement, which they may keep for their records. This agreement contains the following language:

"In accordance with federal regulations Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and California State University policy, audio recording, transcribing of class lectures, and video recording can only be made by must be allowed for students who are currently registered with the Disability Resource Services (DRS) program and are approved for this accommodation. I acknowledge and agree to use the audio or video recordings of any class lecture exclusively for my private educational use and study. I agree not to share these recordings with any individual who is not registered unless approved by with the DRS program. I understand that any other form of recording of class lectures is prohibited." Faculty may download this agreement form on the DRS program website.

Resolution amended to read:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the attached Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be effective upon approval by the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook.

RATIONALE: A policy ensuring the intellectual property rights of an instructor's classroom pedagogy needs to be protected. Further, disabled students have special needs that require them to utilize learning tools that instructors need to accommodate. This policy ensures the instructor's property rights, while meeting the needs of disabled students prescribed by law.

Discussion:

Hejka-Ekins noted that at the last senate meeting FAC obtained input from Morgan Foster and Novak and others and did what they could to get more input and the FAC offered the additions/changes noted above. On the resolution, one of the issues was where would the policy go, so they added two resolvents indicating presidential approval and placement in faculty and student handbooks. The other additions indicate that they have checked with Lee Bettencourt to determine the wording of the policy. FAC added mention of the Disability Resource Services (DRS) Program as an accommodation. This complies with the ADA, and balances faculty rights to have control over the class with access by students who need special help in order to learn. Under #3, in consultation with Bettencourt, the new language indicates that the exception must be approved by DRS. The program will contact the professor about accommodations. Then they quoted from the ADA section in the next paragraph to make sure that we're doing this by law, quoting the statute. It seemed to be the best language FAC could come up with to serve disabled students and to protect faculty rights.

Thompson noted that this is a second reading for action, and the actual resolution is on page one, and page two was an attachment to the

resolution. All that can be amended is the resolution itself. Open for discussion.

Tan asked about the last paragraph of the policy, and questioned the wording in the statement. Hejka-Ekins said that it was direct language from the law and that's why it was slightly different from the prior version which did not include a direct quote. Nainby asked about the language in the rationale. It seems that the wording seems to indicate it is protecting the policy rather than the rights of the instructor. It sounds like the policy is protected, not the faculty member. Garcia recommended changing this to "A policy to protect the intellectual policy rights of an instructor's classroom pedagogy is needed." Agreed.

Young asked about the concerns expressed last time about students other than those under DRS, what was the rationale for continuing in this vein that is essentially allowing faculty to prohibit other students for using a useful learning tool? Hejka-Ekins said that this policy, like most policies, is addressed to deal with not all students, but with disabled students for we had no policy before. If we want to broaden the discussion in that vein, it becomes another issue for faculty to deal with. Right now we have no policy to deal with. We want to keep it focused enough to deal with the faculty right to control what goes on in the classroom and at the same time to be accessible to students with disabilities. The broader question is beyond the scope of this policy now. The idea is to get something established now, with the ability to address this concern later.

Heredia questioned if this policy would be bolded for disabled students when placed in the handbook and Hejka-Ekins replied this policy is for all students.

Tuedio noted that the policy is for the general student body, regardless of a students' sense of need for recording, the faculty can prevent others from making recordings. The answer to Young is different; you have taken a position in respect to the general student body. If only those with approved accommodation are allowed, faculty can deny other students. That situation raises an ethical question of exposure and Tuedio doesn't see that FAC addressed it. Hejka-Ekins replied that this is worked out in a discretionary fashion. Tuedio said that it is not indicated in the policy. There is a restriction in the policy that is problematic. If it's only about disabled students, it could be shorter and only address this.

Filling said that DRS operates under a process that embeds that anonymity. This happens with note takers, and the same already happens with audio and video recordings. Young wanted to be clear that the policy as written allows faculty to prohibit any student other than those registered with DRS from recording. Young is not prepared to support a policy that prohibits modes that would facilitate learning. It is counter to a learning-centered mission. Instead of this policy, she would prefer a policy that would focus on dissemination so that whatever arises in a student handbook about the limitations on dissemination beyond personal use for learning would be addressed. To her, that is more respectful for a learner-centered mission.

S. Davis thinks Young has a great point about differential learning and the way students can capture what they need in order to learn. Maybe someone can clarify if he is currently restricted from prohibiting students from taping in class? Many replied no, that there is no restriction. S. Davis continued that as of now, he could tell students not to record him, and he is allowed to do it. There is no student who can file a grievance for this. This doesn't institute any new limitations, but it allows for the exception for DRS.

Garcia thinks that the language used, sample language for the syllabi, makes little sense. #1 says no recording for any circumstance, but that is not language because it is inconsistent with #3. Thompson clarified that we wouldn't be doing that change today. Tan said regarding Garcia's point, doesn't the last part of the paragraph about discussing with the instructor gives the disabled student the opportunity to show their letter from DRS, so even though #1 is in the syllabus, because of the last sentence, there is an allowance for the disabled student.

Dunham Filson has a problem supporting a policy just for the sake of putting a policy in place without taking into consideration everything out there. Hejka-Ekins said that they have been working on it for over a year. Nagel moved to refer this back to FAC since there is a need for policy but that there are substantial concerns about the wording. DeVries seconded. Hejka-Ekins said that if we take it back and send it around and people object, we don't get any response and we try to talk about it based on what people bring up, and this is happening a lot. It's hard to satisfy everybody, it did start last year when Floyd was chair. If it is defeated, she would like those who object to the language to send concerns back to FAC so that all of the issues can be reconsidered.

Colnic asked if we vote on the referral can they specify some direction. Thompson said that the direction would come outside the meeting since it wouldn't come back until next year.

O'Brien agreed with referring but says that this is a laborious task and maybe FAC should look at the minutes and invite those who have commented to spell out what they would like to see to say in order to eventually pass it. Referred to FAC by voice vote.

b. 6/AS/09/SEC—AB 390

Discussion:

Thompson noted that this was attached to the previous agenda. Filling indicated that there were no changes since the last meeting. Nagel said it doesn't say if this is a sense of the senate. Thompson clarified that it is a sense of the senate vote. Filling noted that it directs that this is communicated to the chancellor, legislators, etc., and is intended as a sense of the senate. A paper vote was conducted, and Thompson reminded all that Aye/yes you're in agreement with the resolution, no/nay is opposition. 31 yes, 12 no 1 abstention. Resolution passes.

c. 7/AS/09/UEPC—BA in Ethnic Studies

Discussion:

Petrosky has no updates from UEPC, but noted that DeKatzew distributed a clarification about Dr Taniguchi's comments last week about

the potentially inflated and misleading information about transfer student data. DeKatzew quickly reviewed the content of the handout that included information from Angel Sanchez that clarified the meaning of the data presented in the proposal. DeKatzew thought it was important to have this on the record.

Hight was asked by her library colleagues to address not specifically this proposal, but to use this as a venue to remind people that the library is impacted and the process by which the library is included in the proposal process is flawed. It's been relayed that everything is available via the internet, it's available by ILL, but ILL costs money, and the library has paid for online resources out of their budget. She wanted to make everyone aware that the procedure needs to be reviewed.

Colnic noted that given this student body, there is a need for this major. Eudey stated it is important to recognize in this proposal there are no new resources needed, it will offer a new option for our students, and it is long overdue to have this major.

Unanimously approved.

7. First Reading Items

a. 8/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Amendment to Principles, Criteria and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure Review, Section II. Review Criteria

It was MS by Hejka-Ekins, seconded by DeVries.

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend to the General Faculty the adoption of the attached amendment to the language of Section II of the Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review.

Rationale: California State University, Stanislaus is primarily a teaching institution as is noted in documents such as our *Strategic Plan* and in accreditation documents submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), and the President has embraced this identity as recently as October 28, 2008 in a message to the campus:

I am fully committed to the mission of California State University, Stanislaus as a teaching institution, as an institution focusing on access and workforce development, and as an institution that is committed to serving the residents of the six-county area and the State of California. I fully respect and commend the values embraced by the CSU Stanislaus faculty, staff and students to provide a personalized education for our wonderful student body.

During their most recent visit to campus and in their final report based on that visit, members of the WASC team wondered why a university primarily focused on teaching has programs that do not have elaborations of the university criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure concerning teaching proficiency. In a series of discussions, committee meetings, and forums, faculty seemed amenable to amending the *Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review* to require that all programs elaborate on the criteria for teaching proficiency. Within those same discussions, the interrelatedness of multiple areas evaluated in RPT reviews was mentioned many times. As participation in university affairs is also an important consideration in awarding tenure and promotion, all departments should also have elaborations in this area.

Hejka-Ekins read the amendment of the *Principles, Criteria, and Procedures for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review* reads as follows:

II. REVIEW CRITERIA

The following four criteria apply to the faculty as a whole, and all criteria must be considered in the review process. Academic departments* must formulate written elaborations of the ‘Scholarship or other creative activities’ criterion and may submit elaborations of the other three criteria (A, B, C, D) listed below. All elaborations and amendments to them must be approved by the URPTC prior to their first use in a review process. Once approved, departmental elaborations remain in effect for all subsequent reviews until amended or replaced by the Department. Any such changes must be approved by the URPTC. Each RPT file must contain copy of the current as well as any applicable prior elaborations. A faculty member has the right to be evaluated according to elaborations in effect when he or she was hired or to which the faculty member subsequently has agreed.

- A. Teaching proficiency, including preparation, classroom presentation, student advising, and adherence to departmental guidelines and university wide academic standards. Teaching proficiency is the primary qualification for retention, promotion, and tenure.
- B. Scholarship or other equivalent creative activities.
- C. Extent and appropriateness of professional preparation, normally including the doctorate or equivalent attainment (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 42711).
- D. Participation in university affairs.

Discussion:

Hejka-Ekins noted that on page four of the agenda the actual amendment is offered. She read the revised Review Criteria for RPT. Under rationale it is noted that this came out of WASC and the long discussion we had as a campus, and that GE and RPT are big issues to address for WASC. The Chair of URPTC, Flora Watson, and Hejka-Ekins and Thompson worked as a team to create a process to discuss the RPT issue. There were two public forums, they attended six college meetings, and talked to chairs and deans to get input on what to do for this process. There was a recognition that we at least needed to mandate that all departments have elaborations in the four areas we stipulate are necessary for promotion and tenure. The policy revision requires that all four must be addressed by each

department's elaborations and were it to pass here, it would go to a vote of the whole faculty.

DeVries seconded it because he still has concerns that this addresses part but not all that was addressed at the open forums. He notes that in the CPR document, it indicates that the university has not yet achieved clarity on RSCA. He would like to table the amendment until such time as we have a more complete set of amendments that more completely address the concerns of WASC. If we table it for now, it's likely the next WASC review they'll be saying that we haven't addressed some of the concerns from ten years ago.

Peterson spoke in favor of the amendment. The main reason we're doing this is not because of WASC, but because it has made us think about what we want. It's important because of the statement that teaching proficiency is the primary activity we do at this university and the concern in the past about WASC focusing on RSCA was that it was detracting from our most important mission. We were talking about research, and they are different across the different disciplines. The idea of people talking about teaching is really important, and it's a reminder that in this RPT process it's the most important.

Hejka-Ekins noted that there is another resolution that follows this that goes more into the process to allow further conversation regarding RPT. This second resolution creates a process for setting it up. If we don't come to an agreement about this constitutionally, then we're back to square one. It isn't as if we didn't do more, this is the smallest step from all the discussions, deciding that we should have elaborations that speak to the four areas, and that teaching ought to be considered primary whatever that means to each department. This seems to be what people were in agreement about as a place to begin, although the process continues in the second resolution.

Young started to break into a sweat when we talk about delaying policy but she too has concerns about this policy as written and think that it requires more discussion because of two questions forwarded by SEC to FAC and URPTC that cannot be addressed today. In line four, all elaborations and amendments must be referred to URPTC before first use. Young has questions about the criteria used by URPTC before they are put into place and want that included in conversation before voting on this policy. Another question is "each must contain current and prior elaborations," because she is confused about the purpose of including all prior ones. She feels uncomfortable voting on the policy when all elements aren't clear.

O'Brien spoke against tabling a first reading, and echoes Peterson's comments. It's something that WASC is looking for, and he's concerned about delaying policies until all aspects are addressed given our prior discussion on recording classes that's going into year two of deliberation. We should give our points of view to the committee and move ahead on it.

Eudey noted the language Young is uncomfortable with is already in the policy. URPTC continues to reviews elaborations and URPTC Chair Watson stated URPTC has continued to discuss the criteria for review and this topic is on their agenda. We are doing and continue to do submit our elaborations, and it is not a new policy statement. Maybe it is not clear the reason for having all different elaborations and URPTC might need to discuss that question, but Eudey does not think this concern rises to the level that we should not approve this proposed RPT change. We are trying to help people through the RPT process and affirming what is important to our campus. It should be made clear to faculty. The sense of the senate resolution that follows says that in Fall semester departments will discuss why they have their elaborations. That does get to the WASC question regarding RSCA without trying to make a final decision on RSCA before we are ready to do so.

Demetrulias stated her concern that tabling the resolution would be detrimental to our reaccreditation efforts. As ALO she understands that the most desired step is to have an exhaustive complete constitutional language, but she has been convinced and impressed working with FAC and URPTC that this is a really great first step and the tandem resolution addresses almost all of the issues that people have raised in consultative processes. The team also met with the Council of Deans and also met with the self study team twice so that we're working in collaboration to achieve our accreditation and to support faculty. She would urge us to consider this as a first step, and the tandem resolution that will set a process for next year that may lead to further resolutions. She asked Hejka-Ekins to affirm that the next steps in the process are designed to give FAC direction for proposing possible additional constitutional language changes on RPT. Hejka-Ekins nodded in the affirmative. We want to address WASC issues carefully and thoughtfully, and doing it quickly may not be in the best interests of all. We need a clear plan and execute it next year, not just continue to talk about it. This is what she has asked all along. It is imperative that we display the clarity of our direction, our commitment, and the good work that our faculty do. Consider doing the best you can with this resolution and continue working on it.

Garcia noted that his department already has elaboration on three of our criteria. He is struggling to understand what the elaborations would look like for item C [professional preparation].

Dunham-Filson said that in reading the resolution in regard to Peterson and DeVries, the rationale might want to change that WASC isn't the first priority of the resolution, that it's something else.

DeVries agrees that we do have to have elaborations in all four areas, but that in the policy teaching is narrowly defined and it doesn't include outside the classroom teaching or research assistance and it should be a broader definition.

Fassinger said point D is the service criterion seems to be limited to university affairs and implicitly excludes outside work. Thompson noted that we have a summary of things that are covered in the different elaborations, so that it might help to provide that before the next meeting. Bender agrees with Fassinger's concerns. There are a lot of service components outside the university, stateside, etc and that needs to be explicitly stated. Some might want to broadly suggest that the current meaning includes community, etc., but he doesn't read it that way.

S. Davis quickly wants to underscore concern in the past and today about the glacial pace of change in higher education. While this particular solution is not perfect and doesn't answer every concern, it's a well constructed first step, and Davis thanks Watson and Hejka-

Ekins for the policy and cascade of action steps behind it. Thompson reminded all that this would return next time as an action item.

Tuedio wanted to know what the force of these elaborations are. Is it clear that once these are approved by the URPTC that all levels of review are under the obligation to work under this framework? Watson said the elaborations help the faculty members when going through tenure and promotion review. URPTC just finished reviewing the files and sometimes it's difficult for URPTC to figure out what is required for tenure, promotion or early promotion. Besides WASC, this is what all agree will improve the ability to review the files. Some elaborations are brief and it's difficult to review the achievements by the faculty when expectations are not known. This change encourages the elaborations to be more detailed and thorough. Thompson noted that many if not all do see the elaborations as something you should adhere to.

Eudey explained that this language is not changing the current value or use of elaborations. The only change is what is required to be in them. The process is not changing.

Thompson asked that additional comments or concerns be sent to Hejka-Ekins or Watson.

b. 9/AS/09/FAC/URPTC—Process for Review of Elaborations (sense of senate)

It was moved by Hejka-Ekins, seconded by S Davis

Resolved: That the Academic Senate California State University, Stanislaus affirm the autonomy of each department to determine their elaborations on the RPT criteria as they pertain to all faculty within their respective departments; and be it further,

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urge departments to review during the fall semester 2009 their elaborations on the RPT criteria to consider the clarity of their criteria and expectations in the areas of teaching proficiency, scholarship or equivalent creative activity, extent and appropriateness of professional preparation, and participation in university affairs; and be it further,

Resolved: That the senate urge that, during those department reviews, the following questions should be considered:

- a. What are your expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service?
- b. How is the primacy of teaching addressed in your elaborations?
- c. How do your elaborations address your department's expectations in each of these areas?
- d. How do your elaborations address issues of faculty workload vis-à-vis expectations?
- e. What can your department do to support faculty in their career development as they proceed towards tenure and promotion?
- f. What additional support will your faculty need from the university to match workload to expectations?
- g. What additional resources outside the department can help your conversation (other department's elaborations, support from the Faculty Development Center)?
- h. What role do you envision regarding your college and your college dean?

Rationale: The WASC final report in response to the Capacity and Preparatory Review made observations in several areas and noted that "these observations are made less as criticisms than as intended helpful indicators of useful steps that can and should be taken before completing the EER report and arranging for the next team visit. They are intended to add strength and credibility to the impressive work already completed" (31). The report also noted that the "team therefore recommends that CSU Stanislaus move this discussion toward resolution through the explicit, written departmental, college, and University policies stipulating the *criteria* by which faculty will be assessed with regard to retention, promotion, and tenure for all aspects of faculty work—teaching and service as well as research, scholarship and creative activity. This may best be accomplished through an open, shared discussion of research, teaching and service within the mission of CSU Stanislaus, drawing on the existing mechanisms for shared governance at the program, college, and University levels" (33). The Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee have led a campus discussion in response to these concerns, conversations with many faculty, in open forums, in meetings with deans and their college leadership groups, and with the Provost's Council of Deans. Based on those discussions and in preparation for further work, the committees recommend that all departments and programs undertake a serious review of their elaborations on the RPT criteria. Responses to these questions and the input given by faculty during the 2009 spring and fall semesters will be compiled as the basis of a survey regarding further steps to be taken in clarifying the RPT process. A faculty survey will be conducted in spring semester 2010 and the results will be used to further address elements of the RPT process that would be useful to the faculty and the university as a whole.

Discussion:

Hejka-Ekins read the resolution and rationale. This is the process action plan that came out of forums and committee meetings. Each department in the fall will take the full fall semester to review their elaborations in light of these questions, submit answers to AS and this will lead to a spring survey about the next steps to take in RPT. S. Davis would repeat all that Hejka-Ekins said. DeVries supports this whole-heartedly and thinks these are a complete set of questions to consider.

Taniguchi supports this, but questions the final sentence. Who will be compiling the result of the survey and who will use it? Hejka-Ekins said that this is a two-prong approach since URPTC sends a memo to departments asking them to look at their elaborations. It looks like we would try to get a memo out this spring that would say to departments that we know you need to review your elaborations in the first two weeks in the semester, but this is a semester long process to look at them in more detail. Departments can submit the current elaborations; the fall would be a discussion within the department on how the elaborations would look based on these questions. This is department driven. We would like people to address these questions that keep coming up. Out of the response to these questions from the departments the SEC will have to determine which committee would compile the response from the questions and move into a

survey mode based on that. It could be a combination of URPTC and FAC, it could be an ad hoc group that FAC puts together, etc. The next SEC would determine how that would go.

S. Davis says these are great discussion questions and can imagine them on a survey. Are you expecting to receive something from the department RPT committees? Hejka-Ekins replied yes, then we would put a survey together that reflects the opinions of the departments and any questions that come out of them. S. Davis questioned if there should be a line asking for the departments to submit something to URPTC.

Garcia pointed out that while we're talking about four criteria, in the rationale that WASC didn't address appropriateness of professional preparation and we're adding more to this. He would like to acknowledge that we're in a budget crisis and this is additional work that we're putting on faculty who are having difficulty covering our current workload.

Novak is concerned with the first line of the first resolved. "Autonomy" suggests a self-contained unit which is contrary to collegiality and is inconsistent with the principles section of the URPTC process that comes out of the AAUP guidelines for evaluation. Those guidelines say that matters are primarily a faculty responsibility. He thinks it conflicts with our RPT guidelines which asks URPTC to review and accept the guidelines. He would recommend a change in the wording from "autonomy" to "primacy" since that is consistent with AAUP and our own RPT guidelines.

Demetrulias said that the WASC statement in the CPR document is not in her view something that they thought of independently of the concerns we had raised in our report and the feedback from faculty and administration. She wants to clarify that it's something that grew from our issues and concerns and included because we had not yet reached consensus and a clear definition. It's not something they have done independently. To clarify, the process described is intended to result in possible constitutional language changes, so when we say further steps, the mechanism we have is to amend the constitutional language that governs our constitutional processes. It's more than just a survey. FAC is wanting to use the information to see where we have consensus/issues to see how that translates into policy.

Hejka-Ekins reminded all of the dialectic. It's a matter of balancing openness with specificity. Part of the problem Watson has addressed is that when elaborations are vague, it's actually to the detriment to the candidate. We're trying to help strike a balance to be specific enough for the candidates so they know the expectations and can work on their career plans, while at the same time being open and flexible. It's to the disadvantage of our faculty if they're so vague that when URPTC gets them they really can't figure out what to say because there is not enough specificity in the elaborations or in the reports as to why faculty made certain decisions regarding junior faculty. It's an attempt to create a process that works even more effectively for the benefit of junior faculty in the department. It's not an easy thing to do, but it can be a great benefit to us when we say primacy of teaching that we need to consider these questions, and it's time consuming but it can be done in a way that can benefit faculty and the institution.

Thompson asked that additional comments or concerns be sent to Hejka-Ekins or Watson.

c. 10/AS/09/FBAC—Local Policy Governing Special Session Program operated by University Extended Education (UEE)
It was moved by Tan and seconded by Filling.

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate approve the attached new policy, *Local Policy Governing Special Sessions Programs operated by University Extended Education (UEE)*, to be effective upon receiving the President's approval.

Rationale:

1. Special session programs are increasing in number, and will probably continue to increase;
2. UEE has been dealing with each new program on an *ad hoc* basis;
3. A policy will provide guidance to Colleges when they plan special session programs;
4. A policy will help to articulate the respective duties, responsibilities, and cost/benefits for the College, UEE, and university.

Discussion:

Tan advised that the policy is coming forward because currently we don't have such a policy. Tan read the resolved and rationale. The initial draft came to FBAC from the Provost in early fall. FBAC communicated with the rest of the CSU campuses to find out whether they had a policy in place for comparison. The communication was that there is no consistent policy that we could follow, each did their own thing. FBAC worked with the draft from the Provost, and Filling went through the policy and wrote a parallel version, and then FBAC went through both line by line. FBAC looked at the special programs already in place like the EMBA and Master's in Finance and another policy related to CJ in Modesto. They looked at the cost structures and also brought in the prior and current UEE director, who presented numbers and FBAC did independent checking of numbers. FBAC members also talked with people on campus with experience with special sessions. They went through the policy line by line, it took a long time because of attention that needed to go to the budget crisis. Eventually, after considering comments from FBAC members, the Dean's Council, VPBF, UEE Directors and CFA, the policy is before you. This has been well chewed by FBAC members. It's a guideline for departments/colleges trying to implement new programs. To give you an idea of the changes that have been made, on page 10 of the bundle if the UEE program makes a profit, that's a surplus and the distribution is offered in the policy. There are differential distributions based on amount of surplus. Initially this was a 50/50 split, and FBAC changed it to a differential split based on surplus. FBAC members have a lot of experience with policies, and she is thankful to FBAC members and the feedback from many others who shaped this policy.

Filling clarified that this policy speaks only to complete programs of study, not offering a single class during summer session. Otherwise, he echoes what Tan says.

Nagel noted that in 3.a.iv, it quantifies the application fee, and wonders if that requires that the policy must be changed if the fee changes over time. He questioned whether they might consider taking the specific fee out.

Dunham Filson referred to page 8 vi. She heard that various constituents were talked to, but asked if the staff were brought into consideration in the UEE responsibilities and whether or not that would add or subtract from their current workloads. Tan replied that in terms of staff, they were told that a certain amount of money from the program is supposed to be going to different areas in the university. If you look on page 10, it says that funds go to admission and evaluation, financial services, etc so a certain amount of the money is supposed to be directed to those positions and the staffing of those. Dunham Filson cautioned that 1% is not a lot of money to go around.

Novak noted that 20% of the revenue goes to UEE and those are the ones whose staff is primarily impacted. Tan agreed that most staff support comes from within UEE.

Thompson encouraged additional comments to be sent to Tan.

d. 11/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 5/AS/04/UEPC—Academic Program Review Procedures

It was moved by Petrosky, seconded by S. Davis

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Academic Program Review Procedures (11/AS/09/UEPC) and be it further,

Resolved: That the Academic Program Review Procedures (11/AS/09/UEPC) take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The academic program review process at CSU Stanislaus is the most important method by which California State University, Stanislaus evaluates the effectiveness of its academic programs in promoting high levels of student achievement. As such, all academic programs are subject to periodic academic program review on a cycle not to exceed seven years.

Governance responsibility for the development, implementation, and periodic review of the effectiveness of university-level academic program review procedures is vested with the University Educational Policies Committee in consultation with the Graduate Council.

Recommended revisions to the Academic Program Review Procedures were made in consultation with the Graduate Council, the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, the General Education Subcommittee, the Faculty Director of General Education, the Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Discussion:

Petrosky noted that all are probably aware that this is an item that goes through periodic adjustment, and the last page shows that this was last reviewed in 2004. It seems like there is a daunting level of wholesale changes, and that isn't necessarily the case. Anything that is underlined and italicized is something that was previously in the document but moved to a new position. If underlined and non-italicized those are changes to the language. This has been through a lot of different committees, a lot of peers' eyes have seen it. It's been through UEPC twice, in Graduate Council, to the GE Director and GE sub, ASL sub and to the ASL Director. Each suggested a tweak or two. All save one lone adverb made it to the version today. One change came as recently as last week, addressing the role of governance and continuing improvement. He's glad to say that UEPC saw that change before we met today and wholeheartedly approved the change. Throughout the document including the attachments, the changes will include changes in the cycle, timeline, role of GE subcommittee for any GE portion of the self-study, encouragement of external review and how that might be accomplished, substitutions for self study for accredited programs, and a portion reflecting that GE is one of the programs being reviewed.

S. Davis emphasized that this has had extensive and multiple rounds of consultation. He appreciates how clearly this is laid out.

Nagel drew attention to page 21 of the packet under faculty. In the second paragraph, some folks might not realize that non-tenure might include full-time non-tenure faculty, and perhaps change this to say "and temporary faculty"

O'Brien spent time looking at this and has made comments on page after page. O'Brien has lots of questions, as it's currently written he would vote against it. He printed out his remarks, and has shared with Petrosky so he can look at them. He has two items in particular to draw attention to. In page 9 of the document under faculty, second paragraph, it says to evaluate effectiveness of engagement in RSCA and level of support for these scholarly activities. For him, this is embedding RPT evaluations into program reviews and that was alarming. Maybe he's misreading it. The second thing on page 23 of the agenda under external program review, it surprised him that in the current policy the college dean is responsible for the coordination of the external review, there is nominations and faculty get a voice in that and funds will be provided by the college dean. It surprised him that dean's voices are totally taken out of an external review process by its elimination in the proposed version.

Demetrulias said that the external review portion has been moved to appendix 4 and it does include the dean throughout. Also she clarified that the accreditation sections are in the current APR document but have been moved in the proposed version.

Thompson reminded senators that we might want to hold May 5 for an additional meeting or to have a first and second reading at the next meeting. Eudey encouraged us not to meet on May 5 since it overlaps with the Employee Recognition Event. Black is opposed to waiving the first readings and was excited to see something on the agenda today that we haven't had a chance to address.

9. Adjournment at 4:30 pm.