

<p>Academic Senate November 6, 2012</p> <p>Present: Bice, Floyd, Burroughs, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Johnson, Littlewood, Manrique, Marcell, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p>Excused: Avwundiogba, Broadwater, R. Floyd, N. Stessman, and Kane.</p> <p>Proxies: Mark Grobner for Marina Gerson.</p> <p>Guests: Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, Reza Kamali, Glenn Pillsbury, and John Sarraille.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second Reading of 12/AS/12/UEPC-Resolution for a Standard Response System. The resolution passed.</p> <p>Second Reading of 13/AS/12/UEPC-Credit Hour Policy. The resolution passed.</p> <p>Second Reading of 14/AS/12/UEPC-Academic Calendar Policy. The resolution was tabled to the March 26, 2013 Senate Meeting.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: December 4, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Cathlin Davis, Clerk</p>
---	--

1. Call to order

2:04pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 18, 2012

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, Reza Kamali, Glenn Pillsbury, and John Sarraille.

5. Announcements

Eudey shared that Ximena Garcia is having surgery on her foot this Thursday. She will be out for several weeks, but she will be doing some work from home. Expect delays getting return phone calls and emails. She will be available by email starting next week.

Strahm said to be sure to vote yes on Prop. 30 and no on Prop. 32.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

None.

7. Second Reading Items:

12/AS/12/UEPC – Resolution for a Standard Response System

Johnson noted that this resolution returns unchanged from the last time. There was a request that we consider a review in 2 years, but UEPC didn't believe that it would have the intended result. They felt that if we are going to expect the administrators to adhere to policies we should as well, and we shouldn't put something into a policy that we may not follow. UEPC is recommending that the resolution move forward as written.

There being no comments, the resolution moved to a vote. Results of the vote 38 Yes, 4 No, and 2 abstained. The resolution passed.

b. 13/AS/12/UEPC – Credit Hour Policy

Johnson stated that UEPC considered the concerns raised by the Senate and felt that they were valid and relevant to the policy. UEPC suggested some revisions that they hope now adequately address the concerns that were raised by the Senate.

Instead of syllabi, the reference will be to credit hours during the initial course proposal. Also included for senators' information is a copy of the review form that WASC uses when they review credit hours and information from the federal regulations.

The Provost thinks that we should add language to it C2 under Procedures where it says *"Application of the Credit Hour Policy shall be reviewed during the Academic Program Review process to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable and appropriate to degree level."*

The word *"periodically"* implies that syllabi will only be reviewed during the academic review process and he thinks that the original language is much better because chairs on committees, Deans, and others should be able to review syllabi whenever it is appropriate. Therefore, he is not comfortable with the language and doesn't think he'd be able to support it.

Johnson said that this was suggested to UEPC and they considered that but they didn't see any language that would prohibit the review of syllabi if it was appropriate. If there ever was an issue that came up, perhaps a particular course was not meeting the expectations of the credit hour policy; UEPC didn't see anything in this policy that prohibited a review.

Colnic noted that the syllabi can be reviewed for various reasons at various times. This would mandate considering the credit hours during the APR process and it doesn't prohibit review for other reasons.

Eudey noted that we have other policies in place that allow for review of syllabi at other times and we have a blanket policy that covers this concern. This is a subcomponent of that and we need to pay attention to credit hours. This policy is saying that these are the times that we must take that into account. She wonders if hearing that interpretation would make it more likely that the Provost would recommend this if the Senate passes this policy in its current form.

Jaasma noted that as written it would have to wait for the 7th year.

Nagel reminded the Senate that we can't amend the policy as a second reading.

Scheiwiller wants clarification on the additional hours outside of the classroom. In addition to the two hours does that mean you can have 3 or 4 hours? Is there a loophole that the student can say you're expecting too much from me in your class?

Johnson said that these are just guidelines. It's going to differ from student to student and no one is keeping track. If you look at the amount of work, does it look like the amount of time a reasonable person would take to complete?

The Provost noted that it's the faculty member who decides what's appropriate for 2 hours of work not the students. He has a question about item C2. He doesn't recall why we decided to change the wording to include Academic Program Review as opposed to something else or not making the change.

Johnson said that when UEPC looked at the credit hour review checklist from WASC, they have the periodic review process noted. They picked this because it was on the checklist. Provost Strong would prefer that there be language included that the syllabi would be reviewed as appropriate. The way it is now, he has the same concern as earlier.

Strahm asked if it isn't implicit in the fact that there isn't any other prohibition listed in C2. There isn't anything in here that says you can't do something.

Johnson said that when we have a policy that calls for something, isn't there always the possibility that it can be reviewed as needed?

The Provost is thinking about the unusual case where someone doesn't want their syllabi reviewed and they go back to this policy as cited as being done during the APR Process. He thinks this policy would be a lot stronger if it included a statement that syllabi could be reviewed as needed.

Colnic said that he remembers our colleagues having concerns about the syllabi police. This is not the issue of reviewing syllabi; it's about using syllabi to review credit hours. Johnson has two questions. If the words at a minimum were added, would that satisfy the Provost? Maybe per the Provost.

Johnson's second question is if it would be acceptable to the Senate as the whole? Thompson would like to hear the concerns the Provost has in the current language. He'd like to know specifically what language is being used that says someone could argue you couldn't examine the syllabus.

The Provost stated that it says that "Application of the Credit Hour Policy shall be reviewed during the APR process." If it doesn't happen then, it might be conflicting with this policy. He

can see it being put forth and causing us some difficulties. He thinks that more judicious language would be good.

Thompson agrees with what the Provost is saying, but questions what that has to do with someone looking at someone's syllabus.

Provost Strong noted that the original language that was noted before was fine with him. With the current language there is some implication that there is a certain time for the syllabus to be reviewed and that is during the APR process.

McGhee asked that, if Senate returns this resolution to UEPC, the language change address the Provost's concern. Although, he thinks we're blurring two issues. This is a policy for reviewing credit hours, not syllabi. He would assume that there are other things beside the syllabi that would be looked at in evaluating the credit hour policy. You're going to look at things in total, not just the syllabi. It's an ingredient in the process, but it's not the only thing being reviewed.

Nagel asked if there was a motion to table the resolution.

The Provost moved that this resolution be returned to UEPC so that the language could be discussed so he can support it.

Johnson asked if they add the words "at a minimum" would that be a change that the Provost could support. Yes, per the Provost.

Thompson asked what difference do you think those words will make?

McGhee thinks that in those rare instances that the Provost is referring to there would be a chance for someone to object to the process of reviewing the credit hours for a particular class. By adding "at a minimum" that would review that objection. It doesn't require you to review it more often.

Sarraille stated he was resisted the temptation to start giving a lecture on what words mean. You can go consult your own version of Alice in Wonderland. Senate or UEPC can add a couple of words that won't change the meaning but the difference is that the Provost will recommend that it be signed.

Eudey said that if the content doesn't change and it gets it through the process that's a good thing. The language of "periodically" was a problem last time. She thinks that we have university policies, and we have expectations in terms of Carnegie hours that mandate that any time we believe the assigned credit hours are wrong we must review it. There is no way that this policy could be used to say that a course can't be reviewed. There are other more powerful policies that would come into play. For that reason, she doesn't see a need to postpone a vote on this. But if we're not in a hurry to pass this, and if this makes a couple of people more comfortable with it, it can go back to UEPC.

Regalado thinks it would be a waste of time to send it back to UEPC. Each department has its own curriculum committee that can review any syllabi for any reason. That's already being done at the level of the department, where any review process should be.

The addition of the words "at a minimum" addresses one of the concerns, but was the other concern that we must address this during the Academic Program Review process?

Yes, per Johnson but you don't have to gather specific data on the amount of work. You review the course and determine if the number of hours is appropriate.

Results of the vote on the motion to return this to UEPC, 20 No and 18 Yes.

This item remains on the floor as a second reading.

Johnson asked if she can withdraw the resolution and have it go back to UEPC.

Thompson noted that this was something that was put on the floor of the Senate and a majority of the Senators voted to keep it here. He doesn't think Johnson should withdraw it.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that if we pass this, does that mean the Provost will recommend to the President that he not approve it?

It troubles McGhee that we're talking about reviewing syllabi when this is about reviewing credit hours. He would approach the issue of reviewing syllabi differently. The Provost is mentioning the ability to review syllabi and that's a different issue and we shouldn't confuse the two. This is not what we're talking about here.

The Provost noted that this a good point. The policy with the new language says "*Evidence to support credit hour assignments includes course syllabi, course learning objectives, assignment schedules, and class schedules identifying the times that classes meet (if applicable).*" He thinks that his point is even stronger when you consider the other evidence that should be reviewed. The notion that credit hours are reviewed every seven years seems highly problematic to him.

Thompson asked if this also means that we only review course objectives every seven years if someone objected to it.

Vote on the resolution as it stands. Results of vote: 30 Yes, 11 No. The resolution passed as it stands.

c. 14/AS/12/UEPC – Academic Calendar Policy

Johnson said this is a resolution recommending a small change to the current policy. The changes that UEPC is recommending are not substantial. They are removing some of the language that moved to the credit hour policy. The other change was providing 4 non-instructional days when resources like Blackboard would not be available.

The discussion at the last Senate meeting had nothing to do with the suggested revisions that we brought forward, which were not substantial. Instead, the discussion was primarily about an issue that has been considered a number of times in the past with the same outcome: the alignment of spring break with a Christian holiday. While we understand that valid arguments exist for establishing a fixed time for spring break that has no religious connections, we are also aware that this matter was thoroughly explored only three years ago. We are reluctant to revisit this issue again so soon. Other issues raised in the Senate related to the re-naming of Columbus Day and the President's authority to determine when holidays will be held. The current proposed revisions do not modify current policy in these areas. The holiday name is established at the system level, as is the President's authority to determine when certain holidays will be recognized. We request that the proposed policy revisions move forward unchanged from the first reading.

Petrosky fully understands the arguments made last time in regard to spring break. The first one was regarding our "thorough examination" three years ago. He also understands the perspective that it's not us who are initiating this, but he thinks that the incorporation of another institution's ill-conceived policy into our policy is a mistake.

Petrosky moved to table this item to the first meeting of the spring semester to give UEPC time to consider this issue. Seconded by Silverman.

There were questions about the process and UEPC's schedule and further discussion over when the time certain for this item to return to Senate would be. March 26 was given as a possible date.

Results of the vote on tabling to March 26, 2013 was 21 Yes and 20 No.

Tabled this item to the March 26, 2013 Senate meeting to allow UPEC time to consider this issue.

8. Discussion Items
None.

9. Open Forum
None.

10. Adjournment
3:04pm