Note: The Accreditation Steering committee appreciates the time the Senate has given to begin focused discussion on specific elements SJSU will need to address during our re-accreditation review by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Those who participated have provided invaluable assistance and information that will become a resource as our preparatory review report is constructed.

The six areas around which small discussion groups focused were:

**Group 1**: How does the institution ensure that its institutional purposes and educational objectives are regularly reviewed and modified?

**Group 2**: In what ways does the institution ensure that its educational objectives are actively used as guides for decision-making, resource allocation, and action?

**Group 3**: How effectively do the institution's workload policies and practices balance appropriate expectations for faculty scholarship and creative activity, teaching assignments, and other uses of faculty time.

**Group 4**: In what ways does the institution engage its faculty and other members of its community in the process of determining and deploying its fiscal, physical, and information assets?

**Group 5**: In what ways does the institution ensure that its organizational structures and decision processes remain appropriately aligned with its size, complexity, character, institutional purposes, and service to students?

**Group 6**: How well do planning, evaluation, and institutional research activities fit together, and to what extent are they aligned with the institution's purposes and character?

**Group 1:**

*How does the institution ensure that its institutional purposes and educational objectives are regularly reviewed and modified?*
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher education community, and its relationship to society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

Summary of group discussion:

Group 2:

In what ways does the institution ensure that its educational objectives are actively used as guides for decision-making, resource allocation, and action?

Standard this question drawn from:

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher education community, and its relationship to society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

Summary of group discussion:

Group 2: In what ways does the institution ensure that its educational objectives are actively used as guides for decision-making, resource allocation, and action?

· To what extent are our operational practices aligned with our educational objectives?
· Can we provide examples of areas where we use them as guides?
· Can we provide examples of areas where we could improve?
· What policies do we have in place to ensure that we align our operational procedures with our statements of purpose?

Discussion started with the question “what are the educational objectives and how is alignment of the resources to these goals established?” As background, it was suggested that
the San Jose State University Mission statement provides no guidance because it is much too vague to be useful:

â€œTo enrich the lives of its students, to transmit knowledge to its students along with the necessary skills for applying it in the service of our society, and to expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarshipâ€

There is slightly more guidance provided in the Goals of the University (for both undergraduate and graduate students). The Goals are:

· In-depth knowledge of a major field of study
· Broad understanding of the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts
· Skills in communication and critical inquiry
· Multi-cultural and global perspectives gained through intellectual and social exchange with people of diverse economic and ethnic backgrounds
· Active participation in professional, artistic, and ethnic communities
· Responsible citizenship and an understanding of ethical choices inherent in human development

Discussion about educational alignment initially focused on the decentralized nature of campus (e.g., the budget allocations to colleges encourage local rather than central control and direction). One of the critical questions on the thesis topic concerns the linkage between educational objectives and the budget. The specific issue addressed was the linkage between the faculty-to-student ration (FSR) and the budget [rather than â€œeducational objectivesâ€ and the budget; unless the educational objective is â€œbutts in seatsâ€ the problem being equating FTE with quality].

The closest exemplar of a linkage between educational objectives and resources (budget dollars) is in the domain of the GE courses. Although there is no allocation based on GE goals, it is one of few domains with campus-wide buy-in and eventual connection between resources and whether-or-not objectives have been met.

At a more local level, the curricular priorities project did focus on articulated program objectives for the various majors and concentrations. The linkage between goals and resources is notably stronger for those programs focused on credentials and/or with an external governance agency. (as an aside, it was noted that those programs noted for excellence by the curricular priorities project merely survived budget cuts better than other programs, without the intended application of new resources to actually strengthen the programs). Additionally, the college level planning committees would seem to be the natural home of large-scale realignment of Objectives vs. FTS as a basis for funding. The principal issue that would evolve is the â€œcombat modelâ€ of funding and other resources across many colleges seeking funding from the same inherently limited pool.

Although the resource-linkage question would seem to be a good argument for allowing long-term planning by the university community (both as a whole and by component), rational planning is really not feasible given the lack of control on the resource side inherent in the California public university system; budget instability from the state level paired with a lack of
local control over local financial alternatives (e.g., setting tuition) means that any attempt at strategic planning is seriously undermined before it begins. On a campus level, this is a problem because of expectation management – promised resources may not be delivered due to changing budget priorities or state or chancellor-driven mandates.

Returning to the issue of metrics; decanal level metrics that are available to be used include: student attrition, faculty and student publications, FTS, FTES, ratio of F/T to P/T faculty, the contents of the five-year departmental reviews, external accreditation requirements, various-level mission statements (when not too vague), program and university level goal statements, five-year planning documents, and the rationale and evidence included in departmental requests for faculty positions. Clearly the strongest statements of educational goals exist at the course level, and especially for those of many of the GE designated courses. Some departments (e.g., Psychology) are moving to establish goal-metric pairings for each course offering. It is unclear how these would be used to drive resource allocation, given the lack of university-wide hallmarks, goal statements and explicit agreed-upon cross-departmental objectives (e.g., trying to assess whether students can identify the dynamic of ethnic, cultural, gender/sexual, age-based, class, regional, national, transnational, and global identities and the similarities, differences, linkages, and interactions between them would seem to be inherently problematic (example from GE Area D).

---

**Group 3:**

*How effectively do the institution's workload policies and practices balance appropriate expectations for faculty scholarship and creative activity, teaching assignments, and other uses of faculty time?*

Standard this question drawn from:

**Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability**

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

**Summary of group discussion:**

Mickey began by mentioning the AIM taskforce as the current initiative that was meant to deal with these issues. She said it was not possible to reduce workload except through re-assigned time. Charla asked how other CSU campuses were able to have 3/3 course loads, for example in the College of Ethnic Studies at SFSU. Mickey said the contract currently says that only 20% of faculty time is for service activities, which includes committees, advisement, etc. Michael said
that there are many practices where time is re-assigned. Mickey agreed and mentioned that for example, chairs get re-assigned time, as do RTP participants at the university level, and people who work with BOGS. Mickey mentioned that new assistant professors get release for the first year. Michael mentioned that faculty buy-out their time and that departments can give faculty release time for teaching large classes. The Philosophy Department does this by teaching intro classes with 120 students in each class. Mickey mentioned that the current Faculty to Student ration is 1:20. Sylvia asked why it isn’t possible to have grad students do some of the grading. Charla said that because we are not a Ph.D. granting institution, we do not have the labor pool.

Mickey then asked what the tangible outcomes were that are associated with the current AIM initiatives. She also asked what the workload policies are and how effective are they. She said that the AIM money has been reduced from $700,000 to $200,000. Sylvia asked what this money was used for, and Mickey said it was used to hire graders and release faculty.

The discussion then shifted to whether fiscal resources and release time is equitably distributed across the colleges. Annette agreed that this should be researched and said that she’s heard that virtually no one teaches 4/4, that everyone has assigned time. Sylvia mentioned that imbalances in workload across colleges could lower faculty morale in colleges that are burdened with less resources. Charla mentioned that she has taught 4/4 for the past two years. Annette said it has taken a long time to open budgets and that there is no monitoring of faculty workload, i.e. who has how many preps, etc. She also pointed out that department chairs do not have a process for this monitoring.

Someone mentioned that faculty and staff development has to be listed as a priority.

Sylvia mentioned that there needs to be much more fundraising to specifically address faculty workload and that there will be a new alumni center and gallery where endowment initiatives could be focused. She mentioned that the university needs to seriously tap private fundraising.

Peter Chua mentioned that perhaps we could brainstorm what the university is doing well in this area and then what needs revision. He mentioned that perhaps there could be an initiative to change the meaning of what is considered research and creative activity so that things like pedagogical innovations could be rewarded.

---

**Group 4:**

*In what ways does the institution engage its faculty and other members of its community in the process of determining and deploying its fiscal, physical, and information assets?*

Standard this question drawn from:

**Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability**
The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

**Summary of group discussion:**

Organization of faculty's self-governance needs to be rethought. Today, the proportion of full-time, tenure or tenure track faculty to lecturers is approx. 50/50. By and large, lecturers do not get involved in committees on the university, college, or even dept. level. Our committee system was designed at a time, when the large majority of faculty was eligible for committee work. As a result, "regular" faculty is overworked with administrative/committee tasks, while a large part of the faculty is removed from the decision-making process altogether.

In regard to hiring, depts. make their independent decisions. It depends on their budget and on the availability on the job market whether they can hire tenure/tenure track faculty or just lecturers.

The budget is at heart of almost all academic decisions, and in terms of fiscal decisions, the Budget Advisory Committee of the Senate makes some recommendation to the administration and the president. Often these recommendations are ignored without a justification. That information usually does not reach the senate at large or other university committees. Therefore, it presents only the illusion of faculty self-governance and/or participation in fiscal matters.

Last academic year, budget forums were held. They provided a good overview to a larger circle of faculty. There also was a chance to ask questions or make comments, but that cannot be regarded as a process of decision-making or empowerment of the faculty.

Fiscal information does not trickle down to faculty members.

Agrees. Plenty of information is available on physical and information assets, but not on fiscal assets.

In her dept., the maximum number of students in graduate classes was raised from 25 to 40, but the decision was not made on the dept. level, where everybody agreed that this is not sound pedagogy.

The liberty to make sound academic decisions on part of the depts. is curtailed by monetary limits. Depts. work within the framework of the budget handed down to them by their deans. There is little or no influence of the dept. It would be interesting to know, however, how the various colleges are awarded their appropriation of the university's budget.

The needs and methods of colleges and depts. vary depending on their nature. Some disciplines can admit students up to the capacity of the facilities (rooms, labs, etc.), others can only enroll a limited amount of students because constant interaction is necessary (e.g. foreign language
classes). In addition, we do not want students to be anonymous, and a large class runs the risk of having uninvolved and detached students.

The flexibility to make academic decisions often depends on the size of the dept. Larger ones have more flexibility in reallocating and restructuring. Depts. that already cruise on the minimum of course offerings and faculty resources and are stretched very thin are robbed of all flexibility to make sound academic decisions. There is neither sufficient money nor is there room for internal shifts like refocusing and restructuring.

Regional concentrations within the CSU might be an answer. Not every CSU campus needs to offer everything.

The Academic Priority Review was a process to rethink structure and allocations within one campus. It was not necessarily a good undertaking. It was a very cumbersome and labor intensive process, and also very divisive. In the end, it did not yield much. The number of programs decreased on paper, but not many classes were cut. Also, money is allocated pretty much the same way it was before the Academic Priorities Review.

The time and effort would have been invested better to raise money and enrollment.

Does the senate help faculty to participate in the fiscal process?

No! The limitations of the Budget Advisory Committee were already mentioned earlier. The senate as a whole receives lengthy, printed reports from the VP of Administration and from the Athletics Division. These reports are very technical and incomprehensible to most senators. These reports are accompanied by presentations of the VP of Adm. and the Director of Athletics, who -of course- present their budgets very favorable. Questions and answers follow the reports, but often critical remarks or questions are not being acted on. Often they are evaded by saying that the matter will be taken into consideration in the future or that someone else needs to be contacted for additional or specific information. Overall, senators are provided with a mass of information, but they cannot really act on it or gain any involvement in the fiscal decision process.

Annette Nellen added that these reports reach the senate after the fact. Therefore, the senate can only be reactive rather than proactive.

---

**Group 5:**

*In what ways does the institution ensure that its organizational structures and decision processes remain appropriately aligned with its size, complexity, character, institutional purposes, and service to students?*

Standard this question drawn from:
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

Summary of group discussion:

Our Main Question: In what ways does the institution ensure that its organizational structures and decision processes remain appropriately aligned with its size, complexity, character, institutional purposes, and service to students?

We began by considering organizational structures. Our focus was not on reproducing the hierarchy of SJSU, but figuring out which groups on campus allow us to remain appropriately aligned... Our list:

Academic Senate (esp by changing rules for membership and via O & G)
President’s Staff
Provost’s Council
AVP Council
Council of Deans
Council of Chairs
Labor Council

Further discussion:

We are not hierarchical; there are multiple paths to decision-makers
Decentralized approach at SJSU (haphazard?)
How do we decide what sorts of things need to be decided? We don’t may not have any process in place.
Are educational objectives foremost in making decisions?
Note that at Senate policies must include Financial Impact statement at the bottom. Why not Educational Impact also? (i.e., consideration of service to students)

Discussion merged/shifted to decision processes, the second aspect of our main question for consideration. Examples of what works well to remain appropriately aligned... Our list:

At the department level -- Social Work convenes student focus groups at the end of the year to seek feedback about what works/doesn’t work.
Program Planning (realignment built into the process)
Interdisciplinary programs
Next we discussed difficulties/impediments to continually (re)aligning ourselves:

There are competitions (inherent?) amongst colleges, then amongst departments within each college. Can we foster more cooperativity with limited resources? We need to look at both what is working and what is not working. Not enough means to share/communicate excellent ideas (exceptions = Program Planning and BOGS where model departments and courses are available to assist others going through the same processes) How to avoid confusing quality and quantity? (Example of this and poor communication -- from todayâ€™s senate vote on the change in membership of the Program Planning Committee: UGS and the Program Planning Committee were not consulted about the doubling of the committee membership. The biggest problem with committee workload is that not all committee members are doing their fair share of the work, not that there are too few members.) Other (non-senate) faculty and campus members uniformed about important issues. Other CSU campuses distribute senate agendas by email to help with this communication issue.

**Group 6:**

*How well do planning, evaluation, and institutional research activities fit together, and to what extent are they aligned with the institution's purposes and character?*

Standard this question drawn from:

**Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities at different levels of the institution, and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work.

**Summary of group discussion:**

1. What is the character of SJSU?
   a. To a large extent, it is defined by our students (e.g. most students commute, most work, many have families, culturally very diverse).
   b. metropolitan
   c. we focus on practical matters â€“ applied aspect of scholarship -- e.g. applied research that fits Silicon Valley.
   d. we have developed multiple partnerships with the city of San Jose.
   e. unique gender balance with women constituting 43% of the faculty and 50% of the academic deans.
f. diversity of students reflects the diversity of the community.
g. high enrollment from transfer students.
h. We are #5 in research grants among the CSU campuses.

2. What is its purpose?

a. provide access to an excellent education and life-long learning for a highly diverse population of Californian students.
b. we power Silicon Valley.
c. we prepare students for technologically advanced applications
d. form multiple partnerships
e. maintain a liberal arts program with a practical emphasis.
f. the university is involved in preparing K-12 teachers.
g. Provide a graduate education

i. provides faculty with a quality research experience that they can take back to the students.
ii. contribute to professions
iii. essential to have graduate students for faculty to maintain an active research program.

3. How well do planning, evaluation and institutional research activities fit together?

a. We need a strategic plan. At present, one doesn’t exist.
b. The general feeling was that there is not a good fit in expectations for research, teaching and service. There is a push to increase both research expectations and teaching loads and they are not compatible. Pressure to get grants without providing support.
c. There has been increased support of faculty through the Center for Faculty Development and in orientation of new faculty. These programs have been evaluated and that information would be available.
d. partnerships could be evaluated.
e. Priorities tend to be set by what is expected in a traditional sense but not by what we really are.

i. Time lags need to be included in planning. For example, time needed to establish a functional research program before getting publications.
ii. priorities need to reflect impact on workloads.
iii. there is no real avenue for communicating priorities among different levels (e.g. department, college, university).

f. Suggestion with respect to the RTP process.

i. develop forums to establish priorities
ii. have faculty retreats with facilitators trained by the university (e.g. through CFD).