The Senate was called to order at 2:03 p.m.

Members present:
Academic Senators (CSU): Eadie, Wheeler. [Absent: Ornatowski.]
Arts & Letters: Abdel-Nour, Balsdon, Bordelon, Borgstrom, Csomay, Donadey, Esbenshade, Osman, Putman. [Absent: Biggs, Blanco, Del Castillo, Kamper, Mattingly, McClish.]
Business: Chan, Ely, Fleming, Zheng. [Absent: Plice.]
Coach: Van Wyk.
Education:, Bezuk, Butler-Byrd, Wang. [Absent: Alfaro, Alvarado, Graves.]
Engineering: Beyene, Valdes, Walsh. [Absent: Venkataraman.]
Health & Human Services: Fields, Pruitt-Lord. [Absent: Chowdbury, Love-Geffen, Mathiesen, Rasmussen.]
IVC: Cordero.
Library: Rhodes. [Absent: Salem.]
Lecturers: Aste, Goehring.
MPP I & II: Richeson.
Parliamentarian: Snavely.
PSFA: Alter, Geist-Martin, Lindemann, Schreiber, Spilde. [Absent: Cirino.]
Sciences: Deutschman, Matt, Nickerson, Papin, Schellenberg, Stewart, Torikachvili, Ulloa. [Absent: Beck, Bergdahl, Dunster, O'Sullivan.]
Staff: Baxter, Bojoroquez, Preciado, Sanborn-Chen.
University Services: Rivera.
Administration: Kitchen, Marlin, Shapiro, Welter.
Emeritus: Shackelford.
Associated Students: Cecil, Kim, Terry. [Absent: O'Keefe.]
California Faculty Association: Toombs.
Guests: Dayan, Davies, Rollins, Quintana.

1.   **Agenda (Bordelon)**

MSP   Approved agenda for April 9, 2013, as revised.

2.   **Minutes (Bordelon)**

MSP   Approved minutes of March 5, 2013.

3.   **Announcements (Eadie)**

Chair Eadie explained that the Senate was expected to discuss a proposal from the Sustainability Committee today. However, no committee members were available to address the proposal; thus, it will be placed on the May agenda. President Hirshman received the proposed Policy File revisions from the Active Transportation Task Force. Anticipating a meet and confer process with the staff unions, the President has decided to hold off approving the proposal. Elections are coming up for senators from the various colleges. Please encourage colleagues to run for the Senate. After the elections are completed, a caucus for the election of Senate officers will be held. The caucus is scheduled at 2 p.m. April 30th in the Senate Office to nominate officer candidates. The Environment and Safety Committee might also have an answer to the leaf blower referral at the next meeting. If this occurs, the Chair said the Senate will have addressed all of the referrals.

4.   **Academic Affairs (Marlin)**

The Provost provided a budget update. Federally, the government imposed sequestration or proposed budget cuts to specific areas of federal spending. The Provost explained that people often don't realize that sequestration imposes a ten-year cap on spending. For higher education, the two areas most affected are student financial aid and research funding. In terms of student financial aid, the Pell Program is protected for this year; however, other areas of financial aid would be cut. These areas include TRiO, GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness for Undergraduate Programs), and the Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program. How the cuts would be implemented has yet to be determined.

Since her report to the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost said Congress recently voted on a continuing resolution that would allow federal agencies and programs to operate at current funding levels through the remainder of the fiscal year. As part of the resolution, the Provost said Congress restored the military assistance program. The legislation also includes a controversial political science amendment that would prevent the National Science Foundation (NSF) from funding political science research unless the project is certified as "promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States." Thus, the Provost said people in that area that rely on NSF funding are going to be greatly affected. For all of the other areas—National Institute of Health and NSF—there was some restoration in the continuing resolution but still great uncertainty about how the remaining cuts would be implemented. At SDSU, the Provost said the University has faculty, graduate students, and technicians who are paid by those federal grants.

The state level also has seen a great amount of activity. In terms of the $125.1 million that would be allocated to the CSU in the governor's proposed budget, the Board of Trustees tentatively would use some of those funds for enrollment growth and for mandatory costs, which are largely health-care related. There also is hope that funds would be used for compensation increases.

However, the Provost said what was more troublesome than the state budget was the legislative action, particularly the MOOCs bill. Under this proposal, the University would be required to accept courses taken from online vendors. Higher education quality control comes through the accreditation process. But this bill could significantly impact accreditation since universities would be forced to accept courses from unaccredited places. Another issue was potential follow-up legislation to SB 1440. The Provost said she appreciated efforts on campus to create Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) and to comply with the law. However, she said that there was significant pressure that the TMC should articulate with all degrees. For example, in business, a general business degree was created for transfer students. There was pressure that all students should be able to take this degree. For other programs that have degrees open only to transfer students, the Provost said she was unsure what would happen in the future.

Locally, several major searches are concluding. The University is finalizing searches for the Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs and the Dean of the College of Education. In addition, Jim Kitchen, vice president for Student Affairs, recently announced his retirement and will be leaving at the end of the semester. Eric Rivera, associate vice president for Student Affairs, will serve as the interim Vice President.

The Provost concluded by announcing recent awards. Dr. Beth Pollard of the History Department recently gave a talk as the recipient of the Senate Distinguished Professor Award. The Albert W. Johnson Research Lecture recently occurred, and Dr. Karen Emmorey, a professor of speech, language and hearing sciences in SDSU's College of Health and Human Services, gave an excellent talk. In addition, Sally Roush, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs, was recognized as the Chief Financial Officer of the year by the *San Diego Business Journal*. Finally, the Student Research Symposium had 450 student presenters, which is the largest turnout since its inception. Awards also were recently given to student

participants. The Provost added that the symposium wouldn't be possible without active faculty researchers and support from staff and committees. She commended Senator Emilio Ulloa, the outgoing chair, for his work on the symposium.

Discussion:

Senator Preciado said one issue involving student success was students on financial aid who were participating in study abroad programs. In the summer program that is expanding in the College of Extended Studies, he said there seems to be a "structural gap" in the advising that these students were receiving. He asked if there was an appropriate venue or committee that could address this issue. **The Provost** suggested the senator discuss the issue with the International Programs Council. **Senator Preciado** also noted that during the Vice President of Business and Financial Affairs search, one of the candidates talked about changing the system-wide Undergraduate Grants program to reallocate resources within the campus. **The Provost** responded that she was unsure what motivated the candidate to propose that change. **Senator Preciado** asked whether SDSU administrators were discussing potential changes to this program. **Provost Marlin** noted she was aware of broader discussions within the statewide Senate, but said she was unaware of such discussion on campus. **Senator Fleming** asked about faculty hiring for next year and if it would follow the same process as last year or if the number of potential candidates would be expanded. Depending on the state budget, **Provost Marlin** said she there was a "high probability" that the University would possibly hire an expanded pool of candidates.

5.   **SEC Report (Valdes)**

    5.1   **Referral Chart:**

Committee	Date	Item	Referred by
Environment and Safety	*Nov 29, 2011*	Review the memo from Peter Andersen, re: "Air Pollution from Leaf Blowers" (page 44-46 of SEC agenda) and provide a recommended action for the Senate.	Officers
Academic Policy and Planning	*Mar 15, 2012*	Develop a review process for Distance Education Modality courses that addresses compensation, TA support, final testing schedules, and course quality.	Officers

        Discussion:

        Vice Chair Valdes announced that Chair Eadie was re-elected to the statewide Senate. In terms of the referral chart, the Vice Chair said that the second referral was addressed in today's agenda.

6.   **New Business: Action Items**

    6.1   **Committees and Elections (Ulloa)**

        Action:

        The following official nominations have been received from the College of Business Administration and hereby submitted for appointment via senate.

        General Education Curriculum Committee
        Xudong An will be on sabbatical for the AY 13-14 and is to be replaced by Marie-Eve Lachance

Library Committee
Xudong An will be on sabbatical for the AY 13-14 and is to be replaced by Ning Tang

MP   To approve the above list of faculty nominations.

6.2   **Environment and Safety (Quintana)**

Action:
Environment and Safety Committee proposes several changes to the SDSU Senate Policy on Smoking (see policy at the end of this document for exact proposed changes to Senate policy file). In addition, this draft document includes changes suggested by the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting held March 19, 2013.

The proposed changes can be summarized as follows:
1.   The new policy would state that the SDSU will have an entirely tobacco-free campus. The committee envisions that this would occur within one year. During this phase-in year, two designated smoking areas would remain on campus, one near Viejas Arena and one near the south end of campus (Physical Plant).
2.   The new policy would state that no tobacco-related advertising, sampling, or sponsorship shall be permitted on SDSU property, at college-sponsored events, or in publications produced by the college.
3.   The new policy would state that enforcement, complaint, and disciplinary procedures be specified and that these will be communicated widely through electronic and print media and signs at strategic locations on campus. Fines could be collected from repeat violators according to recently passed State legislation dealing with enforcement of smoking policies on California university campuses.
4.   The new policy defines what is meant by the term 'smoking'.
5.   The new policy states that the smoking policy shall be widely disseminated to the campus community, for example in student and new employee handbooks, websites, and news center notifications.

These changes in part follow the model code of the American College Health Association regarding tobacco policies on campuses. The changes are also based on examples from other CSU campuses, the California Youth Advocacy Network (funded by the California Tobacco Control Program of the Department of Health Services) and the American Lung Association.

The proposed policy changes are based on the following rationales:

A. The tobacco-free policy would significantly improve SDSU's approach to tobacco use regarding second-hand smoke exposure, changing the social norm about tobacco use among students, and protection of the campus physical environment for the benefit of all employees, faculty, and students. The current policy calls for designated smoking areas, and this policy is confusing, has generated significant numbers of complaints, and fails to protect the campus community from second-hand smoke exposure and toxic tobacco waste products.
B. The new policy has the following significant improvements: It would be made clear to students, campus visitors, staff and faculty that there is no smoking allowed anywhere on campus, and they would be informed of this tobacco-free policy at all principal entrances to the campus. The procedures and responsibilities are detailed in the new policy, and prohibitions on tobacco company sponsorship and advertising are explicitly stated. There would be no area of campus that would expose students, faculty, and employees to second-hand smoke. Over time, there would also be economic benefits in that fewer signs would be necessary, and clean-up costs across campus would be reduced (over the last three years, about 24,000 butts have been collected each year during one-hour cleanups of the campus by 50 volunteers).

C. A completely tobacco-free policy also positions SDSU as a leader, not a follower, in a national trend to implement tobacco free university campuses, supported by the US Department of Health and Human Services. The Environment and Safety Committee surveyed the CSU campuses and found that as of March 2013, one CSU campus has passed a completely smoke-free policy (CSU Fullerton), and about half have designated smoking areas. The rest rely on a 20-30 foot rule prohibiting smoking near entrances to buildings, windows, and walkways (see Appendix for details about other CSU campuses).

D. The Academic Senate of the CSU has requested the Chancellor to modify the CSU System policy to create a smoke-free University system in January, 2013 (http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2012-2013/documents/3102.shtml

E. The US Surgeon General has asserted that tobacco use in any form and exposure to secondhand smoke presents a significant health hazard; the the US Environmental Protection Agency and the California Environmental Protection Agency have determined that there is no safe level for exposure to secondhand smoke; and secondhand smoke (environmental tobacco smoke, ETS) has been declared a toxic air contaminant by the State of California Air Resources Board, therefore implementing a ban smoking on campus would reduce exposure of its students, faculty and staff to a known health hazard.

F.   Cigarette butts have been recently been shown to be a toxic environmental contaminant (Tobacco Control. 2011 May;20 Suppl 1:i25-9. PMID: 21504921). When deposited into aquatic environments, they may be are toxic to fish, microorganisms, and other animals at low concentrations. Banning tobacco use on campus will reduce the burden of toxic tobacco waste products that flow into storm drains, streams, and San Diego waterways.

G. Removing cigarette waste will support a more pleasant and attractive campus image and learning environment. It will also reduce janitorial costs by reducing litter and need for cleaning cigarette urns.

H. Banning smoking on campus would reduce the incidence of trash receptacle fires and associated Public Safety and first responder costs due to cigarette caused fires.

I.   Tobacco bans are known to lower smoking rates (Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 2008; 162: 477-483; CDC, 2007, 56(24);604-608), and therefore this action would likely increase healthy behaviors and reduce smoking rates among our students, faculty, and staff. The SDSU campus offers smoking cessation assistance through Student Health Services and Employee Assistance Programs.

J.   Other CSU Campuses, other San Diego area campuses and all UC campuses have passed 'smoke-free' resolutions in recognition of the advantages of this policy.

K. The American College Health Association supports a 100% smoke-free campus (http://www.acha.org/Publications/docs/Position_Statement_on_Tobacco_Nov2011.pdf)

L.   Legal scholars have found that there is no constitutional 'right to smoke' (e.g. Samantha K. Graff, Tobacco Control Legal Consortium, There is No Constitutional Right to Smoke: 2008 (2d edition, 2008) www.tobaccolawcenter.org)

M. The American Lung Association recommends a campus-wide ban on smoking as an important step to protect the health of our students, faculty and staff.

N. An SDSU student survey carried out by Associated Students found that a majority of students at SDSU support a smoke-free campus.

O. The committee supports the analysis and information about the benefits of going tobacco-free presented in the white paper presented to the University of California that led to the declaration of all UC campuses going smoke free (found at http://risk.ucsc.edu/all-pdf/homepage-smoke-free%20policy-proposal.pdf). This document provides extensive support for the proposed measure.

Smoking
1.0 Smoking shall be prohibited by San Diego State University as follows:
a. In buildings owned and occupied by or leased and occupied by SDSU and in SDSU vehicles,
b. In SDSU outdoor areas including parking lots,

c. In outdoor SDSU owned or leased constructed seating areas where people are likely to congregate.

d. Appropriately worded "no smoking" signs shall be placed in locations where the smoking rule is consistently violated and all public ash receptacles shall be placed in compliance with this policy.

2.0 The distribution of free samples of tobacco products is prohibited. No tobacco-related advertising or sponsorship shall be permitted on SDSU property, at college-sponsored events or in publications produced by the college, with the exception of advertising in a newspaper or magazine that is not produced by SDSU and which is lawfully sold, bought or distributed on campus property. For the purposes of this policy, "tobacco-related" applies to the use of a tobacco brand or corporate name, trademark, logo, symbol or motto, selling message, recognizable pattern of colors or any other indicia of product identification identical to or similar to, or identifiable with, those used for any brand of tobacco products or company which manufactures tobacco products.

3.0 The designated officials in charge of receiving complaints about employees shall be Human Resources, and for complaints about students shall be Student Affairs. Other violations shall be referred to Public Safety, unless other designated officials are named by the President to receive complaints concerning violations of this policy. This official, policy, procedures for complaints, and consequences of violations will be posted online. If needed, AB 795 allows for fines to be assessed for repeat violators, and this avenue will be explored if needed, though social enforcement shall be the primary means of enforcement.

4.0 All members of the campus community will be informed of the smoking policy by widely distributing the campus tobacco policy on an annual basis. The tobacco policy will be clearly posted in employee and student handbooks, on the college/university website, and in other relevant publications. Key components of the policy will be also shared with parents, alumni/ae, and visitors. The general policy will be both printed and electronic formats.

5.0 The university shall offer smoking-cessation assistance for students through Student Health Services and for faculty and staff through the Employee Assistance Program. Interested employees should contact the Center for Human Resources.

6.0 San Diego State University auxiliary organizations shall comply with this policy.

7.0 Smoking shall be permitted in university-sponsored theatre and dance productions and other representations where smoking is part of the script.

8.0 Notice of this policy shall be posted at or near principal entrances to the campus and on www.sdsu.edu.

9.0 This policy shall implement Cal. Code Regs. Title 5 section 42356 and CSU Memorandum 200-26 and 2003-19 in accordance with the Education Code 89030 and 89031 and Cal. Govt Code sections 7596-7598, and CSU Executive Order 599.

10.0 Smoking is defined as inhaling, exhaling, burning, or carrying a lighted or vapor-producing tobacco product. Tobacco is defined as all tobacco-derived or containing products, including, but not limited to, cigarettes (clove, bidis, kreteks), electronic cigarettes, cigars and cigarillos, hookah smoked products, and oral tobacco (spit and spitless, smokeless, chew, snuff).

Discussion:

Prior to discussing the proposal, **Chair Eadie** explained that he would like the initial queries to be clarifying or informational questions. Then, he said he would open the proposal to amendments. Once the amendments were done, the Senate will discuss the main motion. The committee chair will speak to the main motion, Senators will alternate sides in a debate, and then come to a vote.

Information Questions Related to the Proposal
Senator Donadey asked about 1.0 d and whether the statement about placement of public ash receptacles was needed, given the smoking prohibition. **Chair Eadie** said this point could be discussed when amendments were considered. **Senator Cecil** said the first document

providing an overview of the policy revisions states, "The new policy would state that SDSU will have an entirely tobacco-free campus." However, in the proposed Policy File revisions, he said he was unable to see where it actually states that the campus would be completely tobacco free. He said the Policy File revisions state that the campus would be smoke-free but not tobacco-free. **Shanna Dayan**, an SDSU Master of Public Health graduate student who also advocated for a smoke-free policy at the University of California at San Diego when she was an undergraduate there, said the campus would be tobacco free to make the policy comprehensive and to coincide with where the CSU system was going. She added that such a policy would be pro-health and pro-environment. **Senate Chair Eadie** explained that Senator Cecil's was noting that the point about being tobacco-free was not in the Policy File revisions. **Environment and Safety Chair Jenny Quintana** agreed that the tobacco-free aspect of the proposal should be incorporated into the Policy File revisions. **Senate Chair Eadie** said such clarifications would be brought up under amendments. **Senator Snavely** noted that the phase-in year also was not included in the proposed Policy File revisions but discussed in the proposal overview. **Chair Quintana** explained that in a previous version of this proposal, the committee had been told that implementation language should not be included in the Policy File revisions. **Senator Snavely** asked if a senator wished to eliminate the phase-in year, how that would be handled since it wasn't in the proposed Policy File revisions. **Senate Chair Eadie** responded that he would entertain a separate motion on implementation after the proposed Policy File revisions were voted upon. **Senator Putman** asked whether the policy would apply to commercial properties owned by the San Diego Research Foundation, such as Starbucks and the College Square building. **Chair Quintana** responded affirmatively. **Senator Toombs** asked if someone on campus had chewing tobacco in his/her pocket but wasn't using it, if this would be considered a policy violation. **Ms. Dayan** read item 10.0 of the proposed Policy File revisions, which defined tobacco. She said this provision would mean that students couldn't chew on campus. However, **Chair Quintana** said the individual would not be violating the policy if he/she had possession of the product but was not using it. **Senator Baxter** asked if nicotine-producing vapor would be covered by the proposal. **Ms. Dayan** responded affirmatively. Under 5.0, **Senator Cecil** asked why the reference to "smoking-cessation programs" had been changed to "smoking-cessation assistance." **Chair Quintana** responded that such programs no longer exist because of lack of utilization. **Senator Shackelford** asked whether the Foundation was included under the proposed policy language—references to "us". **Chair Quintana** responded affirmatively. **Senator Donadey** said tobacco is defined as all tobacco-derived products. She asked whether that would include sage, which may be burned at a powwow. **Chair Quintana** said the policy would not apply to sage. **Senate Chair Eadie** pointed out that smoking is permitted in university-sponsored staged productions. **Senator Donadey** worried that a powwow would not be considered to fall under the definition of a staged production. **Senator Butler-Byrd** pointed out that tobacco could be burned at a powwow. She suggested that the committee might want to include language concerning cultural events. The Senator said her question had to do with the fines that could be charged. **Ms. Dayan** said that Assembly Bill 795 allows for the assessment of fines for repeat violators and could be used as an enforcement strategy.

Proposed Amendment 1:
Senator Donadey suggested that 1.0 d be rephrased to eliminate "all public ash receptacles shall be placed in compliance with this policy." **Provost Marlin** said it might be helpful to have ash receptacles placed at the entrance of campus. **Chair Quintana** explained that this section was left in the policy because of the phase-in year. However, she added that ash receptacles do encourage smoking and that the committee supported removing that section. **Senator Donadey** formally proposed removing that section from the proposal, which was seconded. She said it seemed illogical to have ash receptacles on a no-smoking campus. **Provost Marlin** noted under F of the proposal overview that "Cigarette butts have recently been shown to be a toxic environmental contaminant." She said she would rather have individuals put cigarette butts in ash receptacles than elsewhere. **Senator Wheeler** said the need for receptacles seemed redundant. **Senator Beyene** said that even with the new policy,

some would continue to smoke. He said receptacles would allow them to throw their butts away. He said it was advisable as an option. **Senator Putman** said having receptacles at the entrance of the campus sent the wrong message. He said individuals could put out cigarettes and throw them away in regular trash cans. **Senator Snavely** said he agreed with Provost Marlin. He said if there is a phase-in period, public ash receptacles would be needed. (He added, though, that he planned to propose an amendment to eliminate the phase-in period.) Senator Snavely said proper signage and receptacles at the entrance of campus would tell people to put their cigarettes out.

MSF   The amendment to eliminate from 1.0 d "all public ash receptacles shall be placed in compliance with this policy" failed.

Proposed Amendment 2:
Senator Cecil said it was important to offer cessation programs instead of just assistance. He moved that "smoking-cessation programs" be substituted for "smoking-cessation assistance" under 5.0.

The motion to have "smoking-cessation programs" be substituted for "smoking-cessation assistance" under 5.0 failed because it received no second.

Proposed Amendment 3:
Senator Schellenberg asked how the proposed policy revisions preclude oral-based tobacco. **Chair Quintana** said the proposal followed the model code of the American College Heath Association regarding tobacco policies on campuses. She said the intent was to ban chewing tobacco and snuff. **Senator Schellenberg** said this point wasn't clear in the proposed revisions to the Policy File. He asked that the policy be clarified. More specifically, he asked if smoking could be defined to include the mastication of tobacco. As a friendly amendment, **Senator Wheeler** suggested that "tobacco use" be substituted for "smoking" throughout the document, which was seconded. **Senator Deutschman** suggested that adding in 1.0 that tobacco use shall be prohibited was a sufficient change. **Senator Deutschman's** amendment wasn't viewed as friendly and was withdrawn. **Senator Snavely** suggested that Senator Wheeler wouldn't want to change every instance of tobacco use (i.e., 10.0). **Senator Wheeler**, agreed, noting it should be changed where it makes sense. In terms of Senator Wheeler's proposed amendment, **Senate Chair Eadie** said he was asking for editorial discretion to revise the proposal as needed. **Senator Baxter** asked if tobacco use for medicinal purposes was allowed. **Senator Rivera** added that tobacco products could be offered for medicinal purposes to help people quit. **Senator Abdel-Nour** noted that to leave the policy inconsistent would allow some flexibility. **Senator Donadey** asked whether the committee could explain the rationale for the prohibition on oral tobacco. She also asked if alcohol consumption on campus was allowed for those over 21. She said she viewed alcohol consumption as being somewhat similar to smokeless tobacco consumption. **Ms. Dayan** responded that the reason oral tobacco was being addressed was that the aim was to make the policy comprehensive. She added that chew was harmful to the environment. An aim of the policy was to encourage people to quit tobacco use and not to use it on campus. **Senator Welter** said he resists rules if they affect someone else's choice and the individual was not affecting others. He said he understands the health concerns related to second-hand smoke. However, he said oral tobacco didn't affect everyone. **Ms. Dayan** responded that the CSU system was going to be going tobacco free. She said it would be easier to not have to revisit SDSU's policy if the system were tobacco free. **Senate Chair Eadie** reiterated that the motion from Senator Wheeler was to give the committee and the Senate officers editorial discretion to substitute "tobacco use" for "smoking." Given that there would be multiple edits to the proposed policy, **Senator Fields** asked if the policy would come back before the Senate once the changes were made. **The Chair** responded negatively.

MSF   The amendment to give the committee editorial discretion to substitute "tobacco use" for "smoking" failed.

Proposed Amendment 4:
Senator Rivera suggested that electronic cigarettes and nicotine gum should not be prohibited since those trying to quit smoking may use such products. **Senate Chair Eadie** asked Senator Rivera to provide language for the amendment. **Ms. Dayan** noted that electronic cigarettes are not an FDA-regulated cessation device. She added that nicotine gum was not a tobacco-related substance. **Senator Rivera** was unable to propose language for an amendment; however, **Senator Cordero** moved to eliminate electronic cigarettes from 10.0, and the motion was seconded. She explained that many people use such cigarettes in an effort to quit smoking. **Chair Quintana** responded that she opposed the motion because such cigarettes produce a vapor that was harmful to others. In addition, she said that when the vapor reacts with air pollutants, it creates very potent carcinogens. **Senator Kim** asked how much research was available to support this claim. **Chair Quintana** said there were at least ten publications. She said this was an emerging area of research. **Senator Cecil** said he understood that these cigarettes were available at hospitals and in airplanes. **Senator Schreiber** responded that they were not allowed in airplanes. He said the vapor was not known to be harmless.

MSF   The amendment to remove electronic cigarettes from 10.0 failed.

Proposed Amendment 5:
Senator Donadey moved that the last part of 10.0 be eliminated concerning oral tobacco (i.e., place a period after "smoked products"), which was seconded. She said oral tobacco use might be unpleasant, but it affects the person using it and not others. However, she noted her support of the smoking ban. **Senator Snavely** pointed out that nothing in the proposal seems to prohibit chewing. He noted that 10.0 provides merely a definition. He said he didn't think the amendment was needed. **Senator Osman** said that while it is a definition, she said the Senate was trying to produce the clearest policy and that this created ambiguity. She said she preferred to create a clear policy. **Senator Beyene** said he thought Senator Donadey had withdrawn her amendment. **The Senate Chair** explained that the motion was seconded and was thus the property of the body. **Senator Cecil** said it was important to keep the definition in the policy because it supports 2.0 concerning the "distribution of free samples of tobacco products is prohibited."

MSF   The amendment to eliminate from 10.0, "and oral tobacco (spit and spitless, smokeless, chew, snuff)," failed.

Clarification:
Senator Preciado asked whether 7.0 needed to be clarified to include cultural productions. **Ms. Dayan** responded that the committee could include "as approved to include cultural events." The Senate Chair explained that there was an understanding here without the need for an amendment.

Action Concerning the Main Motion:
Chair Quintana said that the current policy was not working well. Cigarette butts, which are a toxic contaminant, are found all over campus and pose a danger to aquatic wildlife on campus. She said most of the campuses that started with designated-smoking areas have gone smoke-free. She noted that the Academic Senate recently passed a resolution recommending that each CSU campus create a plan to become smoke-free and to prohibit the sale of tobacco products. She noted that CSU Fullerton was currently smoke free, with full implementation scheduled in August. She said most of the proposals are called smoke-free policies. In addition, Chair Quintana noted student support of the proposal based on a recent Associated Students' email survey. She said her committee recently held a meet and confer with unions

concerning the designated-smoking areas. In order to protect its members, she said the unions had asked why the campus wasn't smoke-free. The proposed revision would improve the campus environment, reduce litter, and provide a much clearer policy than the current one.

Senator Wheeler yielded the floor to **Undergraduate Curriculum Council Chair Barbone** who said it is clear that tobacco use is bad. However, he said smoking is legal in California and that all-out bans or sumptuary policies typically increase the behavior rather than decreasing it. He said he worried, too, in section 10.0 that the University was perhaps violating some academic freedoms. He said he could imagine that some researchers might be interested in demonstrating the harm of smoking. The proposed policy would prohibit such research. In addition, while he noted that CSU system is encouraging smoke-free policies, he said that SDSU is a leader, not a follower. He said the University is supposed to have the "moral courage" to take the lead and not to merely follow. Finally, he said the proposed policy seemed arbitrary. While it is clear that smoking is bad, the Senator said many things cause harm, including football, which is supported by the University. He said he supposed that there is psychological damage to many women who are forced to cover themselves when they leave their homes. They are being told that they are not allowed to be seen; they don't count. These all are known or suspected to cause harm. However, he said it wasn't good to arbitrarily ban something just because we don't like it. In terms of moral courage, the Senator said if we want to ban things that are not good, then ban them all. If not, then be arbitrary. He said we have a word for "the bigger, the stronger" who arbitrarily impose their wills and that is "bully." He asked senators not to vote for the proposal. At the risk of being called "a bully" because he wanted to protect his health, **Senator Snavely** responded to Chair Barbone's statements. First, he pointed out that this was a health issue. When people smoke, it not only affects the individual but also others. As someone who has health issues from second-hand smoke, the Senator said he took offense at the idea that the University would allow smoking on campus. In terms of smoking being legal in California, Senator Snavely said the state has made it clear that smoking should be prohibited in public areas where it may harm others. Concerning academic freedom, Senator Snavely said this was not a real issue, but a straw man argument. Finally, the argument was made that this was an issue of us being moral leaders. He pointed out that SDSU cannot be the leader because "we are the last ones." He mentioned that he was at a university in Ohio that banned smoking eight years ago.

MP   Motion to approve the main proposal was approved.

Following the vote, **Senator Snavely** questioned why a one-year phase-in period was needed. He said the designated smoking areas served as a phase-in period. He moved that it was the sense of the Senate that a further phase-in period was not needed, which was seconded. **Senator Welter** said he didn't smoke, but he said his sense was that it was not easy to quit. He said a one-year phase in period would give people a warning to help them separate from tobacco. **Senator Fields** said she didn't think anyone would quit smoking because of the policy. She said why wait. **Senator Sanborn-Chen** asked how long it would take to implement the policy. She asked when the signs would go up. She said the student body, faculty, and community should have at least a month's notice. **Senate Chair Eadie** said the Senate doesn't really deal with implementation. He clarified that this was a sense of the Senate motion that doesn't have the force of policy.

MSP   Motion "that it is the sense of the Senate" to have immediate implementation of the Senate Policy on Smoking

6.3   **Faculty Affairs (Anderson)**

           Action:

           The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends emeritus status upon the following faculty

members:

Joseph W. Ball, Professor of Anthropology, May 21, 2013, 38 years

Earnest Dale Sevier, SSPAR III in the College of Sciences, August 18, 2013, 13 years

C. Anne Turhollow, Librarian, July 1, 2013, 31 years

MP To approve emeritus status upon retirement for the above individuals.

7.0 **New Business: Consent Calendar (Committee Reports)**

MSP To receive the reports on the Consent Calendar.

7.1 **Academic Policy and Planning (Schellenberg)**

Information:

On 15 March 2012, APP received the following referral: "*Review current policy on the oversight of courses that are either proposed to be offered in a Distant Education modality or are moving to Distance Education Modality. Issue: Up until 2008 courses offered in a Distant Education modality were required to be reviewed by a special distance education curriculum review committee, which was abandoned because it hampered the ability to transition courses to DE in an efficient manner. With more and more courses transitioning to DE modalities new questions have come up with respect to compensation, adequate TA support, final testing schedules and course quality. The review should provide suggestions on developing an efficient DE review process to address these concerns*."

On 18 September 2012, this referral was revised by senate officers to read: "*Develop a review process for Distance Education Modality courses that addresses compensation, TA support, final testing schedules, and course quality*."

Overview: Online education is a "disruptive innovation" that (1) challenges the traditional brick-and-mortar-based structure and operation of higher-education and (2) introduces new potentials and pitfalls for student learning and success. This issue is particularly complex given that an individual's schema regarding online education is strongly influenced by their broader educational philosophy, general familiarity and comfort with technology, and level of experience in online course design, operation, and assessment.
 During the 2012-13 AY, APP explored the components and spirit of this referral, along with its broader context and implications, with informal input from various stakeholders including students, faculty, staff, and administrators. This information item, together with the attached action item, summarizes our findings and recommendations.

Compensation: APP interprets this term to refer to instructor assigned-time with respect to (1) "one-time" efforts to transform course modality from face-to-face or hybrid modes to a fully online mode and (2) the "semester-to-semester" potential for large enrollment (i.e., 100s to potentially 1,000s) within a single online section. Assigned-time policy regarding both issues exists at the CSU level, and is administered/reported through *Faculty Assignment by Department* reports. APP recommends that interested parties refer to this policy (see attached), particularly assigned-time codes for Excess Enrollment (Code 11), New Preparations (Code 12), Non-Traditional Instruction (Code 15), and Instructional Experimentation, Innovation, or Instructionally-Related Research (Code 22). APP notes that these assigned-time codes were last amended in 1991, and may be overdue for review and potential revision.
 Given the significant effort involved in transforming courses into a quality online learning

experience and the potential challenges of large section enrollments, APP recommends the following:

(1) Instructors should discuss their interest in developing online courses and/or large enrollment sections with their department chair to establish a clear agreement and documentation regarding assigned time.

(2) Department chairs and equivalents should consult with the involved instructor prior to setting section enrollments, whether face-to-face, hybrid, or online.

(3) Instructors and department chairs should seek assistance in the development, operation, and assessment of online courses through ITS, whose mission is to provide support and leadership in the effective use of technologies for enhancing learning as well as facilitating research and strategic initiatives. This support can range from informal consultation with ITS course designers to participation in the annual Curriculum Design Institute, for which selected instructors currently receive three units of release time. APP anticipates that the Strategic Plan will include additional investment in such resources.

Teaching Assistant Support: This issue relates to compensation in that TAs can provide important value and assistance in maintaining course quality within large-enrollment sections that may or may not be fully online. As with the above compensation issue, APP refers interested parties to the existing CSU-wide policy regarding assigned-time, specifically Excess Enrollments (Code 11).

Final Testing Schedule: This issue relates to the current lack of articulation of online courses within the SDSU final exam matrix, and thereby the potential for clumping of online final exams on certain days (e.g., first day of finals, which provides instructors with the maximum amount of grading time). In addition, APP recognized the need for clear and consistent coding of both hybrid and online courses within the schedule of classes with respect to their synchronous versus asynchronous formats, any required activities involving student presence on campus or elsewhere at specific places, dates, and times, etc. APP believes that both issues are important for enrollment management as well as student success, but does not view either issue as rising to the level of formal Policy File additions. Instead, APP requests that the administration develop timely and effective operational solutions to these logistical issues.

Course Quality: The term "quality" denotes a desired degree of excellence with respect to some broader distribution. Thus, the term can be relativistic among individuals and is, by definition, relativistic with respect to the selected distribution. APP interpreted this referral to reflect concerns about specific low-quality online courses with respect to all courses regardless of modality. We reject the dichotomous view that online learning and courses are, *by definition*, innately inferior to face-to-face learning and courses. However, we also appreciate that some courses may, based on their content and learning outcomes, be more suited to one modality than another. In other words, APP notes that the mission of SDSU is agnostic to course modality. Thus, APP believes that concerns regarding low course quality are healthy, but should be broadened to *all* modalities *including* the face-to-face modality. That said, the potential for online learning to expand student learning and improve student success does come paired with pitfalls that, once recognized and addressed, are readily avoidable.

What is the way forward with respect to course quality? APP believes that this complex issue transcends our committee's specific role within shared-governance, and merits a broader discussion with various senate- and senate-appointed committees (e.g., Instructional and Information Technology, Library, Student Affairs, Student Learning Outcomes, Undergraduate Council, Undergraduate Curriculum) that is informed by the outstanding efforts of Instructional Technology Services and the Center for Teaching and Learning. APP recommends that these stake-holders collaborate to identify mechanisms and policy that will promote course quality across *all* modalities. In the meantime, APP encourages those individuals currently involved in the college-level approval of new and existing courses for operation in an online mode, as in all modes, to (1) seek input from individuals experienced in

course design and (2) consider the CSU Quality Online Teaching rubric (QOLT, attached) as a potential means to assess the quality of courses across *all* modalities.

APP Recommendations and Comments beyond Specific Scope of Referral

Nomenclature: Throughout SDSU, APP recommends that (1) courses without a significant online component be formally defined, and consistently referred to, as "face-to-face" (versus "normal" or "regular") and (2) courses in which greater than 50% of the instruction is online be formally defined, and consistently referred to, as "online" (versus "distance education"). These recommendations reflect more than low-level semantics: For the first recommendation, use of terms such as "normal" or "regular" are arguably pejorative with respect to online education. For the second recommendation, the term "distance" has a geographic denotation, yet many, if not most, students are participating in online courses while proximal to, or actually on, the SDSU campus. In addition, the term "distance" can have a negative connotation by implying that this modality produces an inherent gap in meaningful instructor-student interaction, which need not be the case given technological advances that allow timely and dynamic interactions (e.g., live and interactive synchronous sessions, timely feedback via discussion boards, etc.). In addition, the adoption and consistent use of the terms "face-to-face" and "online" are more consistent with the current use of the term "hybrid," which describes sections with periodic "face-to-face" meetings within physical classrooms as well as a significant "online" component.

Intellectual property: Instructors have expressed concern regarding the intellectual property of the content that they have developed for online learning, particularly comprehensive course materials and architecture housed in Blackboard courses. APP refers concerned parties to the Policy File, specifically Item 2.4 of the *Classes and Courses, Hybrid, and Distance Education* section and to the broader *Copyrights, Trademarks, and Trade Secrets* section. Given the complexity of the later section, APP suggests that Faculty Affairs collaborates with the Center for Teaching and Learning as well as the California Faculty Association to develop opportunities to clarify these issues for all parties.

Requests that a face-to-face section is offered whenever an online section is offered: Such requests beg the question that online courses are inherently inferior compared to face-to-face courses in terms of quality, accessibility, and student success. While some peer-reviewed studies support such views, others do not. While APP endorses diversity in course modality, the requirement of such pairing is often not feasible given staffing and programmatic constraints.

Requirements that an instructor teaches online: While APP believes that no instructor should be forced to teach hybrid or online sections, we also appreciate that certain logistical circumstances and programmatic designs may favor an online modality for a given course. APP encourages involved parties to engage in good faith discussion on this issue in order to avoid the difficult situation of a forced means that works against the desired ends.

CSU INSTRUCTION RELATED ASSIGNED TIME CODES
Activities for which Weighted Teaching Units may be assigned:
Code*

11. Excess Enrollments
a. For classes with census date enrollment of between 75 and 120 and exceptional workload, a graduate assistant or student assistant may be allocated.

b. For classes with census date enrollment of over 120, a graduate assistant, a student assistant, or an additional 3 WTU may be assigned.
Assignment of graduate assistants is a preferable way of handling such large class loads, but it

is recognized that qualified graduate assistants are not always available.

In no case shall a faculty member be granted assigned WTU for more than one class with excess enrollments.

12. New Preparations

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for preparation of courses never before taught by that particular faculty member, if courses actually taught include two or more such new preparations.

14. Course or Supervision Overload

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU equal to course or supervision overload earned in a prior fiscal year provided that calendar considerations so necessitate and the faculty member has not been present for the full preceding academic year.

15. Non-Traditional Instruction

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for activities involving instruction and evaluation, which include such activities as modularized instruction, self -paced instruction, team teaching/cluster courses, thematic projects, open laboratory, sponsored experimental learning or other community activities, writing adjunct, mediated instruction (involving computers, television, and/or other media devices), and peer instruction. These activities typically do not involve a single instructor regularly meeting a group of students in an assigned classroom or laboratory setting.

16. In-Service Training for K-12 School Personnel
A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for activities involving in-service training for K-12 school personnel. Typically, the activities are provided on the school site using a variety of instructional modes and do not necessarily involve an instructor regularly meeting a group of students in an assigned classroom or laboratory setting on a campus.

17. Credit by Examination/Evaluation

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for activities that give primary emphasis to the evaluation of a student's knowledge and skills rather than upon the instructional process by which the knowledge and skills are acquired. Such activities include:

a. Credit by evaluation of prior experiential learning (e.g., based upon evaluation of a portfolio of materials).

b. Credit by examination (where the examination is generated and evaluated in whole or in part by the campus), including comprehensive and challenge examinations. The characteristics of evaluation activities that should be treated as part of the regular instructional program involve 1) regularly enrolled students, and 2) a substantial effort on the part of the faculty member to perform any of the following tasks:

a. Interview and make a preliminary assessment of the student's background.
b. Counsel the student regarding preparation for the evaluation.
c. Selection or preparation of the examination or assistance in preparation of a student portfolio.
d. Evaluation of the portfolio or evaluation of the student response to the examination.

18. Instructional Support for Graduate Students

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special graduate student testing duties, in particular for conducting comprehensive examinations for master's degree candidates and examinations in fulfillment of foreign language requirements.

21. Special Instructional Programs

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation in a team teaching effort.

The total assigned and earned WTU associated with a team-taught course may not exceed the WTU generated by the course multiplied by the number of faculty members teaching the course. In addition, no individual faculty member may be given more WTU, both earned and assigned, than the course generates.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for program and tape production for instructional television.

c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for liaison duties among multiple sections of the same course.

22. Instructional Experimentation, Innovation, or Instructionally Related Research

a. A faculty member may be given assigned time for development and implementation of experimental programs involving:

1. Instructional television
2. Computer assisted instruction
3. Other innovations in instruction

b. A faculty member may be given assigned time for documented research evaluations which are demonstrably related to the instructional functions and programs of the college.

23. Instruction-Related Services

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for his services related to college clinics, study skill centers, farms, art galleries, and other campus institutions and facilities which are ancillary to the instruction program.

31. Advising Responsibilities

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying an excessive advising load due to a relatively high proportion of part-time faculty in his department.
b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying a greater than normal share of departmental or school advising responsibilities.

c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for services as departmental graduate adviser.

32. Instruction- Related Committee Assignments

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation over and above normal levels in such areas as curriculum, personnel, budget, library, audio-visual, and selection committees at the department, school or college level.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for membership in or liaison to special

committees whose activities have significant bearing on the instructional programs of the college, or the CSU system at large.

c. Includes all-university assigned time.

33. Curricular Planning or Studies

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special individual or committee related curriculum planning, development and redevelopment activities.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for development of special tests for credit by examination.

34. Accreditation Responsibilities

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for accreditation responsibilities.

35. Instruction-Related Facilities Planning

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for duties related to planning of instructional facilities.

41. California Faculty Association Activities

Each CFA campus Chapter President and each of four CFA statewide officers (President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer) shall be granted a reduction in workload, without loss of compensation, of up to three (3) WTU on asemester campus, or four (4) WTU on a Quarter campus, per academic term.

*This is the code used for reporting assigned WTU in the Academic Planning Data Base Document last amended November 1991

Quality Online Learning and Teaching (QOLT) Rubric Summary

The QOLT program is a pilot effort to establish a system for informing and evaluating online teaching and learning using Moodle in the CSU.

The following scale of effectiveness is applied to each QOLT objective:

Exceeds/Always (3 points)	Criterion evidence is clear, appropriate for this course, and demonstrates best practices in a manner that models its use.
Meets/Frequent (2 points)	Evidence of this criterion is clear and is appropriate for this course. Minor room for enhancement.
Developing/Rarely (1 point)	Some evidence of this criterion, but it needs to be presented more clearly and/or further developed.
Nonexistent /Never (0 points)	Not present, but should be, based on course design and content. Or, is present, but not appropriate for this course.
Non-applicable (no score given)	Objective does not apply to the course (e.g., course does not have group-work assignments and rater would enter "NA"). Objective(s) rated NA will not factor into overall points and resulting Mean scores.

Section 1. Course Overview and Introduction
Instructor gives a thorough description of the course, as well as inducting students to the course protocol and expectations.
1.1 Students are provided clear instructions to get started and access all course components.

1.2   Course description is provided in a manner that goes beyond the very brief description that is typically provided in the course catalog.
1.3   Instructor information is available to students and includes contact, biographical, and availability information, as well as picture.
1.4   Etiquette expectations for online discussions, email, and other forms of course communication are clearly stated.
1.5   Academic integrity is defined and expectations provided.
1.6   Prerequisite knowledge and competencies (if applicable) clearly stated.
1.7   A list of technical competencies necessary for course completion is provided, identifying and delineating role/extent the online environment plays in the total course.
1.8   Calendar of due dates and other relevant events is provided.

Section 2. Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning
Student Evaluation and Assessment refers to the process your institution uses to determine student achievement and quality of work, including the assigning of grades.
2.1   All Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are specific, well-defined, and measureable.
2.2   Instructions for students to meet the SLO are adequate and stated clearly.
2.3   SLO are not just in bulleted list, but also integrated within respective assignments/assessments.
2.4   The course grading policy is clearly stated, along with scale and weights of respective assignments.
2.5   Demonstrates an understanding of the relationships between and among the assignments, assessments and standards-based learning goals.
2.6   The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the student work being assessed.
2.7   Students have multiple opportunities to measure their own learning progress.

Section 3. Instructional Materials and Resources Utilized
The instructor has carefully selected a variety of materials and material formats to represent course content and enable students to meet relevant learning outcomes.
3.1   Students are given adequate notice to acquire course materials.
3.2   Syllabus lists whether textbooks are required or recommended.
3.3   For each required and recommended text, there is a brief statement as to its value/purpose in meeting student learning outcome(s).
3.4   When possible, students are given options in terms of how they acquire course materials, including Open Educational Resources (e.g., MERLOT).
3.5   There is a variety of instructional material types, helping to engage students in the content, while not overly relying on one content type.
3.6   Audio and visual files used are clear in purpose and do not distract from outcomes.
3.7   The instructional materials present a variety of perspectives related to course content and topics within.
3.8   All resources and materials used in the course are appropriately cited.

Section 4. Instructional Design and Delivery
Addresses how the course design, assignments, and technology effectively encourage exchanges amongst the instructor, students, and content.
4.1   At the beginning of the course, students are provided with an opportunity to introduce themselves to each other as a way of encouraging community.
4.2   A variety of instructional delivery methods, accommodating multiple learning styles, is available throughout course.
4.3   The selected tool for each activity is appropriate for effective delivery of teacher or student content.
4.4   Establishes and maintains ongoing and frequent teacher-student interaction, as well as student-student interaction.
4.5   Discussions are organized in clearly defined forums, threads, or communities.

4.6   The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning outcomes.

4.7   Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.

4.8   When requiring group work, a statement of the task is provided, with clear and concise outcomes that are appropriate and reasonable.

4.9   Rules for forming groups and assigning roles are clearly stated.

4.10   Benchmarks and expectations of group participation are clearly stated.

4.11   The modes and requirements for student interaction are clearly articulated.

4.12   Instructor's plan for response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.

4.13   Course abides by copyright and fair use laws.

Section 5. Technology for Teaching and Learning

Instructor utilizes technology to effectively deliver course content, engage students in learning activities (individual, student-to-student, instructor-to-student) and for students to express themselves or demonstrate learning.

5.1   The tools and media support the course learning objectives.

5.2   Course tools and media support student engagement and guide the student to become an active learner.

5.3   Navigation throughout the online components of the course is logical, consistent, and efficient.

5.4   Students can readily access the technologies required in the course.

5.5   Acceptable formats for assignment completion and submission have been articulated.

5.6   The course technologies are current.

Section 6. Learner Support and Resources

Learner Support and Resources refers to program, academic, and/or technical resources available to learners.

6.1   Instructor states her/his role in the support process and how students obtain support.

6.2   The course instructions articulate, or link to, a clear description of the technical support offered and how to access it.

6.3   Syllabus articulates how students access and fully utilize campus library resources and support.

6.4   Course instructions articulate, or link to, an explanation of how the institution's academic support services and resources can help students succeed in the course and how students can access related services (e.g., Disability Support Services, Writing Center, Tutoring Center, IT Help Desk).

6.5   Course and institutional policies with which students are expected to comply are clearly stated and/or links to current policies provided (e.g., cheating and plagiarism, copyright).

Section 7. Accessibility and Universal Design

The course utilizes principles of accessibility and universal design that are critical to some learners, as well as offering benefits to all learners.

7.1   Course instructions articulate and/or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.

7.2   The syllabus makes clear how the instructor will follow university policy and work with students who have an officially registered disability.

7.3   The course employs accessible technologies: course environment, communications, engagement, instructional materials, and assessments.

7.4   The course design facilitates readability and minimizes distractions.

7.5   The course design and materials accommodate, rather than inhibit, the use of assistive technologies.

7.6   Instructor adapts and adjusts instruction to create multiple paths to learning objectives.

Discussion:

Senator Preciado asked for Chair Schellenberg to provide an overview of the report on online education. **Senator Schellenberg** reviewed the different sections of the report, noting the referral was "multi-faceted." Thus, the committee attempted to break it into specific sections. He said many of the issues were already addressed by existing policy, with some from the CSU-system level. However, the policy at the CSU level was last submitted in 1991. This report may need to be revisited. In terms of the final testing schedule, he said the schedule was really a logistical issue. He said the University could do a better job of setting up final exams that are on a matrix for online courses. However, the Senator said this was an implementation issue, rather than a policy question. He then reviewed some of the remaining sections of the report. He noted that many had voiced concern about course quality; however, he noted that quality was "a very loaded term." He said the concern seemed to refer to a concern about online courses and "low-quality" online courses, specifically. He said this concern should probably be a broader discussion about quality in all of the University's courses. However, he noted that such a discussion "transcended the role of AP&P."

In terms of the question of course quality, **Senator Abdel-Nour** said he agreed that courses do come in different qualities. However, he said the modality of online asks faculty members to think through course design at a different level than face-to-face. In the curriculum review committees at the college and university levels, he said individuals on those committees have the "accumulated wisdom" of previous generations that they have culled over the decades in order to judge the quality of face-to-face courses. The Senator said this level of curriculum knowledge is not available concerning the quality of online course design. He said what is needed is to consider whether something equivalent to the former distance-education review committee needed to be reinstated. Perhaps the committee was acting as a "bottle-neck"; however, he said rather than solving the bottle-neck problem, the University eliminated a level of review so that now we have a new technology that "we don't even know how to assess; we don't even have a procedure whereby online courses are assessed." He said this was the question of quality that needed to be addressed.

In response, **Senator Schellenberg** said he agreed with the Senator's comments. However, in the spirit of initiating a broader discussion, the Senator said he saw such a question as involving the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. He said he felt such a discussion extended beyond the role of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee. **Chair Eadie** said he recently attended a conference on Student Success and the Quality Agenda. He said he came away with the idea that to have quality, the University needed engaged students and engaged faculty. As the Student Success goals in the Strategic Plan are implemented, he said he would like to engage faculty in discussing these types of issues. **Senator Schellenberg** drew attention to a rubric attached to the report. Although it was developed for online courses, he said many of the items applied to face-to-face courses. Perhaps such a rubric could be used for all courses.

In terms of issues related to finals, **Senator Putman** said according to policy, if instructors don't have comprehensive finals, they still are required to meet during finals weeks. He noted that with online courses, instructors could take finals six weeks in advance. The Senator asked Senator Schellenberg if the committee had considered making it clear that this was a fifteen-week term. **Senator Schellenberg** responded that incorporating online courses into a finals' matrix would help to solve that problem because there would be a time assigned for finals.

Senator Donadey asked whether there was a review process for courses that were switched from face-to-face to online. **Senator Schellenberg** said this decision was made largely at the department and college levels. She said she appreciated many aspects of the report but had a couple of concerns. The assumption was the desire to have courses online came from instructors. However, she said the push for online courses was coming largely from administrators and legislators. She said the report didn't address what an instructor or a

department can do if they don't want to offer a course online. **Senator Schellenberg** responded that there was no requirement to teach in the summer. **Senator Donadey** contended that some who have taught summer courses face-to-face for years were now being asked to teach them online. In addition, she pointed out that research indicates that under-prepared students don't do well with online courses. **Senator Schellenberg** said there also was research showing no difference in success between online and face-to-face courses. What was behind the difference may be the type of courses that were being offered. He said what was critical for the online course was course design. The Senator applauded the Strategic Plan for increasing support for the course-development program offered by Information Technology Services.

7.2   **Academic Resources and Planning (LaMaster)**

Information:

The Senate officers issued a referral to the Academic Resources and Planning Committee, asking the committee to consider the proposal of the sustainability committee on signing the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment and report on the resource implications for SDSU should the president agree to take such an action. The officers ask AR&P to provide its best estimate of the effects of signing onto the commitment for campus budgeting processes (for example, could anticipated costs be absorbed by careful budgeting or by spreading out payments over a number of years, or would the cost have to be put ahead of other spending priorities that SDSU might have). If possible, the officers ask AR&P to advise the Senate on the advantages and disadvantages of agreeing to the commitment so that senators will have an adequate background for making a decision on this matter.

AR&P invited Dean Geoff Chase and Robert Schulz, Associate Vice President for Operations, to the March 12, 2013 meeting to provide input on the components of the report and associated costs. We were informed that the initial costs (year 1 & 2) would be minimal and would include $4000 to join the organization, staff support and small internal costs. However, full implementation for our campus would be at least $250 Million over 20 or so years. With such a wide range of numbers and variables, AR&P does not believe actual costs can be determined with the available information.
Our committee identified the advantage to signing the document as a public statement for the campus acknowledging the importance of climate change and the need for a campus plan .
 The disadvantage was identified as a commitment to an organization that would involve an unknown fiscal commitment by the campus. In summary, AR&P would recommend that the campus develop a preliminary plan that has specific goals and associated costs prior to committing to this initiative.

2. PBAC Voting Items

AR&P discussed one-time funding proposals from Student Affairs, Business & Financial Affairs, University Relations and Development and Academic Affairs. Each proposal was discussed and the corresponding merits identified. The wisdom of the committee was to support as many of the requests as possible with campus safety, ADA issues and academic affairs as top priorities. Given the fact we were reviewing this agenda item without a budget we did not allocate funds to each division proposal.

Discussion:

In terms of the committee report, **Senator Preciado** noted that it included information that would be important to review prior to the next Senate meeting related to the signing of the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment. **Chair Eadie** said this information was in response to a referral, and he thanked the committee for providing the information so promptly.

      7.3   **ASCSU (Ornatowski)**

Information:
Mandated Child Abuse Reporting

The Executive Order on Mandated Child Abuse reporting is being rewritten. At this point, faculty do not have to sign the Mandated Child Abuse Reporter form and there will be no consequences for not signing it. At some point in the future, we will get a "reminder" and at that point we will have to take on-line "training," which is allegedly being reduced from 4 hours to about 45 minutes (under pressure from CFA) and sign the form. At that point, being a mandated child abuse reporter will become a "condition of employment." At this point, Community Colleges have not yet been made "mandated reporters," neither have UC faculty. However, the law covers all segments of higher education, therefore, the CCs will have to comply. UC is late to the table and has turned the matter over to their HR. Stanford has already developed 44 designations of mandated reporters but we (CSU) have yet to sort it all out. We are officially on hold as more issues are examined.

Resolutions

At the March 13-15 ASCSU plenary, five resolutions were passed

AS-3110-13/FGA California State University (CSU) Action on Environmental Sustainability
Commends the CSU campuses that have signed the American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment and the CSU campuses that have signed Talloires Declaration and encourages the Chancellor's Office and the other campuses to consider becoming signatories to these commitments.

AS-3111-13/APEP Support for the Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System
Expresses support for the continuation of the C-ID system and requests funding to ensure its viability. The system not only supports the implementation of SB 1440 but also provides a vehicle for systemwide articulation.

AS-3112-13/FGA (Rev) AB 67 (Gorell) and SB 58 (Cannella) Post-Proposition 30 Freeze on Systemwide Student Fees and Tuition Increases
Expresses concerns about overall CSU funding and encourages the authors of the bills to include exceptions in the case that adequate state funding is unavailable.

AS-3113-13/AA/FGA Request for a Task Force to Study California State University (CSU) Student Tuition Fees and Financial Aid Support
Encourages the establishment of a task force to include CSSA, Chancellor's Office staff, and ASCSU.

AS-3115-13/EX Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the Academic Senate CSU

One resolution was tabled

AS-3114-13/APEP/AA/FGA SB 520 California Open Education Resources Council
Expresses concerns about the potential usurpation of faculty role in approving curriculum and the potential privatization of higher education. However, following a long discussion, the resolution was tabled. Since SB 530 is still evolving, ASCSU leadership will draft a letter articulating faculty concerns and meet with the author and/or his staff in person on March 25; in addition, a delegation of senators will travel to Sacramento on April 9 with a similar purpose.

Nine resolutions received their first reading (they will return as second reading items at the May ASCSU meeting)

AS-3116-13/EX Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2013-2014 Meetings

AS-3117-13/FA Change to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Section 4d(2) Charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee

AS-3118-13/FGA AB 386—Cross-Enrollment in CSU Online Courses
Opposes the provision requiring the establishment of a numbering system for online courses due to concerns over feasibility and resources to accomplish the bill's goals.

AS-3119-13/AA Clarifying the Changing Expectations for General Education.

Requests that a joint task force (between the ASCSU and CSU Chancellor's Office) be established to address the movement towards outcome-focused assessment, greater alignment of co-curricular activities with learning outcomes, and the need for systematic assessment of GE through program review, and requests a preliminary report at the September 2013 ASCSU meeting.

AS-3120-13/EX Re-instituting the Annual CSU Academic Conference

Refers to a prior resolution confirming the value of the annual CSU Academic Conference to shared governance within the CSU.

AS-3121-13/FGA AB 387--Online Education in the CSU
Opposes AB 387 (Levine) because of the difficulties in developing a workable common course numbering system just for online courses and the imposed mandate dealing with the number of courses to be developed.

AS-3122-13/AA Reaffirming the Importance of Graduate Programs and Access to Those Programs

Focuses on the preservation of State University Grants (fee waivers) for graduate students.

AS-3123-13/AA Support of Student Mental Health and Counseling Services

AS-3124-13/AA Recognition of Executive Order 1047, Extended Education and Self-Support Courses and Programs

Expresses gratitude for the clarification provided by the new EO.

Copies of this and other resolutions can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/. Faculty are encouraged to provide feedback on the above resolutions as well as on any other relevant matters to their academic senators (Bill Eadie, Cezar Ornatowski, Mark Wheeler).

7.4   Diversity, Equity and Outreach (Butler-Byrd)

Information:

In January 2013, Dr. Anne Donadey presented this 2006-2011 SDSU Employee Data report to the Diversity, Equity and Outreach Committee. The committee requests that this report be shared with the SDSU Senate to contextualize the on-going challenges that SDSU faces regarding faculty and employee recruitment and retention.
The updated report has been posted on the Senate website at:
http://newscenter.sdsu.edu/universitysenate/index.aspx.

Discussion:

Senator Donadey explained that the staff diversity statistics were incorrect in the report. Thus, the conclusions were very different. The group that has suffered the most with budget cuts was actually faculty and not staff. **Chair Eadie** said a corrected report would be available in the minutes, and the corrected report also will be posted on the Senate website. **Senator Toombs** said he was disturbed that in a forty-year period, the University had not addressed the "static hiring" of African American faculty. He asked the Senate and administration to develop a plan to address this issue. He said the demographics of the student body are changing, yet the faculty demographics aren't. **Senator Butler-Byrd** said her committee would follow these issues. She said it was embarrassing that there had been no change in forty years. In the hiring process, **Senator Donadey** said one of her hopes was that that there be an awareness on the part of the groups making the decisions that the kinds of fields in which you are approving hires do have an impact on the kind of personnel that you might attract. She said she was hopeful that in both the areas of excellence and in the regular tenure-lines hires, that there will be an awareness of this point. She said that in administrative hires, we also should consider the ability of a dean or a vice president to enhance the diversity of faculty and students. **Senator Toombs** said even though we haven't hired African Americans faculty members in forty years beyond this 25 or 20, he pointed out that once hired, they generally make it through the tenure process. **Senator Ulloa** said the DEO Committee was considering obstacles as well as interesting ideas to attract faculty. For instance, developing relationships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities through visitor programs could potentially improve recruitment strategies. He noted the committee encouraged different recruitment ideas.

7.5   **Graduate Council (Balsdon)**

Information:

EXERCISE AND NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES

1.   Changes in course title, unit value, and description.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
CPTS PHYS PATHOPHYS PHARM
DPT 750. Concepts in Physiology, Pathophysiology, and Pharmacology (4)
Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Normal physiology, diseases, disorders, and injuries. Pathological processes, specific organ system pathology, multisystem pathology, and pharmacological concepts.

Change: Revisions reflect additional concepts in normal physiology, exercise physiology, medical terminology, and pharmacology being presented.

2.   Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 786. Clinical Communication (2)
Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.
Professional issues affecting physical therapists. Development of engaged professionalism through the American Physical Therapy Association.

Change: Content better presented in DPT 868 and 887.

3. Change in grading.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 822. Interventions in Musculoskeletal Therapeutics (3)
   Two lectures and three hours of laboratory.
   Prerequisite: Doctor of Physical Therapy 821.
      Analysis of interventions used to treat clients with dysfunctions of the musculoskeletal
   system.

Change: Letter grade more reflective of learning than Cr/NC.

4. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 870. Health Care Systems (2)
   Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.
      Business strategies and skills for private practice setting.

Change: Content better presented in DPT 710 and 872.

5. Change in grading.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 881. Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice I (2)
   Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.
   Preparation as a consumer of the professional literature in physical therapy.

Change: Letter grade more reflective of learning than Cr/NC.

6. Change in grading.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 882. Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice II (2)
   Prerequisite: Doctor of Physical Therapy 881.
   Use of evidence in current physical therapy practice.

Change: Letter grade more reflective of learning than Cr/NC.

7. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 883. Seminar in Normal Human Gait (1) Cr/NC
   Prerequisite: Doctor of Physical Therapy 725.
      Normal gait and skills necessary to evaluate pathological gait.

Change: Content incorporated into new course, DPT 783.

8. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DPT 884. Seminar in Abnormal Human Gait (2) Cr/NC
   Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.
      Gait analyses and gait-related physical therapy examination and intervention planning
   with a variety of patient populations.

Change: Content incorporated into new course, DPT 783.

9.   New course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
FUNCT NEURO-BIOMECH REL (C-3)
DPT 886. Functional Neuro-Biomechanical Relationships (3)
      Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.
            Structures of the musculoskeletal system and individual regions. Forces sustained in normal and pathological conditions.

10. New course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy
DOCTORAL RESEARCH (C-23)
DPT 897. Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC
      Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.
            Investigation to the general field of the doctoral project.

11. Change in program

Specific Requirements for the Doctor of Physical Therapy Degree
(Major Code: 12122) (SIMS Code: 556529)
      The Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) is a professional and not a research degree. Students in the program will be involved in evidence-based practice/translational research projects as part of coursework and clinical internship. Students are expected to complete the program in three years while attending full-time as there is no part-time program. The minimum number of units for the DPT program of study is 116 units and the maximum number of units allowed is 121 units.

	FALL SEMESTER I *(17 Units)*
DPT 725	Clinical Anatomy I (4)
DPT 750	Pathophysiology of Physical Therapy Practice (4)
DPT 780	Integumentary Therapeutics (4)
DPT 881	Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice I (2)
DPT 887	Seminar in Professional Development (3) Cr/NC
	SPRING SEMESTER I *(16 Units)*
DPT 710	Foundations of Physical Therapy Evaluation (3)
DPT 726	Clinical Anatomy II (4)
DPT 760	Neurosciences (4)
DPT 880	Differential Diagnosis in Physical Therapy (3)
DPT 882	Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice II (2)
	SUMMER I *(13 Units)*

Session 1:

DPT 782	Therapeutic Exercise (4)
DPT 872	Health Care Economics in Physical Therapy Practice
DPT 886	Functional Neuro-Biomechanical Relationships (3)

Session 2:

DPT 801	Clerkship (3) Cr/NC
DPT 897	Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC
	FALL SEMESTER II *(18 Units)*
DPT 802	Life Cycle I (2)
DPT 820	Musculoskeletal Therapeutics I (4)
DPT 830	Cardiopulmonary Therapeutics (4)

DPT 835	Neurophysiological Therapeutics I (4)
DPT 885	Seminar in Case Presentations (3)
DPT 897	Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

SPRING SEMESTER II *(15 Units)*

DPT 803	Life Cycle II (2)
DPT 821	Musculoskeletal Therapeutics II (3)
DPT 836	Neurophysiological Therapeutics II (3)
DPT 857	Prosthetics and Orthotics (2)
DPT 875	Medical Therapeutics in Physical Therapy Practice (2)
DPT 878	Psychosocial Aspects of Rehabilitation (2)
DPT 897	Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

SUMMER II *(9 Units)*

Session 1:

DPT 822	Interventions in Musculoskeletal Therapeutics (3)
DPT 837	Interventions in Neuromuscular Therapeutics (3)
DPT 868	Physical Therapy Organization and Administration (2)

Session 2:

DPT 897	Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

FALL SEMESTER III *(14 Units)*

DPT 889	Doctoral Project (4) Cr/NC
DPT 895	Clinical Internship (10) Cr/NC

SPRING SEMESTER III *(14 Units)*

DPT 889	Doctoral Project (4) Cr/NC
DPT 895	Clinical Internship (10) Cr/NC

Change: Update of program with new courses and revisions.

GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

1.   New course.

   Geological Sciences
   RESEARCH FORUM (S-23)
GEOL 602. Research Forum (3)
   Prerequisite: Consent of department.
   Identification of an original research project and collection of preliminary data. Oral presentation of a written proposal.

2.   Add prerequisite.

   Geological Sciences
GEOL 750. Research and Technical Writing (3) Cr/NC
   Prerequisites: Geological Sciences 602 and advancement to candidacy.
   Research and technical report writing in geological sciences for students in
      Plan B.

Change: Inclusion of new GEOL 602.

3.   Add prerequisite.

   Geological Sciences
GEOL 799A. Thesis (3) Cr/NC/RP
   Prerequisites: Geological Sciences 602, an officially appointed thesis committee, and advancement to candidacy.

Preparation of a thesis for the master's degree.

Change: Inclusion of new GEOL 602.

4. Change in program

   Geological Sciences
   Specific Requirements for the Master of Science Degree
   (Major Code: 19141) (SIMS Code: 775301)
          (no change to first paragraph)
   A minimum of 18 units must be selected from 600- and 700-numbered courses in the Department of Geological Sciences. Graduate students are required to complete Geological Sciences 602, up to six units of Geological Sciences 797 Research, and three units of Geological Sciences 799A Thesis (Plan A) or three units of Geological Sciences 750, Research and Technical Writing (Plan B). (no change to balance of paragraph)

   Change: Inclusion of new GEOL 602.

PUBLIC HEALTH

1. New course.

   Public Health
   SCI WRITING EPIDEMIOLOGY (C-4)
P H 725. Scientific Writing for Epidemiology (3) Cr/NC
Prerequisite: Completion of one year of master's level coursework in epidemiology or biometry.
          Prepares students to generate a feasible hypothesis, perform, organize and write a literature review, and summarize proposed methodology. Topics include research development and organization, finding data sources, principles of scientific writing and revising, plagiarism, and citation management.

2. Change in program

   Master of Public Health Degree
          Concentration in Environmental Health
                  (SIMS Code: 557315)
          Courses required for the concentration:
   (no change to list of required courses.)
          Prescribed electives: A minimum of nine additional units selected with the approval of the adviser from:
          P H 630   Environmental Health Risk Assessment (3)
          P H 700D   Seminar in Public Health: Environmental Health (3)
          P H 738   Topics in Toxicology (3)
          P H 784   Global Environmental Health (3)
          P H 798   Special Study (1-3) Cr/NC/RP

Change: Amend prescribed electives to reflect course offerings and germane to field. Increase elective units from 6 to 9. Delete P H 635, 637, 721; add P H 784.

3. Change in program

   Master of Public Health Degree
          Concentration in Epidemiology
                  (SIMS Code: 557329)

Courses required for the concentration:
(no change to list of courses)
Prescribed electives: Six units selected from the following public health courses in epidemiology:
Addition of following new course to existing list:
P H 725 Scientific Writing for Epidemiology (3) Cr/NC

Change: Addition of new course to prescribed electives.

7.6   Undergraduate Curriculum (Barbone)

Information:

COMMUNICATION

1.   Changes in course prerequisite, unit value, grading, and mode of instruction.

Communication
(C-78)
COMM 490. Internship (1) Cr/NC
            Prerequisites: Communication 300 and 350; junior or senior standing. Admission to a major or minor in the School of Communication.
            Students work at approved agencies off-campus under the combined supervision of agency personnel and instructors. Internship hours to be arranged. Maximum credit three units.

            Change: Update to enable students to obtain internships. One unit appropriate for amount of academic work.

7.7   University Relations and Development (Carleton)

Information:

SDSU's four living presidents were on campus last month. Brage Golding, Tom Day and Steve Weber were on campus in the KPBS studio and joined President Hirshman for a lively conversation about SDSU's history. That program will air as a special episode of **"SDSU Insider" on KPBS on March 30 at 12:30 p.m**.

Campaign Update:
The Campaign has raised nearly $390 million in gifts and pledges through February. $208 million is dedicated to supporting our faculty through programs, endowments and chairs.

Recent gifts of note:

Carey Mack pledged $250,000 to the College of Business Administration Building and Classroom Remodel Project.

A gift in kind of software valued at $307,000 from MSCI for the Wells Fargo Financial Lab.

The ARCS Foundation made a gift of $46,000 to support graduate students.

Bill Waite made a $750,000 planned giving commitment for Lavin Center Scholarships.

To find out more about the gifts being made to support our students, faculty and programs, please visit: http://campaign.sdsu.edu.

Marketing and Communications:
On March 12, President Hirshman lead SDSU's delegation to Sacramento for **CSU Legislative Advocacy Day**.

On February 28, the university honored Tony Young with the **President's Service Award**. Young is the former City Council President and current Red Cross CEO. It was a great event attended by several current and former councilmembers, members of the Red Cross Board of Directors and members of the SDSU community. First presented in 2001, the President's Service Award is given to individuals who are dedicated to community service and are promoters of higher education. Past honorees have included Bob White, Mayor Bob Filner, former Mayor Jerry Sanders and former State Senator Christine Kehoe.

The spring issue of **360 Magazine** is out and is now being sent to 45,000 alumni, donors and other friends of the university. This issue features stories on the 50th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's visit to SDSU, a Q&A with Ellen Ochoa, Director of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, and an expanded focus on faculty research (heart research, language research and fetal alcohol spectrum disorders). The cover story highlights the Bunnell Strings – an extraordinary musical quintet of siblings who are all students.

8.   **Other Information Items**

Senator Cecil introduced Morgan Chan to the Senate. Chan, who is the new Associated Students Vice President of University Affairs, will replace Senator Cecil.

9.   **Adjournment**

The Senate adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Suzanne Bordelon   Allison Bobrow
Secretary of the Senate   Administrative Analyst