Academic Senate  
October 9, 2007  


Proxies: Hall (Deaner), Renning (Manrique), Mulder (Thomas)  

Guests: C. Brown, Demetrulias, Duggan, Jaasma, McNeil, Moore, Novak, Schulz, Wendt  

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman  

20/AS/07/UEPC--GE Director Position, First Reading  

Discussion: Academic Calendar for 2010-11  

Discussion: Course drops, withdrawals, incompletes, and repeats  

Discussion: E-Learning  

Next Academic Senate Meeting:  
Tuesday, October 23, 2007  
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room  

Minutes submitted by:  

1. Call to order at 2:37 pm.  

2. Approval of Agenda-Add as Discussion item 7 b) Change in policy for drops, withdrawals, incompletes and repeats. It was MSP O’Brien/Tynan.  

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 25, 2007-Page 3, 4th paragraph, line 1, to read “Taniguchi advised that the way the PACs are supported is year to year.” Line 3 change “commitment” to “commit.” It was MSP Filling/Taniguchi.  

4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**  

   a. Johnson announced the Provost has established a Strategic Plan Workgroup. The charge states: The Strategic Plan Workgroup will seek input on prioritization and implementation from the larger campus community, including the Academic Senate, and make recommendations for prioritization and implementation to the President’s Executive Cabinet.” Members are: Speaker of the Faculty: Lynn Johnson, Speaker Elect: Mark Thompson, Director of Institutional Research: Kathleen Silva, Vice President for Student Affairs: Stacey Morgan-Foster, Provost: Bill Covino. Faculty member recommended by the Committee on Committees: John Sarraille. The first meeting will be held this Thursday, October 11.  

   b. Dieter Renning announced on the City Council’s agenda tonight is a proposal to rebuild and add on to the Carnegie Arts Center. Members of the building committee have been working for several months to come up with plans, but they have run into a snag. Several city council members are dragging their feet to provide adequate funding for this project. It may come to a head at tonight’s meeting. He urged Senators to come to the meeting tonight to express their support.  

   c. O’Brien reported that AAUP has sent out a list of post Katrina problems higher education is experiencing in the South. They have sanctioned three or four universities for firing faculty.  

   d. O’Brien advised the Faculty and Staff picnic is October 27 at the Faculty Development Center. This is sponsored by the faculty and staff unions. Everything is provided, (food and beverages). Taniguchi reported that thanks to Brian Duggan, they will show a DVD talking about the history of CSU Stanislaus. It will be set up in the reference room.  

   e. Covino advised that Mary Allen, a leader in assessment of student learning, visited our campus for three days last week meeting with various groups. After the interviews, she entered a very positive report. He thanked everyone, especially the program assessment coordinators for their efforts. Thompson asked if the
assessment report will be distributed. Demetrulias stated after she and Rosanne Roy review the report, it will be sent to the Speaker, Council of Deans and the wider campus community. Johnson stated she will distribute to faculty when she receives the report. Demetrulias stated she will also send the report to the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee and the General Education Subcommittee.

f. Covino stated that a telephone meeting was held with the team from WASC last Friday to review the EdD proposal. He stated we were prepared for the worst, but were surprised that the questions were very complimentary and after the interview they said they would proceed without further requirements and go to a site visit. Covino opined that this is a great testimony to the quality of our proposal and the hard work of all involved. The Doctoral degree is on track.

g. Covino announced that the catalog is moving back to an 8 1/2 by 11 format. He welcomes comments or suggestions faculty have. Some questions he has are: Should we make a stronger effort to make a better online catalog? Should we publish a hard copy every year or every two years? Questions of format, indexing have been brought up before so he would like to get the process rolling. Please send comments to him.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

a. Graduate Council
Tynan reported that Graduate Council met on September 20. Graduate enrollment numbers are no less than last year. Graduate School publications are being updated for fall. A form is being created to allow waivers for the 7005/7006 courses. This is when students finish their coursework, but are still working on their graduate project they have to signup for 7005 or 7006 so they can have access to facilities. In some cases where they don’t use the facilities, there is a waiver. There was an update on the EdD for Education, but the majority of time was spent discussing and approving the MS in Nursing.

b. Faculty Affairs Committee
Floyd reported FAC has met twice this semester. They are meeting this Friday. Discussions have focused on personnel issues. FAC is presently deliberating on a Presidential request to change local RPT policy to delegate the final decision to the Provost. FAC has begun discussion to study possible changes in the rules concerning the composition of RPT files. The request came from the Chair of the URPTC. The original discussion and PTR Policy that came through the Senate in 2001 has been found. FAC will be reviewing that.

c. University Educational Policies Committee
Filling reported UEPC has been discussing subcommittee charges. With the revised College restructuring last year, some of the charges should be revised. UEPC discussed a new Concentration for Criminal Justice, changes in the Ethnic Studies Program, the Academic Advising Policy and the GE Director position. At the next meeting the attendance policy (a carryover from last year) will be discussed.

d. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee
Schoenly stated FBAC has met twice. Discussions have focused on the 2007/2008 University budget, fiscal effects of new MPPs, funding of 07/08 sabbaticals, funding to support faculty research and the EMBA Program. FBAC requested and received a pdf of the University budget from Vice President Stephens which has been posted online. The budget includes expenditures but not revenues and figures will require periodic updating. Provost Covino distributed the 07/08 enrollment growth funding by Colleges and the 08/09 allocations for tenure-track positions. Particulars of the university budget will continue to be discussed at future meetings. FBAC has also requested from Vice President Stephens a 5-year hiring schedule of MPP’s for Vice President, Associate Vice President, and Director positions to see how these change from year to year. The Provost reported that the number of sabbaticals have increased for our campus from 9 to 17.

e. Statewide Academic Senate
O’Brien reported the next interim meeting is this Friday. The next plenary is November 12-13.

6. FIRST READING ITEM

a. 20/AS/07/UEPC—Director of General Education
MS Filling/Davis

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus believes that the general education program is an integral and important portion of our academic programs and as such the general education program is
Resolved: That there is a clear and compelling need for a director of general education on our campus, and that the attached position description has the approval of the Academic Senate and be it further

Resolved: That the attached position description be effective and that the search process for the director of general education begin upon approval of this resolution by the President.

Rationale:

This resolution recommends the establishment of a Faculty Director of General Education.

The position incorporates tasks assigned to the former Associate Dean of the College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences, and designates a specific leadership role for faculty in the day-to-day operation of the program. With the break-up of the College of ALS, these tasks have been parceled out to various offices, and filled on a piecemeal basis. This position unites these duties, and does so under faculty leadership and guidance.

The position description (attached) was drafted using the assignment of the Associate Dean of ALS as a template. The draft was then reviewed and revised by GE Subcommittee, after lengthy consideration and consultation with various faculty members, UEPC, and the Provost. The Sub forwarded it to UEPC, who revised the document again in preparation for submission to the Senate body.

There is a clear need for academic leadership in the future direction of the General Education program. While the GE Subcommittee has oversight responsibility for program inclusion and general oversight for assessment of the program, as well as nominal review authority under the provisions of the new Academic Program Review Policy, regular membership turnover leads the Subcommittee to prioritize its month-to-month duties over long-range development. There is no Program Assessment Coordinator attached to the GE program. And there is no office designated to advocate for course development. This position fulfills these needs, in particular the need for continuity and institutional memory.

The GE Program is currently going through an Academic Program Review, its first under the new APR process. As a part of this review, the assessment of the program, long stagnated, needs to become more focused and matured. These tasks are beyond the scope of the Sub in its current configuration, and indeed the first steps toward the completion of these tasks were only completed with the aid of summer stipends. There is clearly an urgent need for the position in the short term. As the program develops its charter (under the terms of the APR process), further decisions about the assessment and maintenance of the program will need to be made. The position and its office are a logical place to promote such discussions and to work with the Sub and the campus community in arriving at the best process to go forward.

The position also oversees the Summit Program (alternative to upper-division GE) and the GE components of First Year Experience, two very successful programs who otherwise would have no designated advocate. A grant proposal is currently being developed to allow additional growth to Summit; without this office, this opportunity will be missed. In addition, the summer enrollment patterns for FYE have no monitor; this task is accomplished as well.

Finally, this position allows faculty to assume leadership for the General Education program, and to do so within the aegis of faculty governance. While the position reports to the Vice Provost (as this authority has been delegated by the Provost), the position also works closely with UEPC, and indeed UEPC will periodically review the need for the position. The position does not substitute for the GE Sub; rather, it coordinates its activities with that body, allowing both to function more effectively. The position has clear responsibilities for broad consultation with GE Sub, ASL Sub, and the Faculty Coordinator for Student Learning, and offers the possibility for renewed GE program assessment development through the Program Assessment Council.

Discussion:

Filling pointed out a couple of changes that were made since the last Senate meeting when this item was on the agenda as a Discussion Item. Not on the attachment, but should be changed on page 7, compensation, item 1 “assigned time 15 units for initial three-year appointment” to read, “assigned time 15 units per annum.” Change
made on Page 6, 10) to read “Attends GE Subcommittee meetings and Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee meetings…” Change made on Page 8, 5) to read “Vice Provost makes final selection after consultation with the UEPC Chair and the GE Subcommittee Chair.” He stated at the last Senate meeting, many expressed a need for a champion for GE. The position description went through a lot of changes from various committees including Senator Scott Davis and himself spending hours discussing it. Davis agreed that the position description involved a lot of consultation. There is some urgency to get the position filled. We need to complete an academic program review on the GE program this year. And there is a long-term need for some vision and an instigator of discussion.

Wendt asked two questions: 1) Is the intention to recommend 15 of 30 units and Filling replied yes. The intention is a 50% position. 2) Is the intention there be days as special consultant and Filling replied we would deconstruct 10 month salary and pro rate it. The work would have to be classified as a special consultant. Demetrulias added that is how we do the Assessment Coordinator position. Summer workdays are negotiated. Sarraille asked if someone teaching 24 units per year would receive 15 units of assigned time and thereby go to teaching 9 units per year and Filling indicated it was his understanding that, yes, it would be 9 units.

Thompson recommended the name of the resolution be changed to “Faculty Director of General Education.” Davis agreed.

There being no further discussion, this will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

7. DISCUSSION ITEM

a. Academic Calendar change—Spring Break

Johnson stated UEPC requested this item be put on the agenda as a discussion item. Filling explained that UEPC was reviewing the 2010/2011 academic calendar and noted that spring break would be in the 10th week of the semester, which is the week after Easter. UEPC wonders if timing the break to coincide with that of the Turlock School District is still important.

Comments:
- This problem would occur only once every 15 or 20 years.
- Student reps should take this issue back to discuss with students.
- All schools take breaks at different times. Some elementary schools are year-round so take no spring break. Some schools take more time at Thanksgiving. Whatever we do, it will accommodate some but not others.
- Ask the departments on accreditation cycles whether a change would fit.
- Take the break around Cesar Chavez Day. It might prevent having to change a Monday to a Friday schedule for example.
- Better air fares may be available if the week break does not occur close to a holiday.
- Ask the students to vote on when they would like to have spring break.
- Any thought given for a rationale? Why aren’t we thinking of standardizing it? Schools are on all different calendars.
- If spring break is around Easter, many students would have a chance to take a break with their children.

Johnson asked Senators to go back to their departments and get input and send to UEPC, via Filling. Student representatives to share this issue with their Senate.

b. Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats

Johnson explained there is a systemwide task force that just completed a study of system policies and practices regarding course drops, withdrawals, incompletes and repeats. Although this has been referred to UEPC, the SWAS Academic Affairs Committee will be meeting this Friday to discuss this. They want our feedback and suggestions, specifically they want to know if we could implement these changes if adopted and what the positive and negative effect would be, and would it be consistent with our mission. The input received today will be sent to them by this Friday and UEPC will send their formal comments later.

O’Brien stated in theory this is good, but he would like to see assurance there are exceptions to the rule. Taniguichi asked if students can only withdraw after census date if they withdraw from all classes. Would this change our
policy and allow withdrawal from individual classes? Johnson asked if that limitation is just something we do on our campus or systemwide? Demetrulias stated our policy says that for documented extreme circumstances one may withdraw from class. She doesn’t know if it is system language.

Taniguchi asked what the second bullet means, “withdrawal from a full semester of coursework counts as 6 of the 18 units.” Johnson will follow up. Filling suggested we take issue with the notion of units being wasted. These failures are sometimes learning experiences. Lawson stated in the Counseling area, they have been getting students out of individual classes after census date. But at the end of the term, they would have to withdraw from all classes. Taniguchi asked if students can withdraw after census date. Demetrulias replied for compelling reasons they can. It involves waiving university requirements. Floyd added that the dean makes the final decision on withdrawals. It goes from the faculty member to the dean. Jaasma noted that the dean approves but Lisa Bernardo, Dean of Admissions makes the final decision.

Peterson stressed the need to let the students off the hook if they show compelling reasons. There is terrible stuff going on with people all the time and she sees it more now as a faculty member. The goal of the CSU is to provide access and that includes people with problems. Mayer asked if some of this comes from abuses. If so, we need to protect our students. Johnson stated one question that came up is, are we trying to address a problem that doesn’t exist?

Eudey noted that many of these students could take an incomplete rather than withdraw. We need to let our students know of this option. And we need to think about how we deal with incompletes and think about the amount of paperwork that goes with incompletes. We need to be more vigilant about tracking what is supposed to happen after an incomplete is granted. And sometimes the way we construct syllabi informs students how accessible we are to requests for help. Many students who ask for help really need it. Some students remain enrolled in classes because they need to keep their financial aid. We need to see how our policies affect the financial needs of our students.

Nagel asked for the background of these recommendations and the cost benefit analysis. It seems punitive. Johnson explained the idea behind it is you have students repeating classes or taking spaces that could have gone to someone else. Thompson questioned how much different this is from current policy? Is it a big change? Peterson replied she does not think we currently have a limit on the number of withdrawals. There was a discussion in UEPC a few years ago limiting the number of course repeats. Thompson asked how this differs from current system policy and Peterson replied she does not know. The DWIR is a symptom of the problem. Thompson stated he does not understand the interest by the CSU in withdrawals prior to transfer. Also on repeats, if the system is going to set limits, students should be able to “spend up to” that limit however they write the 4th bullet to state: “courses can only be repeated if the previous grade was lower than ‘B-’.” That is rewarding poor performance. Sarraille said there has been a lot of discussion about facilitating graduation over the last few years, and this may well be at least partly politically motivated. We are already doing a good job graduating students. Perhaps people are trying to impress the Legislature or address pressures to reduce CSU funding. We may want to appear to be more efficient to produce more students for less.

Borba asked if this policy applies to both undergraduate and graduate students and Demetrulias replied it is for undergraduates only. Taniguchi stated students are different at every campus. It should be at the campus discretion to do this or not. Dempsey questioned what about students who are struggling in classes. For those students, limitations prevent graduation. If they reach the max and they can’t opt out of class any longer, they will quit. Eudey suggested conversations with students during times of DWIR to intervene to insure future success. If we have hard limits, we may lose students unnecessarily.

Johnson suggested we perhaps could recommend that these be campus-by-campus choices. It is less of a concern at a campus that is not impacted, and it can depend on campus demographics. Consensus: Advise the Academic Affairs Committee that we recommend that these be a campus-by-campus choice.

Janz asked if they are soliciting a campuswide response or individual people and Johnson replied either one. But, they were asking each campus to gather information and summarize and send forth. If the ASI would like to send a separate response, she stated she is sure they would welcome it.

8. OPEN FORUM

Brown advised that in MOM, they passed a resolution that said nothing should be offered as eCollege without full review and consent of the department and the faculty that ordinarily teach the course. A part time person was assigned to teach in his area during the summer and the cap was increased to 60 where it was normally 40. This just slipped through the cracks. He expressed disappointment that this was allowed to happen. He stated he had been
assured this would never happen, but it did. O’Brien stated he increasingly is getting applications from people who want to teach online courses for CSUS from remote locations e.g. New York.

Duggan stated the initial intent was to have tenured faculty do the teaching online, but it has been left to chairs and deans to sign off on who gets to teach what. He stated his office has a hands-off approach to the decisions. Tynan questioned what are the policies and procedures around doing this. Brown stated eCollege is still a pilot program. Filling agreed this is the second year of a two-year pilot. It is not a permanent part of pedagogy. UEPC and AS will evaluate the effectiveness of eCollege, Blackboard and Moodle. Johnson added that she is the chair of a task force that will be evaluating the three platforms regarding the differences in cost and the perceived ease of use. They will not be evaluating online learning. The report will state if we are going to have online courses, which platform makes the most sense for us to use. Eudey stated she is doing a lot of online teaching. Her class this past summer filled up quickly. She was asked if she wanted to raise the cap, but she said no, that she preferred to open up another section, which was done. The stipend to develop a course is only offered through eCollege but you do have to teach the course a certain number of times. However, there were no other constraints that went along with agreeing to take the funds. All control is at the department level, so there should be paper work to accompany increasing the caps. There is no university policy that says we have to do it certain way. Thompson stated every time this comes up he asks what are the ways a course max can be changed? The course max is part of the course approval process on the course proposal form that goes through faculty governance. What are the means by which a course maximum may be changed? At some point when issues like this comes up, we need clarification from UEPC. Also, Thompson asked Brown if their issue was just over enrollment or other issues. Brown replied the department felt it wanted full time faculty to teach these classes and it wanted to have the final say about whether to run courses online. As it turned out, it slipped past us. Brown suggested Senators talk this issue over in their departments so they don’t lose control like MOM.

Colnic questioned if the task force is not evaluating the effectiveness of online learning, who is? Johnson replied it is the understanding that it is up to departments to determine suitability of offering online courses. Whether or not we assess online courses at the university level is a decision to be made in the future. Thompson stated the point Colnic made is interesting because this is about pedagogy. There is a question of control and although we can look at the principles from UEPC, faculty should not have to ask if they add something like community service to their course.

Mayer stated he has been won over to eCollege simply because of the access issue. He received very good support from eCollege techs. And there is a huge demand at least during the summer to fulfill GE requirements online. He had 40 students in a class over the summer and turned 50 away. And the quality of students that took eCollege course was high quality for the ones that remained. He stated he has recommended we hire TA’s so we can encourage large enrollments for some of our classes. It could solve problems such as growth and space. But there needs to be some kind of monitoring of online classes.

Duggan advised that in 2005 someone passed guidelines for online courses. He and Koehler make faculty aware of the various options. eCollege is only one way to deliver an online course. We use the term eLearning. Mayer stated he got good support on campus from Duggan and Koehler. eCollege support people were also helpful. However he could have done the course with Blackboard.

Eudey suggested monitoring of classes and class size has to be a department function. CSU East Bay has online courses to help you teach online. Fee waivers are available. She is willing to share information on how to do online learning.

Provost Covino asked for clarification from Brown that his department voted to not offer eCollege next year and Brown replied the department voted to review the decisions and vote whether to approve online courses.

Schulz advised that some courses that require face to face and online (hybrid courses) work very well. Those initial meetings are nice to have. The hybrid model is the best of both worlds. Covino added that we have a small grant to explore hybrid courses in upper division GE.

Filing indicated that he felt, notwithstanding Johnson’s opinion, that the task force on eLearning will produce information evaluative of online learning.

Thompson stated he will follow through with Russell Inman about the problem with ASNET not working.

9. ADJOURNMENT 4:12