

BLP Report to the Senate Executive Committee
February 26, 2007

The Institute for Social Justice & Equity (ISJE)

Dr. Sharon Elise joined BLP as the representative for the ISJE proposal. We had the proposal with budget spreadsheet, and previous responses from Dr. Elise to the Senate's Executive Committee questions about the ISJE proposal. The charge of BLP was to examine the proposal for its budgetary implications.

We noted that the budget was far more detailed than those that accompanied previous proposals for Centers and Institutes. We did not want to penalize a proposal because they tried to accurately reflect all the expenses involved. Our concern was that it was very expensive in the start-up phase. Dr. Elise indicated that the proposers had reviewed the proposal in an attempt to cut some expenses in the earlier phase, when it is supported solely by internal funding. Dr. Elise indicated that graduate interns might be used instead of administrative staff initially. Computers were reduced from two to one. Travel was cut. Projected space needs could be delayed until after the first few years. The cost of the baseline survey could be the responsibility of the new Diversity and Educational Equity Coordinator.

The proposers have submitted a request to Academic Affairs for funding from Strategic Initiative monies. BLP recommended the proposal also be submitted to the Student Affairs division since they are also heavily involved in the proposed ISJE. The Strategic Initiative proposal had a budget of slightly more than \$77,000 for the first year, reduced from the original projection of \$115,654.

BLP thought the proposal underestimated the expense of summer support for the faculty director. The proposal asks for one-month summer support, when in reality, the director would probably be working year-round. BLP suggested that a twelve-month appointment should be requested for the first two years; in year three when an Associate Director hire is projected, that person could cover the summer.

BLP expressed concern with the response to the question of "what happens if outside sources of funding are no longer available." The response, "We request a commitment from the university that the Institute will always be funded and supported" seemed to unfairly advantage the ISJE. Dr. Elise explained the intent was a philosophical commitment to the Institute, and that in times of budget cuts the Institute would not "go out of business." Dr. Elise clearly understood that the ISJE would be subject to the mandatory review process. BLP suggested wording the response "Subject to successful review, we request that internal support would continue." That does not imply a commitment of funding at the budgeted level if budget cuts were necessary. Support at the University sometimes becomes "life-support" for temporary periods.

BLP thought the proposers should be more specific about activities that would be done by the Institute in the first year. Dr. Elise explained the strong research component in the proposal which included activities involved in coordinating research efforts to study social justice.

The BLP committee would like to express our appreciation to Dr. Elise for her willingness to meet with the committee and her responsiveness to our suggestions. BLP requested that the Strategic Initiative proposal be forwarded to the Executive Committee along with this report of our conversation with Dr. Elise.

UCC questions about the review of the MSW P-Form:

1. In which college will the MSW be located, will there be a college level review?
2. The originator of the MSW program is no longer at the university. Can the P-Form still be presented to the senate?
3. UCC would like to get some kind of guarantee that a person will be appointed to work with the committee to make changes to the P-Form.
4. If UCC starts to review the MSW program, UCC would like to have an appointee from Sociology or another closely related department at the UCC meetings.

EXTENDED STUDIES: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

The Extended Studies program at California State University San Marcos provides increased access to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education and thereby contributes to the lifelong learning opportunity of students and community members, and to the continued health and economy of the communities served by the university.

As an educational unit of the university, Extended Studies is subject to the regulations of the State of California, the California State University, and CSU San Marcos. This document provides guidance for implementation of the applicable regulations and covers the following types of instruction.

A. Courses that may be used to satisfy requirements for a degree awarded by the university ("~~university credit courses~~") – these include:

- 1) Special session courses: Courses listed in the university's catalog and offered in special sessions utilizing alternative times, locations, or modes of delivery. ~~(Special Sessions);~~
- 2) Contract credit/Special session courses: Courses carrying university credit, approved/established by an academic department and approved by the Academic Senate, but not listed in the university's catalog, which are designed primarily to address the needs of a specified client group or audience. ~~(Contract Credit/Special Session);~~
- 3) Open University courses: Courses offered to non-matriculated students on a space-available basis. ~~(Open University).~~

B. Courses that may not be used to satisfy requirements for a degree awarded by the university (noncredit courses) – these include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Courses which lead to certification of particular skills.
- 2) Courses intended for professional development that award continuing education units.
- 3) Courses which serve the intellectual and avocational interests of members of the community.

C. Courses that award university credit that may not be used to satisfy requirements for a degree awarded by the university (extension credit).

II. UNIVERSITY CREDIT COURSES

A. Extended Studies courses and programs offered for university credit must have been approved by the CSUSM Academic Senate or the CSU statewide Academic Senate, the dean of Extended Studies, ~~and~~ the president or designee, and the appropriate college/library. These courses are part of the university's current curriculum, and can also be courses designated "Special Topics." The appropriate Form E or Form ET must be used to obtain the necessary approvals.

DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSES

**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

Definition

This policy defines a Community Service Learning (CSL) course, provides a procedure for recognizing existing courses, and provides a recommendation for the use of companion CSL courses

Authority

President of CSU San Marcos.

Scope

The curriculum of CSU San Marcos.

DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSES**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

I. POLICY DEFINITION

Community Service Learning (CSLLS) is a structured learning experience within an academic course. The service work is directed toward the achievement of course learning objectives and also toward making meaningful contributions to the areas of need identified by the community being served.

The service activity is used to clarify, illustrate, challenge, or stimulate additional thought about the topics covered in the classroom. Structured ~~W~~ritten and/or oral reflection ties the service experiences to the academic content of the course and also provides students with the opportunity to develop or strengthen their awareness of the relationship between the course material and societal needs, a service ethic, and their role as citizens.

The community service could take on a variety of forms. Examples include the following:

- Direct service to people in need
- Policy analysis
- Community outreach and education
- Program assessment and improvement of community resources;
- Organization for action on social, health, safety, or environmental issues;

The service activity should correspond with and must be appropriate to the student's level of academic preparation. Activities must take place only at sites approved by the instructor and under contract with the University in accordance with University risk management procedures. An "Informed Consent Waiver" must be completed when a non-CSUSM-approved site is selected, and should only be considered by the instructor under extraordinary and compelling circumstances.

A Community Service Learning course includes:

- Explicit learning objectives and explanation in the syllabus of the role of the service experience in attaining those objectives;
- Preparation in class for the service activity to increase the student's understanding of the community context that the student will be entering, needs and issues they may encounter, standards of conduct expected of them, etc.;
- Ongoing, structured, critical reflection with regular instructor feedback that ties the community experience with the academic course content, thus enhancing both; and
- Evaluation that is based on the quality of the student's learning; not just the completion of certain hours of service; and a grading weight that is proportionate to the community service learning component of the course.

The time allotted to the community service learning portion of the course includes the preparation and analysis time and the time for written and oral reflection as well as the actual time spent in the community. While, typically, the largest portion of time in community

DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSES**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

service learning would be in the service activity, time allotted for ongoing critical reflection should be substantial as well.

The criterion used to determine whether the community service learning makes enough of a contribution to the achievement of course objective for the course to qualify for designation as a Community Service Learning course is that at least 15% of the students' grades [ds1] will be based on the community service learning portion of the course. It is suggested that the service consist of at least 20 hours of direct, academically-relevant community service.

II. Procedure: Recognition of Existing Courses **PROCEDURES RECOGNITION OF EXISTING COURSES**

If all sections of an existing course will meet the definition given above, then the department chair (or program director, or associate dean) should submit a brief memo to that effect to the Catalog and Curriculum Coordinator in the Office of Academic Programs so that the courses can be so coded at the course level.

If some sections, but not all sections, of a course will meet the definition, then the department chair (or program director, or associate dean) should identify the community service learning section(s) to the Academic Scheduler and Space Coordinator in the Office of Academic Programs when the class schedule is under construction.

III. Recommendation: Creating Companions to Existing Courses **CREATING COMPANIONS TO EXISTING COURSES**

There are situations where it may be desirable to create a Community Service Learning course that would operate in tandem with, and supplement another course (referred to here as the "primary" course) which may or may not itself be a Community Service Learning course. This recommendation suggests how such a companion CSL course might be used to reinforce the academic material and learning objectives in the primary established course. If the primary course did not already have a community service learning component, then the companion CSL course would offer the additional learning strategy of community service learning, and if the primary course did already include community service learning, then the companion course would provide an opportunity to increase the quantity of the community service learning.

The proposal for a CSL companion course should specify that the primary course is a co-requisite. When both the primary and companion courses are offered, students registering for the primary course would have the option of also registering for the CSL companion course, in which they would participate in community service learning (or in additional community service learning) and the reflection activity associated with the service experience or the additional

DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSES**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

service experience. For instance, there could be a primary course called XYZ 350 carrying 3 units of credit, and a cCommunity sService lLearning companion course called XYZ 350C, carrying an additional unit of credit; students could register for either XYZ 350 alone, or the pair: XYZ 350 and XYZ 350C.

Like other service learning courses, the companion CSL course syllabus would explicitly integrate the role of the service activity in attaining the overall primary course objectives. The course would include preparation for entry into the service; ongoing structured critical reflection with instructor feedback to tie the service experience to the academic course content; and evaluation that is based on the quality of the student's learning and not just the completion of certain hours of service. In the case where there was no community service learning in the primary course, the CSL companion course might include in-class time as well as in the community time, in order to include the necessary preparation and reflection. If, however, the established, primary course is also a community service learning course with in-class reflection, it is possible that the companion course might consist primarily of additional service hours with which to deepen the student's experience. It would be important, however, to ensure sufficient student reflection and feedback and enough contact to support the students with their increased community involvement. A one-unit CSL companion course should include 45 hours of direct, academically relevant community service.

- 49 B. Instructors who teach Extended Studies courses offered for university credit must be
50 approved in advance and in writing by the department chair or program director of the
51 appropriate discipline and the appropriate college/library dean each time a course is taught.
52
- 53 C. Extended Studies will obtain student evaluations of each Extended Studies course offered
54 for university credit and will provide copies to the instructor, the appropriate department
55 chair or program director, and the appropriate college/library dean.
56
- 57 D. Only non-matriculated students may enroll in courses available through the Extended
58 Studies Open University program. Students who have been disenrolled from the university
59 may enroll in Open University courses only with the prior permission of Enrollment
60 Services and course instructor.~~Both matriculated and non-matriculated students, except~~
61 ~~those who are disenrolled from the university, may enroll in courses available through the~~
62 ~~Extended Studies Open University program.~~
63

64

65 III. COURSES OFFERED WITH NON-DEGREE UNIVERSITY CREDIT
66

- 67 A. Extension credit provides non-degree units and allows CSUSM to offer a wider array of
68 credit courses to a larger audience and have these units appear on a CSU transcript. These
69 are typically professional advancement courses that are credit worthy, but not applicable to a
70 degree or part of the standard CSUSM curriculum. These courses are developed to meet
71 special needs of particular groups or communities, e.g. K-12 teachers; the extension credit
72 that they confer denotes an investment of time and accomplishment comparable to that
73 required in established university courses.
74
- 75 B. Courses that ~~would~~ carry extension credit ~~would be~~ are numbered in a series ~~outside of the~~
76 ~~current other than those used for university~~ degree courses, ~~perhaps an 800/900/1000 series,~~
77 and carry the prefix of the corresponding CSUSM department. Extension credit courses
78 ~~would be~~ are not ~~be~~ listed in the academic catalog.
79
- 80 C. All such courses and instructors ~~would~~ require the review and approval of the corresponding
81 college/department, in a manner similar to ~~what that which~~ special session and/or special
82 topics courses require.
83

84

85 IV. COURSES OFFERED WITHOUT UNIVERSITY DEGREE CREDIT
86

- 87 A. Extended Studies courses offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit may award
88 continuing education units, certification of particular skills, or certificates of completion.
89
- 90 ~~1. —~~ Documents attesting these awards must clearly specify the nature of the award in
91 order to avoid confusion with award of a degree.
92
- 93 B. Extended Studies courses offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit are subject to the
94 approval of the dean of Extended Studies and the president or designee but are not subject to
95 approval by the CSUSM Academic Senate.
96

1. When planning a course or program without CSU San Marcos degree credit, Extended Studies shall inform the deans of the appropriate colleges/library, who shall notify the faculty of the appropriate disciplines. The communication shall specify the course or program's:
 - a1) purpose;
 - b2) intended audience;
 - c3) content;
 - d4) instructor qualifications; and
 - e5) sites and facilities.
2. Each time it offers a course without CSU San Marcos degree credit, Extended Studies shall consider:
 - a1) the appropriateness of intended sites and facilities;
 - b2) the qualifications, teaching interests, and availability of CSU San Marcos faculty members in the appropriate disciplines; and
 - c3) the qualifications, teaching interests, and availability of lecturers for the course.
3. Extended Studies will contract directly with instructors of courses offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit.
4. Extended Studies will obtain student evaluations of each Extended Studies course offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit and will provide copies to the instructor. Evaluations will be retained for three years and will be available for inspection by the dean of Extended Studies and other university personnel in accordance with applicable campus policies.

V. REVIEW AND EVALUATION

- A. The dean of Extended Studies will provide to the Provost a report of the progress of Extended Studies, including an overview of the types of courses and programs offered, enrollment data, their collaboration with academic departments, locations of where the courses or programs were held, and an assessment of the success of these programs in meeting the unit's goals and objectives. This annual report will be available by September of each year and presented to the Academic Senate as an Information Item. The report will provide an assessment of the prior fiscal year's activities and a self-evaluation which addresses
 1. the quality of the Extended Studies programs and courses;
 2. the adequacy of the curriculum in meeting the needs of students and the community; and
 3. the adequacy of the sites and facilities used.

- B. As a way to seek the active collaboration and consultation of the Academic Senate in course and program planning and evaluation, Extended Studies will include at least one NEAC-appointed faculty member from each college and one from the Library to serve on its Advisory Council. These appointments will be made according to the NEAC calendar and will begin in September of each year. The dean of Extended Studies will provide a report of courses and programs to the Academic Policy Committee and the vice president for

~~Academic Affairs annually by the end of the first week of March. The report will include information on:~~

- ~~1) programs offered and their location;~~
- ~~2) enrollment data;~~
- ~~3) new programs and/or initiatives being planned for the next year;~~
- ~~4) programs being deleted from offerings;~~
- ~~5) a summary assessment of Extended Studies' attainment of its objectives in support of its mission; and~~
- ~~6) other information as requested.~~

~~B. The Academic Policy Committee of the Academic Senate (APC) shall review the report of the dean of Extended Studies and prepare an evaluation of the Extended Studies program with recommendations which will be provided to the provost and the Academic Senate as an information item at its first April meeting. The evaluation may consider such questions as:~~

- ~~1) the quality of the Extended Studies programs and courses;~~
- ~~2) the adequacy of the curriculum in meeting the needs of students and the community;~~
~~and~~
- ~~3) the adequacy of the sites and facilities used.~~

SDSU Senate Sponsored Faculty Forum on Professional Behavior in the Event of Job Action

The officers of our senate and the president and vice president of our CFA chapter invite all SDSU faculty to participate in a forum on professional decorum in the event of a faculty strike.

- Who: All faculty
- When: Friday, March 2, 1:00 — 3:00 p.m.
- Where: Hepner Hall 130
- What: Informational briefing and discussion

We find ourselves in a challenging situation that calls for the best from each of us if we are to accomplish the maximum benefit to the faculty with no “friendly fire” casualties among the faculty. Our Senate officers decided to sponsor a broadly based faculty conversation on the maintenance of professional collegiality in the event of faculty job action. The president and vice president of our SDSU chapter of CFA agreed to join in that activity. We all fervently hope that the situation will not deteriorate to the point where faculty strike is called for.

Our forum will be limited to presentations and discussion on the maintenance of professional collegiality and sustainable interpersonal relationships should there be a strike with the understanding that arguments pro and con job action *per se* will be out of order. All members of our panel have agreed to these ground rules. We respectfully request that all attendees do the same.

The session will open with brief comments by panel members followed by ample opportunity for questions, answers, and discussion. Members of our panel will do their best to provide up to the minute reports on

- status of fact finding at the time
- most probable CFA job action at SDSU
- likely CSU and SDSU administration treatment of job action participants

Panel members will be:

Edith Benkov	Prof. and Chair, European Studies Chair Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Bill Eadie	Prof. of Communication Secretary of the Senate
Fred Hornbeck	Prof. of Psychology Chair of the Senate
Gene Lamke	Prof. of Recreation, Parks and Tourism, Past Senate Chair, VP SDSU CFA Chair Senate Comm. on Academic Resources & Planning
Cezar Ornatowski	Assoc. Prof. Rhetoric & Writing Studies Vice Chair of the Senate
Radmila Prislin	Prof. of Psychology Group conflict scholar
Mark Wheeler	Assoc. Prof. of Philosophy President SDSU Chapter of CFA

Questions and comments in advance of the event may be sent to the Senate at senate@mail.sdsu.edu. Please join us in this activity planned to assist all of us in the maintenance of professional collegiality and sustainable interpersonal relationships in the event of a faculty strike. Ample opportunity will be reserved during the forum for questions, answers, and discussion. Electronic response devices—“clickers”—will be available for voluntary, anonymous response to questions posed to participants. Brownies, coffee, and bottled water will be offered.

SDSU Faculty Forum on Professional Behavior in the Event of a Strike: Opening Comments

Fred Hornbeck, Senate Chair
March 2, 2007

We are in a challenging situation. It calls for the best from each of us if we are to accomplish the maximum benefit to the faculty with no “friendly fire” casualties among us.

CFA has been bargaining with the CSU for a new contract for nearly two years. It is extremely frustrating for all to have bargaining at impasse. A fact finder has been appointed who is examining the situation. She will make non-binding recommendations to the parties. Should a contract not emerge as a result of this process, the CSU will have the authority to unilaterally impose working terms and conditions on Unit 3 employees. However, in the absence of a ratified contract, Unit 3 employees will be permitted under HEERA — the California Higher Education Employer–Employee Relations Act — to undertake job actions. CFA has been gathering data and consulting with members to determine the path that it will pursue.

Our Senate acknowledges that it is neither its role nor responsibility to participate in collective bargaining. It is, however, its role to advocate for actions and policies that produce a quality educational environment at SDSU. In this light, our Senate unanimously passed a resolution noting that the current climate harms morale and threatens our ability to recruit and retain high quality students, faculty, staff and administrators. This resolution called particular attention to matters of faculty compensation, workload, and support for professional growth and development as critical contract issues. The Senate urged negotiators for the CSU and the CFA to use the fact-finding process to reach a reasonable solution that addresses the critical issues without resorting to the imposition of terms and conditions by the CSU nor job actions by CFA.

Let me emphasize that we are not here to argue the wisdom or efficacy of faculty job actions. That is in the domain of our bargaining agent. It is up to CFA to decide that matter. We are here to consider and discuss the nature of appropriate professional conduct in the event of a strike.

Some of us are concerned that thoughtless or careless behavior may severely harm relations within our faculties; that the effects could be quite harmful to the very fabric of our faculty culture. Our Senate officers agreed that it was appropriate for the Senate to sponsor a faculty conversation on the maintenance of professional collegiality in the event of a strike. The president and vice president of our SDSU chapter of CFA agreed. This forum would be limited to presentations and discussion on the maintenance of professional collegiality. It would be understood that arguments pro and con job action *per se* would be out of order. All members of our panel have agreed to these ground rules. We respectfully request that all present do the same.

Bear with me as I describe the dilemma as I see it and the question that I hope we will seek to answer. I shall then recognize members of our panel for their comments before opening the meeting for participation by all.

I joked to my wife that it would be helpful to have an eloquent, charismatic, nonsectarian Solomon true to the spirit of Samuel Gompers whose values embrace those of Christ, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Cesar Chavez. Well..., we'll just have to go with what we have.

What we have on the one hand is the possibility of faculty job actions, **of a strike**. This tool in the hands of trade unions involves the application of considerable pressure on all members to actively participate and support the collective action of the majority. Those individuals who do not conform are subject to ridicule, criticism, and, occasionally, bodily harm. *Scabs* are scorned.

Reluctant individuals are subjected to extreme efforts to comply. *True believers* justify their means by their ends.

What we have on the other hand is a community of scholars, of professionals dedicated to the highest principles of free inquiry and open expression. Last semester, we adopted an academic freedom policy drafted by a Senate task force, adopted by the Senate, and approved by President Weber. That same task force has completed a policy on the freedom of expression that is now in the Senate. Any policy on freedom of expression must apply equally to everyone — particularly those with whom we disagree. Freedom of expression must be a core value of the academy.

Should there be a faculty strike, it is certain that many will participate in the concerted effort. It is equally certain that some will not. We must find the capacity to appreciate, accept, and honor the decision and behavior of each of our colleagues and to do so without prejudice. We should raise the salience within our faculty of the values of tolerance for others and of mutual respect.

And here is why: Professors are not cigar makers, shoe makers, steel workers, teamsters, longshoremen, farm workers, or auto workers. And, professors are not nurses, public school teachers, air traffic controllers, or airline pilots. They differ from these and other employees who engage in collective bargaining in one profoundly important way. Virtually all important faculty personnel decisions: appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, sabbatical leaves, and grants in aid are decided first and foremost by ones peers. Peer evaluations and recommendations must be based in every instance upon the academic case made by the applicant and judged by fair and impartial professional colleagues. We must not permit differences over bargaining tactics to taint or bias this process. We cannot have those who will determine others' professional fates licensed to threaten, harass, or intimidate any one of our colleagues. It will destroy our very system of peer review itself should differences in beliefs, opinions, and actions in the collective bargaining arena intrude into the academic peer review process. No member of our faculty should be placed in a situation where her or his course of action is controlled by fear of retribution by peers.

How can we immunize ourselves from the development of hostile or negative attitudes toward those who choose a course different from our own? How can we assure ourselves that the civility and collegiality that are essential to the practice of our profession will be protected — particularly without diminishing in a material way the message that a strike is meant to convey to our Board of Trustees and Chancellor? I see this as an incredibly challenging question and ask that we now work together to arrive at some consensus with regard to behavioral norms in the event of a faculty strike. One cannot legislate civility and collegiality any more than one can legislate morality. We are incapable of controlling the attitudes that we and others form toward one another. We can, perhaps, agree on common goals and provide some well considered guidelines for appropriate conduct. Let us proceed to do our best to establish guidelines that preserve the overarching values of self determination and peer review for our faculty...for ourselves.