Academic Senate  
February 17, 2009  

Present: Bell, Bice, Black, Campbell, Cogan Bailey, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeVries, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Hall, Hejka-Ekins, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Keswick, Lindbeck, Manrique, J. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson, Petratsos, Petrosky, Russell, Senior, Silverman, Sniezek, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Werling, Young  

Proxies: Petrosky (Brown)  

Guests: Dean Nael Aly, Lauren Byerly, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, John Sarraillle, AVP Ted Wendt  

Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary  

WASC Report, DISCUSSION  

CSU Information Security Policy, Responsible Use Policy and Information Security Standards, DISCUSSION  

1/AS/09/UEPC—Statement on Impact of Budget Reductions on Educational Quality, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY  

2/AS/09/GC—Petition/Appeal of University Requirements & Course Substitution (Graduate), FIRST READING ITEM  

Next Academic Senate Meeting:  
Tuesday, March 3, 2009  
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room  

Minutes submitted by:  

Betsy Eudey, Clerk  

1. Call to order  
2:35pm called to order  

2. Approval of Agenda  
no changes  

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of January 20, 2009  
Young requested a change to page 8 paragraph 8, last sentence, to correct a misspeak at the meeting. “reads GC membership includes…” revise to say includes “a coordinator from every dept that has one or more graduate programs.”  

4. Announcements  
Eudey thanked those who attended Instructional Institute Day, which included a presentation by Sheridan Blau. She also reminded faculty of the webinar available tomorrow on making pdf files accessible, and the upcoming sessions in the FDC.  

Mayer announced Friday March 13 UPB and Theatre will put on the Vagina Monologues with proceeds going to a local women’s shelter.  

Filling implores all to contact a legislator to suggest that they please pass a budget, which has still not occurred.  

Covino reminded folks that a RFP for extended university projects has come from the CSU, they have about $400K available. Stanislaus got money a couple of years ago for our Genetic Counseling program. We submitted one for a center for applied creativity coming through faculty through the College of the Arts. There is some number of UEE prospective program proposals/initiatives being discussed this spring. Covino will ask the Deans to look at this and work with faculty to see if there are programs that might want to apply for funding. The program might need to meet workforce needs, serve a broader constituency, address alternative needs, include international experiences, etc. Juan Carlos Morales will again send out the RFP, due April 3rd.  

Covino also noted that relative to the budget reduction scene, we are awaiting a state budget and what that includes for the CSU and whether that conforms to the governors proposed budget or not. In response to recommendations from UBAC and the President’s response and directive, in Academic Affairs we’ve begun developing 6% - 15% reductions indicating the impact of each step and trying to prioritize these reductions. Deans are working with departments and faculty, and Covino is working centrally on monies held centrally. Monday at noon he will be getting proposals from the Deans, and will pull those together to submit proposals. Two faculty searches are active, one in nursing and the other in public administration – high priority for accreditation requirements. Other searches not going forward, although Covino wishes they were. We’re doing the best to keep our priorities before us and deal with the budget reduction.
Thompson said that most have seen the message from the President that he has withdrawn his application to the University of Idaho.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

no questions

Meeting highlights of the Graduate Council include the following:

1. 2/AS/09/GC – Petition of University Requirements & Course Substitution (Graduate)
The Council considered recommendations resulting from the first reading of this draft policy at Senate. Revised draft policy has been forwarded to be considered for approval at the second Senate reading.

2. MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies Director Position
The search committee for this director position is expecting to announce to faculty the call for applications within the next week. The committee plans to close the search by March 23rd so that the committee can complete interviews and make a recommendation to the Vice Provost before Spring Break. The committee would like to successfully complete the search in time for the new director to be able to observe this academic year’s last round of MA/MS IS candidate proposal meetings on May 6th.

3. Grad Council Spring Meeting Schedule Revision
The following schedule revisions were made:
- April 30th was changed to April 23rd, 3:00-5:00 pm
- May 21st was cancelled

4. Academic Program Review
The Council reviewed proposed APR procedure revisions and is forwarding a summary of recommendations to UEPC to consider in its deliberations of APR and eventual action.

5. Graduate Culture
Emerging from discussion about campus-wide graduate culture, the Council will be conferring with department members about ways in which the graduation ceremony could incorporate special recognition of the master’s students (e.g., through hooding).

6. Graduate Education and the University Strategic Plan
Reflecting on the WASC CPR visit, the current draft graduate assessment plan, and other related activities/events/documents, the Council is continuing to examine the University Strategic Plan and discuss how/where graduate education fits into this plan. At its next meeting, the Council will identify and prioritize graduate education goals and discuss how graduate education contributes to the fulfillment of the mission and vision of the University. Possible activities to realize the strategic priorities in the University’s Strategic Plan will be shared with the Strategic Plan Working Group.

Highlights of the February 12, 2009 meeting of the University Educational Policies Committee include:

- **Academic Program Review Procedures.** The UEPC will defer further discussion until recommendations from the Graduate Council and possible additional revisions from the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, the General Education Subcommittee, the Faculty Director of General Education, and the Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning have been made and brought before the UEPC members for action.
- **Course Proposal SW 2010 Introduction to the Social Work Profession.** Following the approval of this new course by the GE Subcommittee, the UEPC was asked to investigate further by the Department of Sociology and Gerontology. Members of that department and the Department of Social Work presented their respective cases at UEPC meetings in January, and were further invited to submit their positions in writing. After careful deliberation and in consideration of the issues of redundancy, replication of curriculum, duplication of university resources, and the process and nature of consultation, the UEPC (by majority vote) concurred with the decision of the General Education Subcommittee: SW 2010 Introduction to the Social Work Profession is approved for GE applicability for area D2b, effective fall 2009.
- **Upper Division Writing Proficiency Catalog Revision.** After communicating with the chair of the University Writing Committee, UEPC members agreed to not seek a policy change at this time
- **Online Courses.** Following a meeting among B. Duggan, D. Demetrulias, C. DeVries, P. Peters, A. Petrosky, and C. Whitman, it was determined that, with the consensus of the UEPC members, A. Petrosky will direct the Technology and Learning Subcommittee of the UEPC to develop a draft policy regarding online courses. Item deferred until the draft policy has been received this spring term.

6. Discussion Items

   a. **WASC Report**

Covino asked if there was a progress report from FAC regarding RPT. Hejka-Ekins said there are two RPT items, one that is changing some of the language in RPT which lead to a substantive change, and that is coming up soon. Hejka-Ekins met with Flora Watson (URPTC Chair) and the URPTC to try to plan an approach for the research, teaching and service angle for WASC. That’ll be coming up soon. After tomorrow there will be more to say. Covino likes the very soon part. Hejka-Ekins said that FAC is trying to coordinate with both committees to develop a process.
Covino said there is a conference call on Thursday at 9am with the WASC commission, the President, himself, and Demetrulias when they’ll be obtaining official information about the CPR from the WASC Commission. Demetrulias said that they will be asked to give an overview of the process being used to address the issues in the report, so it will be helpful to have heard from FAC about the RPT process.

b. **UEE Director, Robyn Criswell-Bloom**

Robyn Criswell-Bloom was introduced by Thompson. Thompson noted that she was invited to the last SEC meeting and we asked her to come in and share whatever she’d like to share, and then we’ll open things up for discussion and questions. There were materials distributed offering an overview of what UEE can do, and brief notes about UEE on the back of Criswell-Bloom’s business card.

Criswell-Bloom is an education solutions provider for students at various points in their careers – just-in-time training, certificate programs, career advancement, and finding ways to provide educational access to degree programs and academic work. UEE’s goal is to make it easy for the student to earn their degree and for faculty to make it easy to teach. UEE takes care of the logistics. It’s the goal to provide a vehicle to reach out in a way that becomes a revenue source for departments and colleges. There are lots of different means including online formats, accelerated formats, and Saturday formats, to offer programs that meet the needs of the college and students.

Taniguchi noted that after a quick glance the offerings are impressive. She suggests that as we join the boards and engage in partnerships, it would be nice if Merced Chamber of Commerce and the Merced Hispanic Chamber of Commerce were included. Taniguchi thinks it’s good to have that interlocking relationship with other counties.

Hejka-Ekins asked Criswell-Bloom if she could give some examples of current programs. Criswell-Bloom replied that we currently have the EMBA, with 3 cohorts through COB, and they’re in the process of recruiting the 4th cohort. There is also the MS in Business Administration, some offered here, with a spring term in Paris. They’re working with the Child Development MA program via interdisciplinary studies, now with its third cohort. There’s also the MS in Genetic Counseling, which is a collaboration between SFSU, Kaiser Permanente and CSU Stanislaus. Next week they will launch the BS in Criminal Justice at the Modesto Police Dept, and this is expected to be a growing program. They’re working on the RN to BSN degree completion program and a BA in Social Sciences. This is a time to be creative and thinking about new programs.

Hejka-Ekins inquired as to who actually teaches the courses, are they faculty here and is it above and beyond the workload and therefore paid separately? Criswell-Bloom replied that in all degree programs present faculty teach the bulk of the courses, and it’s primarily above what is done for their academic load. Schedule 23-22 determines the pay rate. Some programs have found ways to factor the UEE teaching into the workload.

Hejka-Ekins asked if all the programs that were mentioned have gone through an academic review through faculty. Criswell-Bloom replied yes, that they have gone through regular processes through faculty governance and additional processes to make sure all the ducks are in a row with WASC. They’ve done all the check points to make that happen because they’re meeting CSU criteria for degrees.

Nagel doesn’t understand what rationale there is for housing a degree program under UEE rather than under a regular academic program. Criswell-Bloom says the overall purpose is outreach. UEE is the entrepreneurial arm of the university. UEE can offer the degree in another location or modality in order to reach populations of students whose needs that wouldn’t be met on campus. Philosophically it’s a way to reach out to new student populations. Logistically, it’s not using state funds to support instructional expense, using a tuition-driven route to support expenses of the program. If offered through UEE you can generate revenues that then pay for the program and generate a profit for the college and department.

Nagel says if students were enrolled in the well-advertised EMBA, if they are taught primarily by COBA faculty except for exchange programs, it’s hard to see what about it is beyond the normal instructional facilities of the university. He asked if that is really an important part of the rationale for housing it in UEE. And relatedly, is the revenue generating aspect kind of like running a private university inside the confines of a public one?

Criswell-Bloom replied that in a way it is like a private school. UEE gives the university the flexibility to take on the characteristics of a proprietary institution. It’s like a private college working within the polices of a public institution. The first part of the question is how the academic difference is justified. The outreach is to serve those not otherwise served. That’s typically adult learners, working adults, etc. Having said that, what’s different in an off-campus or online setting is the way in which the courses are conducted from an adult learning theory perspective. It’s the same content, but the strategy is more facilitative, it’s much more applied in approach. There is a difference in teaching strategies for adult learners.

Hejka-Ekins noted that she does that anyway, so the philosophical issues are really important. She can see it’s a way to make money, but it’s important that it be part of the university process and structure, not something separate. She doesn’t know what mechanisms are in place to ensure that we give the same kind of attention to UEE courses as to regular courses.

Covino indicated that we do give the same attention. All UEE programs have gone through faculty approval and curricular processes. For example the EMBA faculty are appointed by the COB. The dean would probably agree that while there may be some elements of the EMBA pedagogy that address themselves more pointedly to working professionals than the state-side MBA, at the same time they are the same, of the same quality. What is being offered is a case and package that suits work lives. They can meet on Saturdays and incorporate the courses into their work lives. To speak to Nagel’s questions, we are expanding access, and the access mission of the university via UEE by offering programs that we could not afford to offer if we had to offer them otherwise. We’re serving law enforcement officers, nurses, business professionals, people in child development and genetic counseling work. These are degrees we agree we should offer,
That's the kind of exploitation that can occur by offering classes via UEE. Nagel offered a hypothetical exploitative situation if there is a shifting of classes, not degree programs, from the college. All are involved in evaluation, etc. They have to report the EMBA as part of accreditation, so they have to keep good track of all they are doing. The academic side is housed with the program, and will keep the quality high.

Dean Aly is director of the EMBA. He noted that it was designed by the COB faculty. It went through the university-wide processes to approve it. As Director, Aly and the chairs make decisions regarding instruction and other issues. All faculty are full time faculty currently involved in the stateside MBA except two. One is a PT faculty who is a professional, and the other is a retired faculty from the college. All are involved in evaluation, etc. They have to report the EMBA as part of accreditation, so they have to keep good track of all they are doing. The academic side is housed with the program, and will keep the quality high.

Sarraile has some concerns about UEE. He can see why we would want to keep some things in extension, but one thing that bothers him is that students wind up paying more for the courses, and also the way the faculty are furnished for the courses is sometimes strange. This is a can’t win situation. If you create a new program and hire new faculty, that’s a higher cost issue. If you have the faculty teach overloads, as is happening in business, they spend extra time teaching in the EMBA, and you could argue that that is detacting from those who are paying them stateside. That’s an oversimplification, but maybe something is being lost on the public side by the fact that the faculty are teaching extra courses in order to make the program work. If you don’t do that, maybe your folks can teach less within the COB and you could use UEE to hire lecturers to teach classes, pay them less or equally, but taking a chance on what/who you’re getting in the public program. Is the public program subsidizing the private, and does it do justice to the public program? Is the public side getting all that it ought to out of the arrangement?

Demetrulias reminded that Criswell-Bloom alluded to regulations. The Department of Education mandates accrediting bodies to regulate any off-campus delivery or mediated delivery of instruction. If some are thinking of these alternative ways to deliver instruction, keep in contact with Demetrulias or Criswell-Bloom – the regulations apply whether stateside or UEE. If they are a certain distance from campus, a certain percentage online, etc it will generate additional approval processes, which are about 6 months longer. Be aware of this as you’re planning your timeline. If students are enrolled in a program that doesn’t meet federal and WASC definitions they can’t receive financial aid. It’s a regulation that affects the students.

Tan followed up with what Sarraile said. First, when we have different colleges on this campus and some are doing more Self Support, bringing in the surplus, they may be viewed as the rich college, and then there are the poorer colleges. When it comes to budget cuts there may be a sense that the rich colleges should have a greater cut. We need to bear in mind that when it comes to generating self-support funds, there could be backlash and you could be asked to take a cut. Also, regarding the extra workload. Sometimes there is pressure on faculty, especially junior faculty, to take on extra work that perhaps they didn’t want to. Sometimes they are pressured to make sacrifices. And if they have a specialized skill they are expected to participate in a self-support program. They’re not wanting to do it, but think they need to do it.

DeVries has a concern about the potential for overloads for faculty. He’s concerned that advising duties, scholarly output, etc. might suffer given our already high workload. If doing overloads in UEE, it hurts all faculty duties/responsibilities. Is the overload for UEE being tracked as part of faculty workload and consideration given to what the effect has been on departments with these programs? Wendt says it’s being monitored via the CBA and executive order that the overload cannot be more than 25% of what the normal appointment would be. Wendt doesn’t know of any instance of undue pressure to exploit faculty who are being paid well already who are now getting some additional compensation on top of their regular compensation. He has not heard complaints of exploitation.

Covino says that teaching via UEE or other related activity is regulated and is elected, there is no compulsion afoot about teaching these courses. He would add that it is possible, and has worked it out, to create a budget for a program that incorporates a subsidy for assigned time, building in some income category into the program so that if you are in the department of nursing and teach 8 courses and can’t do more and do research, and are offering an online RN to BSN course it’s possible to structure the budget to use monies to support those faculty and moderate the teaching load and give them support for research and balance it. Not only does the department benefit from the revenue it generates in terms of surplus, but find ways to support or not further beleaguer the faculty workload. That’s not happening in other cases yet, but they have explored it thru nursing. Criswell-Bloom indicated that genetic counseling is doing this too.

Thompson is focused on what’s happening this week. He noted that we’re cutting half of summer, but what needs to be thought about regarding cutting a class stateside and offering it via UEE in summer? What is the process for summer, and can this be done in other terms? Covino has answers from statewide academic council. We are not moving back to a self-support summer as there was some years ago. That used to be a way to save money in Academic Affairs, but we’re not allowed to do that. That said, UEE courses can be offered in summer or any time to serve a particular student population that would not otherwise be served under the curriculum/budget because they are offered in a special time frame, accelerated case, in order to appeal to that student population. Or if offered in an alternative delivery format, that gives it a kind of appeal or provides a kind of access not provided otherwise. There are reasons for offering courses in summer or not in summer via UEE that fall within the general CSU policy that regulates it. We can’t do everything, and need to be consistent with their policy, but there are cases that allow us to do so.

Thompson asked if the message is that it needs to be outside the traditional scheduling module. Covino said that would be one approach.

Nagel offered a hypothetical exploitative situation if there is a shifting of classes, not degree programs, to UEE. In response to budget cuts, a dept or program could find ways to cut a class from the regular session, and via UEE offer the same course with the same course content not available to be offered otherwise, and in UEE the course is taught by the same lecturer but this person would not get benefits. That’s the kind of exploitation that can occur by offering classes via UEE.
Mayer says the other side is that the course cannot be offered stateside, but via UEE they get some opportunity that they wouldn’t have at all.

Covino clarified that there are no FTEs attached to courses taught via UEE.

Tan followed up on Wondt’s statement that no one came forward complaining about UEE. Tan is concerned that via the RPT process there is encouragement to participate in UEE. It doesn’t mean that someone complains, it could be subtle, or a tenure-track faculty is under review and they get extra praise for participating in UEE, so the pressure may not be something obvious but it’s creeping in the RPT processes. They don’t complain.

Peterson is thinking that while we don’t support slavery, but a faculty could be acknowledged in RPT for doing extra work that is supporting students, and that’s not bad. It’s bad to pressure them to do something they don’t want to do, but it’s not bad to praise them for doing something extra. Tan says that those who don’t want to do things feel pressured. Peterson notes that what we’re doing is price discrimination, but this is done to extend the market so there is an exemption of the law. We say we can’t afford to do what we want with the money we want, but we’re getting money to help us do more of what the state wants us to do. The two tiered system makes her nervous, but the people are saying they’re willing to pay more for the option and that money is helping us. It does seem that faculty who do that extra work should be appreciated.

Criswell-Bloom noted that from a different context, what they’re doing is helping students. When we center it back to what is good for the students, they won’t enroll if they don’t have quality and convenience. They need to meet these criteria, and there are other institutions providing these programs and they will go to them if we’re not providing it for them. We’re doing this for the students.

Petratos says that other colleagues feel like they can’t do everything. They feel that it’s not worth going over their workload, but they feel compelled to do it anyway. They’re feeling overworked.

S. Davis wondered if ASI or student affairs had an opinion to share about this. Heredia thinks it is helpful to students. If they didn’t have what she wanted in the regular program she would go through UEE. Heredia asked how faculty feel compelled to participate if they are paid extra. Petratos noted that it’s extra work for extra pay.

Black stated as a non-tenured faculty member he has not been asked to do a class like this, but there is pressure to create a UEE class because they are revenue generating. He might feel pressured to do this if asked. He’s concerned that if he complained, he might be punished for not complying. He’s unlikely to complain because he’s untenured. At the same time, he likes to teach, and getting some extra money can be useful.

Mayer said with the budget reduction scenarios we were forced to create, in his department they got rid of his summer courses and there are students who desire to take courses in the summer. If only taking 3 units in the summer, the cost is lower via UEE. Two years ago an upper division GE course was offered online and over 100 students wanted the class. There was no funding the next year so he offered it via UEE and met with mild success due to the way the courses were publicized. Even if the system doesn’t want us to go to self-support in summer we might need to do that for summer and winter.

Taniguchi wonders if the problem is with the way the programs have been developed and it appeared that there was a group of people in the college who really wanted to teach it. It grew from within, which may not have the same pressure as others are thinking. What is the method by which these programs have developed?

Aly said it was part of the college strategic plan and President Shirvani gave more incentive to move forward. They had more urgency but he gave them the okay to start and get more money back to the college. All courses were designed by faculty, they did a feasibility study, studied the market, and created their own niche. Their success is taking a look at how to make it convenient. They only offered Saturday classes, incorporated online components, etc. Some faculty were against it, and they had heated discussions about the issues, but found ways to make it work right. All but one of the EMBA faculty members are full professors – you can’t twist their arms. Many faculty are enjoying the experience, working with different students.

Petratos wonders if the issue of overload would be resolved if the classes would be included as part of the workload. McNeil stated in genetic counseling the faculty can get workload credit - it can be worked out. Again, it was worked out from the faculty involved in the program development. In 40 minutes he’s teaching a senior level IBS course with 20 students on the waiting list that need just that course to complete their program. He would like to teach it in summer, but likely won’t be able to teach it except with UEE. Thompson asked if it was offered in summer via UEE, what will be done differently? He says it’s a special population that needs the course, so they may do the lecture online or differently.

Eudey stated that for full time faculty, we can make interesting choices to make extra money, teach in the summer and it doesn’t count toward workload. People most exploited are part time faculty. They take on activities and it doesn’t help their benefits or time toward entitlements. We have to be careful not to exploit them. We should weight the costs and benefits. At times it is smarter to do UEE because it is better than nothing, but we need to push for more funding to serve students needs. UEE is a temporary process and we should not continue to rely on UEE to do it and let the state off the hook.

Thompson is still trying to decide how UEE works and has needed to hear it over and over to try to understand it. He noted that it’s good for Criswell-Bloom to hear the kinds of concerns that faculty have, and thanked her for joining us.
c. CSU Information Security Policy, Responsible Use Policy, and Information Security (the SEC agreed that we should send a summary of comments to the campus Information Security Officer, to the Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate, and to the CFA. Please be prepared to offer your comments.)

Thompson noted that this was on the agenda last time, there was discussion of this at system-wide level and an original deadline for response had been delayed to give more time for campuses to respond. The new deadline is March 2nd. Last time we had Whitman and Holmberg here, and Thompson sent out notes from that meeting. Technology and Learning Subcommittee is also looking at this. Holmberg has also sent the information to John Sarraillie and CFA. This is our last shot from Senate to address it, so we’re waiting for more comments.

DeVries indicated that they have talked about it some at T&L Sub. DeVries believes that responsible use should be restructured to give two duties to OIT – comply with legal compliance and assure that the equipment works, beyond that they shouldn’t step any further. Having reviewed the policies they take many steps that are further than that, including the thorny issue of what constitutes objectionable material.

Thompson said to feel free to email comments to Thompson so that we can put the info in an understandable form before we sent it off.

7. Action Item

a. 1/AS/09/UEPC--Statement on Impact of Budget Reductions on Educational Quality (sense of the Senate; from the University Educational Policies Committee Statement Regarding Budgetary Process).

Petrosky noted that last time members of senate were encouraged to send further comments or suggestions, and none were forwarded to Petrosky, so it stands before us in the same form as at our last meeting, in the minutes beginning on page 7.

Thompson started the comments by saying the senate may have had more timely resolutions on their agenda before, but he hasn’t seen it. This is the most timely he has ever seen.

Petrosky didn’t mention last time that in the discussion in UEPC and over the last two weeks, in a perfect world this isn’t the end but the beginning of a discussion of this. At UPEC and elsewhere faculty should look toward budgetary actions in the light of their area of authority. For example, if on URPTC, consider how budgetary situations impact the types of expectations placed on faculty in the RPT process. If in an accredited program, consider what impact actions have on pursuing or maintaining accreditation. This is a beginning rather than an end.

Vote – passed unanimously. Thompson noted that this is a sense of the senate and will be sent out in paper to the general and associate faculty and any others that the second resolved covers.

8. First-reading Item

a. 2/AS/09/GC—Petition/Appeal of University Requirements & Course Substitution (Graduate)

It was MS Young/S. Davis

Resolved: That the Academic Senate approve the attached language amending the policy for Petition/Appeal of University Requirements & Course Substitution (Graduate); and be it further

Resolved: That the policy, 2/AS/09/GC, take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The Graduate Council has deliberated the importance of ensuring the quality and integrity of our graduate programs and delivering them in accordance with the policies of the California State University and Title 5 regulations. These regulations specify that candidates for master's degrees must complete a specified coherent pattern of study as designed by the faculty and as approved by the CSU Board of Trustees and the campus authority.

As such, graduate directors/coordinators, through their department chairs and faculty, are vested with the responsibility to ensure the delivery of graduate programs as approved, with appropriate exceptions made on a case-by-case basis for individual graduate students and for compelling academic reasons. Further, the faculty wish to remain flexible in supporting graduate students' progress toward their degrees. Faculty and students have reported that procedures for course substitutions are ambiguous and inconsistently applied. Thus, this proposed revised policy was designed to clarify course substitution procedures and to expedite students' graduation clearance.

Discussion:

Young prefaced this by noting that on page 10 of the agenda are draft revisions to the catalog. They couldn’t trace this to any policy, so are working with catalog language. There are university regulations and an item related to program requirements. The second header “petitions” refer to university regulations like add/drop, extensions for incompletes, etc. In the third paragraph course substitution relates to program requirements, and the most critical changes relate to this section. The first relates to lines 2-3 “course substitutions are typically 4000 or 5000 level courses” thus implying that most substitution courses would be 5000 and 4000 but the council wanted more flexibility at the program level to allow 3000 level courses to be allowed for substitution since in some departments there’s little difference in content, breadth, or depth of 3000 and 4000 level. The system policy requires upper division level to be used, but new CSU graduate programs can only include 4000 and 5000 level. The language allows flexibility between the two. Substitutions must meet
Young noted that the next critical element comes in lines 3-4 in course substitution. “no more than 20% of units may deviate from the program” this prevents a course of study from deviating greatly from the program. If a program at time of graduation evaluation is different from the form, it will trigger discussion between Vice Provost and the program. The 20% policy roughly parallels the number for transfer into a program (9 units).

Young noted the 3rd critical element relates to lines 4-7 of the same course substitution paragraph. “request… prior to enrollment for the course substituted.” The form is on page 11. The form provides the mechanism for preventing unhappy conversations at graduation evaluation. It must be signed and approved before the course is taken, and there must be acknowledgement by the instructor that there are additional expectations placed upon the student for evaluation in the course. The policies have been on GC agenda for 2.5 years.

Thompson reminded us that the form on page 11 is not actually covered by the resolution. There is the catalog language and what’s on page 9 and 10, page 11 is supplemental.

Taniguchi said that on rare occasions someone has started a master’s at another institution and is bringing courses to us. Is there already a method in place that would allow us to substitute the courses taken before being accepted. Perhaps there can be additional language for a way to allow courses to be considered that were taken at another accredited master’s program.

Young said that transfer units are different than substitution units. If someone took a course and transfers here, the program authority can determine if the course transfers and counts. That’s separate from course substitution, for the transfer course is meeting an approved program requirement. A substitution is a course that is replacing a required course. Young said they can transfer in 9 units and substitute 9 units. Taniguchi say that these substitution matters only cover courses taken at CSU Stanislaus, not courses from elsewhere. Young agreed that was the case.

Petrosky asked if in the substitution statement, does there need to be some attention to the 9000 level courses taken in the EdD program that might be transferred elsewhere. Young said that GC will look at language to consider 9000 level courses throughout.

Colnic asked if the same logic applies to 3000-level. They’re not saying you can’t use 3000 or 9000, but that “typical” is not the same as “only” Young said that that was deliberate.

Thompson added that it’s an important part of the form that the approvals, instructor verification and director/coordinator of the graduate program and it stops there as far as approving the substitution. That facilitates that leeway at the program level.

Hejka-Ekins questioned why there could be a 3000 level course that could be approved for graduate level. Is this undergrad or graduate. At least at senior level it’s arguable. Why might 3000 level courses be approved? She would like to stick to a higher level of expectation. Thompson noted that he supports such a substitution. Thompson argues that there is a concentration in RTW in the English MA. There is a WP course that’s business and technical writing, BUS 3007. Sometimes someone is interested in tech writing that is not covered in a grad level course. For them until this discussion came up, they had not distinguished between 3000 and 4000 when considering if the class could be taken as part of the degree program, with the idea that they would do extra work and be graded more stringently.

Taniguchi first came here asked to revivify a course in women’s history. The senior professors did not wish to list it at a 3000 level because they didn’t want the grad students to take it. The rigor in the class was the same as any 4000 level course. Eudey noted that that course is now at the 4000 level.

S. Davis assumed that we have settled the issue of 3000 level. Questioning the wording related to semester units, seems that the units belong to the program and not to the number the student takes. The wording may not be clear. Young clarified that it is 20% of the total program units. Demetruis says that grad students may take more units, but this is those applied to the program. A student may not count a course in more than one degree, so if they take one for the doctoral program they cannot also use it toward the MA degree. But it may be possible that they are not applying a 9000 level course to an EdD. Young questioned whether changing it to “no more than 20% of the total program units may deviate…” S. Davis suggests making it two separate sentences. S. Davis congratulated GC for getting this to Senate. Petrosky’s thought to include the 9000 level courses here, hoped there would be automatic acceptance of rigor, while 3000 level may still be questionable.

This will be a second reading next time.

9. Open Forum

Thompson has a question about course cuts, There’s been a good discussion in English discussing how course cuts are being done. Does anyone have anything to share. Sarraile has heard that in a department that the faculty are not going to be able to afford to pay well paid faculty to teach certain courses so they will offer courses in the summer and finding people who have a lower pay rate to plug into the courses instead of the one’s who are most preferred, but are trying to find a way to provide less pay to the well paid ones. Is there a contractually permitted way for someone to teach a summer course for less than they would contractually be paid, but the answer is probably no.

Mayer is normally an optimist, and the budget cuts gets rid of all PT faculty and still not meeting the cuts. Concerned what if we’re faced with this same situation a year from now – what do we do? Not optimistic about the decisions to be made a year from now. He
had to cut part time faculty who have been PT in name only, and they’re losing their jobs. Concerns about a year from now.

Thompson is concerned by a compressed timeline. Eudey voiced concern about precedent. She has had to make cuts to her major. Maybe for a year it will be all right, but longer than that, her new major is not worth a lot. It has been hard to deal with because she has not received good information or dialogue with Enrollment Services regarding fte that has to be adjusted. Her program gets 20% from summer school and now it’s not an option. We don’t have good ways to lower fte targets. But if we do get money and can grow, how can targets be reestablished? She is resistant about accepting cuts because she doesn’t know the consequences of her decision down the road. We don’t know what next year will look like so she would feel at ease with her choices.

10. Adjournment