

<p>Academic Senate May 12, 2009</p> <p>Present: Bell, Bender, Bice, Black, Brown, Campbell, Colnic, Cotton, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeVries, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Hejka-Ekins, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Keswick, Manrique, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Russell, Silverman, Sniezek, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxies: Broadwater (J. Mayer)</p> <p>Guests: Dean Nael Aly, Lisa Bernardo, Lila DeKatzew, Vice Provost Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Roger Pugh, John Sarraille, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Associate Vice President Wendt</p> <p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>11/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 5/AS/04/UEPC--Academic Program Review, APPROVED</p> <p>12/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Undergraduate Policy on Course Withdrawals, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>13/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Undergraduate Policy on Repeated Courses, UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>14/AS/09/FAC—Amendment to 2/AS/08/FAC—Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy, APPROVED</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, September 22, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
---	--

1. **Call to order**  
2:35pm
2. **Approval of Agenda**  
approved with no changes
3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 5, 2009**  
deferred
4. **Announcements**

Dean Stefanco announced the second lunchtime seminar series speaker, Hua Gao from Criminal Justice will speak tomorrow on heroin users in the People's Republic of China in South Dining, 12:30-1:30. A Fulbright scholar from Belarus will speak on Thursday from 12:30-1:30 in South Dining talking about corruption in post-communist Eastern Europe.

Lilia DeKatzew thanked Senate for their support and for having approved the major in Ethnic Studies. They are grateful and encourage folks to participate in the major.

S. Davis announced the Beer B Que on Saturday at 5pm in Teague Park. Tickets are \$10.

Thompson noted that IDEA evaluations started yesterday, and forms are due on May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Thompson announced that the General Faculty meeting is here in FDC 118 from 2:30-4:30 on Thursday, and then will be followed by a reception in honor of Diana Bowman.

5. **Questions about Committee Reports**  
No questions were posed.

6. **Action Items**
  - a. 11/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 5/AS/04/UEPC—Academic Program Review Procedures

Petrosky noted that on May 7 UEPC had a long meeting to address suggestions from senators and SEC members on the three items for today. Bowman developed truncated/expurgated information on the changes (handout on the table). The Academic Program Review Procedures include a handful of changes. On the top of page 2, the second paragraph was changed to remove reference to the Vice Provost. Next under roles and responsibilities in the first paragraph under faculty governance, a sentence beginning "Changes to the" added the words "APR procedures" and excised "Vice Provost." Under List of Academic Programs, UEPC deleted reference to CSU

Stanislaus and added a statement to elaborate on the “to be developed” parenthetical phrase to indicate the role of the Graduate Council in developing doctoral program procedures. Under Faculty, there might be confusion as to whether or not the original statement was telling people to add IDEA forms, so UEPC added some clarifying language about “collective” expertise, and “collective” actions within the program. Under implementation plan, they added “the department chair” and indicated who else may be included in meetings which is a repeat from one of the appendices. Those are the changes since the document was last submitted to senate.

O’Brien has a couple of things to bring up, which he did at the first reading. He put comments in writing to Petrosky, and O’Brien is sure that these were shared with UEPC. He was pleased with many of the changes made by UEPC, especially the comments about evaluating faculty expertise, because in its original form it appeared to be quasi-RPT. O’Brien thanks Petrosky and UEPC for this work. This is a dense document, and he thanks UEPC for what they have done. However, he still has some concerns. On page 2 under administration, it starts, “the Vice Provost on behalf of the Provost...” He cringed at the last sentence where it talks about academic program development and budgets. The concern is that we’re in a budget crisis, and maybe things getting worse, and we need to gingerly deal with that. At Humboldt they are categorizing programs as 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Tier, indicting they will continue, might continue, or be discontinued. The thought of budgetary processes being included here freaked him out. Are we kind of moving program elimination into the APR?

Petrosky says this goes hand in hand with some of the comments UEPC didn’t necessarily take into account for changes. Some of this comes because members of UEPC are and aren’t in accredited programs and those who are in such programs take the idea of budgetary processes and ~~external~~ external reviewers as a double-edged sword. We can get some kind of recognition in budgetary processes because of what an external reviewer can say. In his own department, due to attrition, they could lose accreditation, and not only are they saying that but accreditors are saying that also, so there is give and take there.

O’Brien made a motion regarding the bottom of page 2 re external reviewers. In third line it says “strongly encourage external reviewers.” He would like to move to remove the word “strongly,” because he admits that his department has been notified that it will be reviewed next year and he is especially sensitive since they will be under this. O’Brien knows from Petrosky that this is common for some programs to have external reviewers, but for his department it is not. He prefers “encouraged” vs. “strongly encouraged” since strongly is a hair short of mandated. Thompson noted that this language is attached to the resolution so we cannot amend it. The concern can be used as an argument against the policy.

The resolution passed by voice vote.

Thompson noted that in UEPC and Graduate Council there was a lot of focus and time on whether this would be mandatory, strongly encouraged, or encouraged, and that this is a point that got a lot of attention in these committees.

b. 12/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Policy on Course Withdrawals

Petrosky referred only to the truncated version. At the May 7 UEPC meeting they discussed comments from senators and SEC members. UEPC is now emphasizing throughout that it is an undergraduate policy, and included this term again under A. They made some language changes to d to replace “except that” with “however a”. Those are the only changes.

S. Davis said “well done A1.” Peterson noted that it may make more sense to say “some classes” rather than “only one” in d.2. It seems that “one” is an odd choice. The intent was to acknowledge that they may be doing well in some but not all courses and it could be possible to not drop them all. Heredia asked if the wording allows them to drop all. Peterson indicated that d.1 allowed that.

Petratos indicated that the new policy is in the favor of the students.

Hejka-Ekins agreed with Peterson that we can change the wording to be as liberal as we could since some students have catastrophic things that occur. Petrosky indicated that the intent of the policy was to be inclusive. Taniguchi suggested changing to “only selected courses” as a friendly amendment. Demetrulias said that the wording here is the exact wording of the Executive Order. A single course issue has been a problem in the past. She is guessing that is why it was one although you can go in between. Is there a way in the rationale or minutes that it is clear that this is the interpretation we are giving without changing the language so that we can have this in place for the fall.

S. Davis said that the phrasing presents it as a choice of one or two. In the executive order is this listed as a list or as a range of choices? Petrosky noted that the wording was seen as convoluted so it was created as a list by UEPC. Thompson remembered hearing that we can be more restrictive, but not less. If the EO says only one course, and we say more than one course, is that less restrictive? Demetrulias believes there is ambiguity in the EO, indicating “courses” plural, so it’s the linguistic presentation that makes this unclear so we could perhaps address this in the rationale.

Colnic thinks practically that there is a form in which you withdraw from all, but that you withdraw from individual classes. There is nothing that says a student can’t submit more than one form. Can we make that change? Thompson noted that we have a problem with making a substantive change. We still have Taniguchi’s friendly amendment but are trying to figure out if we can determine original intent from UEPC. Peterson noted that if we feel the intent is selective, and we can consider this an editorial change, we can incorporate that.

Thompson indicated that we are incorporating the previously mentioned friendly amendment as an editorial amendment. Passed by voice vote. The vote on the resolution was unanimous.

c. 13/AS/09/UEPC—Amendment to 4/AS/05/UEPC—CSU Stanislaus Policy on Repeated Courses

Petrosky noted editorial changes in the rationale in the fourth line to add the word “policy” and in the note included language that allowed permission codes to signify permission. Within the policy itself, they have made clarifications under 3 to include “may” repeat “up to”. In 4 and 5 they noted “these” instead of “the” limits.

Heredia asked about the EO. In the EO it seems to have moved two policies into one. In the EO Repetition of Courses for Forgiveness, and Repetition for Grades Averaged seemed separate but in the policy they seem like they’re together. She was confused because the wording put them together in one policy. Petrosky noted that grade forgiveness only works on the first 16 semester units, after that everything is averaged. Petrosky noted that there are limits on grade forgiveness, and then after that they must be averaged. In a voice vote, the resolution passed unanimously.

d. 14/AS/09/FAC—Amendment to 2/AS/08/FAC—Temporary Faculty Range Elevation Policy

Hejka-Ekins updated Senate on the temporary faculty range elevation policy on page 31 of the last agenda. At the end of the last senate meeting FAC members noted that on page 32.b in the section entitled evaluation criteria that the language in the policy was not what they had wanted to say. They made some additional clarifications to the additions that they put in. Bowman sent out the changes electronically last week. Hejka-Ekins read the new language under b that “Elevation to range B will normally require *either a discipline appropriate terminal degree for the department’s discipline*, or a significant amount of professional experience and development as listed below. *Elevation to ranges C and D shall require a discipline-appropriate terminal degree.*” The rest is the same as originally written.

Peterson noted that this policy is so people can be considered for range elevation, but that they are still going to be evaluated. They have to have shown that they have made significant achievements. She gave a Bill Gates example, suggesting that he would not be eligible for a range elevation under our current policy because he doesn’t have an advanced degree. As Nagel pointed out, the person will have been here for eleven years before this even comes up. Sarraille agreed with Peterson that it doesn’t happen all that often, that there may be only a few famous stories of people who were outstanding contributors who didn’t have a terminal degree. In Math there was a guy in his sub discipline who was an expert in ring theory and didn’t have a PhD, just a Master’s and any place he taught they were lucky to get him. We should allow the possibility for making such exceptions. O’Brien said they went through this in his department this year. The candidate submitted a full file, was evaluated by the department RPT, the dean met with the candidate and there was a positive result. There are numerous steps, not just a signing off. The candidate had to put forward a lot of information. Filling noted that this is a procedure that allows someone to apply for a range elevation. Period. No different status is achieved, just a raise in pay.

Petratos requested a paper ballot. 34 yes, 3 no. The resolution passed.

## 7. Open Forum

Sarraille had a concern about something that might affect pedagogy and faculty workload. Around the campus course caps are being lifted/raised for certain courses and it’s his understanding that generally those course maximums are part of approved course descriptions by curriculum committees so that if you want to change the cap for the course you have to file a change of course form and take it through the curriculum committee and then it goes through UEPC. But if we’re in various places we’re increasing the numbers of students in certain kinds of classes it means that the students are not receiving enough attention or we’re throwing too much work on faculty members and not giving them enough unit credit. If it just gets done in an impromptu fashion there’s a chance that these numbers will ratchet up and could get to ridiculous levels. He’s curious about how people feel about the process.

Nagel has a couple of questions. First, he inquired at what point we can run into trouble with the fire marshal. The other is at what point someone might regard this as a grievable increase in one’s workload. This is something someone might consider.

Thompson thinks this is a question that hasn’t been answered. Even in a chair’s meeting in CHSS he was surprised at the level of disagreement and asked if the course caps are being changed, who is making the change? If it’s the chair then it’s something the chairs have to answer for themselves if they are going to take on that authority. Thompson agrees that it hasn’t been addressed, but maybe UEPC is the place to discuss this. Cotton, who does program assessment, is concerned about the impact on student learning outcomes. In a class with 40 rather than 30, it’s a challenge to make sure that all students are being taught and hard to achieve student learning outcomes.

O’Brien said this goes back to program review documents. He met with the director of Institutional Research who is sharing data on majors, etc. One of the things he told us about was the very high graduation rate of CSU Stanislaus, second in the system. There is some kind of irony that we’re potentially being forced to make classes larger for budget reality, and at the same time we may be hurting how many students graduate by not giving the students the attention they deserve. We’re at the top of the class in the CSU for retention and graduation, but as we go down this slippery slope this number can go down.

Stefanco noted that there may be dissension in CHSS because there are some cases when faculty want to increase class size. If there is a faculty member who wants to teach a course that doesn’t generate a lot of student interest, there is a decision to allow a small class to be taught and make up for this by increasing the number of students in another class. It’s not a dean’s office issue, but one done at the department level. Or if departments decide to reduce the number of classes a teacher teaches, they can allow them to get double credit for a course with twice the students, and it’s a decision made at a department level. Thompson is asking what is the authority of the department to do that – it’s something he hasn’t gotten an answer to. Thanks for bringing that up.

Sarraille didn’t know for sure what we have written down. Maybe we should look into that. If there is policy that says we’re supposed to do this a certain way, we should give that some more weight. We shouldn’t just disregard policy in support of expediency as a general operating procedure. If we can make one kind of change to a course without going through the curriculum committee, what else can we

change? What are the parameters there? It seems we should have something fairly specific in place for what the procedure should be for changes in a course.

Novak says that there are a lot of things that are changing in courses that are not in the original document, and wouldn't want to go to a committee about this. Where this occurs originally are in the thought process of the originator of the course and a discussion at the department. The course proposal form asks for an optimal size, but he's not sure there is a procedure for making changes in our courses. We make so many changes related to textbooks, assignments that weren't in the original proposal, many that were submitted decades ago. Some maybe should be updated as faculty go along.

Filling pointed out that there might be a difference in pedagogic changes in using new textbooks or doubling class size. The analogy may not work.

Tan said that regarding fire marshal issues, she teaches televised classes, and in the Merced class she was told a student couldn't get a seat because the number of seats available were 8 but the class size is listed as 30 something. It's not a reflection of what is in the physical classroom. She requested that the number be changed.

Petratos said a few weeks ago they raised the K12 class size, and there was a revolution. What he sees is a strange dilemma in higher education. Community colleges have budget protection, and we are here saying it's okay to make changes in higher education. It's like saying we don't value higher ed the same as other schooling. It's a problem with attitude.

Brown was thinking back to the 90s when the size of two classes changed. He went through his chair and dean, and nobody really knew how it happened. He called over to MSR and staff members got it adjusted back down, and it was a kind of arbitrary process. It might make sense for UEPC to have a policy about that. Perhaps the Department chair in consultation with faculty teaching the course can make the decision. It might be a good idea to have something that the departments throughout the university can know.

Sarraille, responding to Novak, noted that the course maximum is on the form. In some cases it could be fairly arbitrary if in a class where you lecture, assign readings, and give multiple choice tests, having a few extra students may not matter. If you have a class where you are a part time lecturer teaching a drama class and individually coach acting or directing and have to spend time with each person and work through problems, if your course load goes from 10 to 20 or 25 students, even in consultation between the chair and faculty member, there could be a power differential problem involved if that's the extent of what happens. It's something that cries out for a little deeper analysis.

Demetrulias noted that her office is the one responsible for the entering of curricular information into the system. There are only two ways to change any element of the course, whatever is originally approved, or if a formal course modification is submitted via a form or memorandum. Anecdotal information that something is randomly changed is not true. The EO about "normal class limits" is an old EO from 1976 or so, and we still code those courses with C, K, and S factors tied to class level and pedagogy. Normal limits tend to govern size, but you put on the form the desired size. That's what is entered into the file. The C, K, and S factors also affect our ability to schedule facilities. If we try to justify more lab or studio space, it does have implications beyond our curricular impact.

Petrosky responded to the issue of department chair and faculty making decisions together. He noted that since Brown has never had a department chair who is a jerk, he's not aware of the possibility that a department chair might align with sycophantic faculty in a way that creates a policy that has its own inertia. They could align and create expectations for faculty. The conversation might be broader.

Young is not advocating for large numbers, but noted that there is some research that we might consider in our teacher conversations. There is some educational research that suggests that class size numbers have greater significance for younger learners than for adult learners. To compare third grade and higher ed may not be precisely comparable. There is some research that indicates that unless class size is decreased significantly, the benefit of reducing class size is not significant. 30-40 is somewhat arbitrary with respect to adult learners, which is less drastic than doing so in the K-12 classroom.

Campbell discussed the setting of a waiting list number, then the students who really must have the class can get in. There is still a handful of students who must have the class, so we need to address what proportion of the class comes through the waiting list.

Moore wanted to respond to the idea of arbitrary when making a decision about caps. In COA decisions about enrollment cap increases or decreases have not been arbitrary. In some cases he's initiated discussions about size to see if given the situation we're in that we have an opportunity for students to take a course, but things we discuss are the ability for the professor to deliver the course to the students and capacity in the facility. We are not going to pack students in a dangerous way. We look at the nature of the course, the professor teaching it, and the facility. Sometimes we've been able to increase numbers, and sometimes every semester they go over the cap by x amount of students so ostensibly the caps have been increased already.

Brown wanted to say for the record that he didn't mean to imply that Demetrulias' office created a problem. He thinks it was a clerical error. There is a number on the document that indicated the classroom size, and they did at the time up the size. He didn't mean to belign Demetrulias' office.

Thompson wanted to address the effect on students, the pedagogical part, and it's also a workload issue. What are the student learning outcomes and the effect on your life? In English we have small cap courses for ENGL 1000, that are now baccalaureate classes that are capped at 15, but when they moved to that they were concerned about moving from 12 to 15 students and having that greater range of student ability and how that can impact faculty ability to give developmental feedback on the writing. You can't leave off the effect on the instructor.

Nagel wanted to note the workload issues here. The difference between 30 and 40 is an incredible difference in workload. Because of CFA work he's aware of a challenge in filing workload grievances because prior to filing a grievance faculty have voluntarily been forgiving/accommodating to others. Heredia doesn't want to lose contact with teachers because they don't have enough time to meet with students.

Filling looked online and the proposals do indeed include optimum and maximum. There is not a mechanism where someone compares who is registered with what is on the course proposal forms.

Eudey encouraged the senate to refer this to UEPC for consideration to ensure that we had a clear policy and process in place addressing the range of implications of changing course capacities.

Sarraille reminded all that this issue of workload and pedagogy are two sides of the same coin. If you increase workload there will be pedagogical consequences. Depending on how you're feeling today it may be primarily a workload issue, but then after talking to your students it's a pedagogy issue.

Hejka-Ekins supports Eudey's suggestion. The biggest mistake in her career is that she always errs on the side of letting students in. When we have more students than classes, she lets them in, and she's paid a big price for that over the years. She's never reconciled that. It's hard to set boundaries. It has had a toll on her health and well-being. The program keeps going, but it's a significant issue.

Garcia agreed with this being a workload and pedagogy/teaching/learning issues and it's bigger than that. The bigger issue speaks to the need for transparency in the budget. Our decision to take on more students is connected to student access, to whether we can keep staff, part time faculty, and administrators. We can only make informed decisions about class sizes if we understand how we are spending our money.

Thompson managed to hold on to the turkey leg the entire year without giving it up to argue the point, and will give it up now so he can make a motion. Thompson moves to refer this to UEPC for discussion. Seconded by O'Brien. Approved by voice vote.

Thompson said he was glad that this came up in open forum so his last discussion as speaker was on this issue. He would have brought up advising if others didn't bring up an issue. Thank you to all, thank you to the senate. We are adjourned.

## **8. Adjournment**

3:50pm