

2002/2003 Academic Senate

MINUTES
September 30, 2002

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and attendance was taken. Thirty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Brent, Nellen, Martinez
Shifflett, Peter, Van Selst

Absent: Caret

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Lee

Absent: Goodman, Kassing, Rascoe

Deans:

Present: Andrew, Breivik

Absent: Gorney-Moreno, Meyers

Students:

Present: Greathouse, Lee, Ortiz, Tsai

Absent: Grotz, Yuan

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Guerra

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Absent: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Main, Liu

CASA Representatives:

Awaiting election results, no CASA members assigned yet.

COB Representatives:

Present: Donoho, Onkvisit

ED Represent:

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz, Rickford

ENG Representatives:

Present: Hambaba, Pour, Singh

H&A Representatives:

Present: Williams, Sabalius, Van Hooff

Absent: Vanniarajan

SCI Representatives:

Present: Bros, Hamill, Stacks, Matthes

SOS Representatives:

Present: Ray

SW Representative:

Present: Hines

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –

The following minutes were approved as is:

April 22, 2002

May 6, 2002

May 13, 2002

III. Communications

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

President Caret and the Vice Presidents could not attend today due to a scheduling conflict. The President asked Chair Brent to communicate his regrets to the Senate. President Caret also asked Chair Brent to communicate his strong support for *AS 1185, Senate Management Resolution: Authorizing the Creation of an Ad Hoc Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of a Diverse Faculty (Final Reading)* that we will be debating today. Today's agenda is relatively full for the first meeting of the year. Chair Brent thanked the Executive Committee, the Budget Advisory Committee, the Professional Standards Committee, and the Student Evaluation Review Board for all their hard work in preparing the resolutions you have before you today. Susan Hansen and Alan Freeman will be giving a presentation at 3:30 p.m. regarding the new Housing Village that construction will begin in January. Chair Brent said there have been several changes in the Senate's membership since the last time the Senate met in May 2002. First, all three Senators from the College of Applied

Sciences and the Arts (Gong Chen, Nancy Lu, Carolyn Glogoski) resigned in the same week. Chair Brent is happy to report that at least two people have completed nominating petitions, and we will be welcoming them to the Senate at our next meeting. In addition, Senator Chris Fink from the College of Humanities and the Arts has resigned, and we are in the process of trying finding a replacement for him. In addition, because of her new interim position with the University Advancement Division, Dean Carmen Sigler had to resign from the Senate. Dean Susan Meyers has agreed to be her replacement, and will be attending future Senate Meetings. Chair Brent asked all Senators to join him in welcoming her. Senator Tim Hegstrom recently assumed the role of Interim Associate Dean for the College of Social Sciences, therefore, he was forced to relinquish his position in the CSU Statewide Senate. Chair Brent announced that Professor Mark Van Selst of the Psychology Department was elected to replace him. In addition, Sally Veregge has a class conflict and is leaving the Senate for one semester. Chair Brent announced that Shannon Bros would be replacing Sally for this semester. Chair Brent asked the new Senators, Maria Guerra from Alumni, Mengxiong Liu from the Library, and Sak Onkvisit from the College of Business, to stand and be recognized. Chair Brent then asked our new student Senators, Argelis Ortiz, Rachael Greathouse, and Maribel Martinez to stand and be recognized.

Chair Brent announced that the annual Senate Retreat would be held this Friday, October 4, 2002 from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. in BBC 32. The topic of this year's retreat is "SJSU's Core Curriculum—What does it mean to be a SJSU Graduate." Eva Joice has passed out RSVP forms for all Senators to fill out so that we may get a head count for lunch.

Chair Brent announced that a service celebrating the life and career of the late Senator Roy Young would be held this Saturday at 2 p.m. in Science 142. All members of the campus community are invited to attend.

Chair Brent announced a vacancy on the CSU Board of Trustees to replace Harold Goldwhite. Chair Brent said that according to SJSU policy, faculty may be nominated by obtaining 50 faculty member signatures, or they may be nominated by a vote in their department. This week further information and nominating petitions will be distributed throughout the campus via campus mail.

Chair Brent said that one of his goals for this coming year is to increase the effectiveness of our Operating Committees. Chair Brent hopes to meet individually with all the Chairs of the Operating Committees by the end of the semester. To date, Chair Brent has met with the Chair of AUTECH, the Chair of the Assessment Committee, the Chair of the Continuing Education Committee, the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Chair of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee, the Chair of the Student Evaluation Review Board, and the Chair of the Student Success Committee. Chair Brent said he was pleased to report that "without exception, each of these committees is engaged in important work with capable, energetic leaders." Chair Brent said that meeting the Chairs of the various committees has been extremely beneficial for him. Chair Brent has been able to see what work they are doing, where their work might overlap with other committees, and where we might be able to consolidate committees as part of the AIM Task Force report requirement to reduce the number of committees we currently have. Chair Brent said reducing the number

of committees is a more difficult task than he thought it would be, because all of these committees are already doing a lot of work.

Chair Brent said he has another goal for the coming year to try and increase the student participation on our committees. We currently have a crisis in student representation on our committees. We have room for 53 students on our committees, and we currently have 48 student vacancies. This has had consequences for our committees that have a high ratio of students on them. Chair Brent asked each Senator to try and find one student to serve on a committee. Chair Brent said he has been able to get six of his students to apply for committee vacancies. Chair Brent is trying to work with Associated Students to expedite approval of student nominations for our committees. Chair Brent will also be meeting with Meredith Moran, Director of the Student Life Center, to come up with ways to reach out to student organizations and generate more student involvement in our committees.

Chair Brent announced that the Senators would be voting on a resolution from the Budget Advisory Committee about budget priorities today. Chair Brent said Senators might ask, "What happens to those priorities after they are voted on in the Fall?" Chair Brent said that in the Spring semester the Budget Advisory Committee uses those priorities as a guide in analyzing proposals submitted to them, from the various divisions of the university, asking for money. In May 2002, the Budget Advisory Committee issued its recommendations regarding budget priorities proposals for the 2002/2003 academic year. This report is available on the Senate website and Chair Brent urged anyone with questions about what the Budget Advisory Committee does to review them.

Chair Brent said that earlier this month, the Budget Advisory Committee approved the release of several hundred thousand dollars in lottery reserve funds to help the university deal with the state budget crisis. Chair Brent explained that each year a few hundred thousand dollars are added to the Lottery reserve in the event of a crisis. This year the Budget Advisory Committee felt that the state budget crisis was sufficient to warrant tapping into the reserve fund to help pay for pressing university needs.

Questions:

Senator Shifflett said the May 13 minutes say that President Caret indicated we were looking at roughly 600 FTE being added in the Fall, and at least a third of that number not being funded. Senator Shifflett asked Chair Brent if he had the actual number of FTE that we ended up with. Chair Brent said he did not have those numbers with him, but he believed we were way over that 600 FTE figure. Senator Singh said he saw somewhere that the number was 825 FTE. Senator Singh asked Chair Brent if he had anything to say about the proposed budget cuts. Chair Brent said that the various divisions had been asked to implement a 5% cut, this amounts to about \$5.6 million for the Academic Affairs Division. The Budget Advisory Committee is working on a proposal to be brought to the Senate on strategies and principles to be followed in a budget-cutting year.

Senator Williams asked if Chair Brent knew of any divisions in the university that had not been asked to cut their budgets. Chair Brent said that it was his understanding that Athletics

and University Advancement had not been asked to cut their budgets. Later, it was brought to the chair's attention that this answer may have been misleading. Athletics and Advancement were not asked to participate in the first round of budget cutting, but if the university were forced to absorb a 5% cut in the spring, those divisions would be expected to absorb their share of such cuts.

Senator Shifflett said there appear to be some quirks that need to be worked out in the implementation of the Scheduling policy. Academic Scheduling has sent out a message saying that they will remove classes that are in conflict with the allocation policy. This removal appears to some as if it is done without notification to the departments. Senator Shifflett said what this appears to mean is that if you don't fall into whatever guidelines are in the rules, your course gets pulled from the schedule. Senator Shifflett said if a course has a lab that uses a classroom, and not a lab room, it appears as though it will be pulled from the schedule. Chair Brent said he will raise these issues with Kathy Rott in Academic Scheduling.

Senator Buzanski addressed the Senate on a point of parliamentary privilege. Senator Buzanski said the university should not be using the word "Frosh" in place of "Freshman." Senator Buzanski said that the word Freshman goes back to the year 1515. The Oxford English Dictionary said as early as 1696 the word Freshman was used at Cambridge University. Webster's Dictionary, the 1890 edition, defines Freshman as the lowest of the four classes in an American College. However, the Freshman/Sophomore definition was shortened to Fresh/Soph as early as 1851. Senator Buzanski said please note that the term is Fresh/Soph not Frosh/Soph. Senator Buzanski said that the only definition given in the Oxford English Dictionary for Frosh is Frog.

B. From the President of the University – None

VI. Policy Committee & University Library Board Action Items.

C. Professional Standards – Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.

Jan Johnston presented *AS 1183, Policy Resolution: Adoption of a New Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Instrument (Final Reading)*. Senator Katz gave a brief introduction on this issue. Senator Katz said that the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) has been working on this survey for more than three years. They have produced a new SOTE form. Senator Katz will be asking for a suspension of the rules which requires a two-thirds vote, so that the Senate will be in a position to vote up or down on the instrument. Senator Katz said that the proposal had been discussed in the Professional Standards Committee. The Professional Standards Committee expressed concern that there may have been undue influence on items 16 and 17 on the SOTE. Therefore, the Professional Standards Committee is recommending that items 16 and 17 not be reported back to departments, but rather to the SERB. The Student Evaluation Review Board and the Professional Standards Committee are hoping to implement the new SOTE in the Fall of next year.

Jan Johnston said that the outline of how the SERB produced the SOTE is in the first two

pages. The whole review process began because the current SOTE is thirteen or fourteen years old, and it was never developed from any systematic process. During the first year of this review process, the SERB looked at the old SOTE and its limitations by comparing it with similar instruments around the country. The SERB came up with about 130 to 140 possible new items for inclusion in the new SOTE. The SERB then put these items through a series of tests. Focus groups were held across campus with faculty and students to get feedback on the questions. The focus groups were followed by a campus-wide forum to give everyone an opportunity to provide input. The first pilot testing was done in 2001, the SERB had added about 35 items to the old SOTE. The SERB got a lot of demographic data out of that test. The SERB then brought in three experts in Statistics, two from SJSU and one from Stanford, to look at their preliminary analysis and future plans. After that evaluation, the SERB reduced the SOTE to the present number of items. The SERB then did another field test of 2000 respondents that were from a stratified sample of classes this year. The SERB played around with the presentation and scaling of the instrument, before finally coming up with what we have today. Jan Johnston said that the SERB's task was to find something that would fit every class. The SOTE before the Senate is the SERB's best effort. The SERB will be recommending that the SOTE be given to all classes in Fall 2003 when first implemented.

Questions:

Senator Peter asked if questions 16 and 17 were tested along with the other questions. Jan Johnston said that items 16 and 17 were new items that were added after the testing was done. Senator Peter said the resolution from Professional Standards does not say that the SOTE will be administered to all classes. Senator Katz said the MOU says that we are only required to evaluate one course a semester. Senator Katz said they are not in a position to mandate that more classes be tested, but the Professional Standards Committee would recommend it. Senator Peter said that it seems that the conflict between the MOU and the academic governance is a false conflict. Senator Katz said that when they discuss administering the instrument they can address this issue.

Senator Hamill asked how the scores on the new SOTE correlated with the scores on the old SOTE, or were the scores even checked for a correlation? Jan Johnston said that there is a high correlation between the two instruments. Faculty that were rated very high overall on the old instrument were rated high overall on the new instrument. Senator Hamill asked Senator Katz for clarification on what the Senate would be voting up and down on. Senator Katz said the SOTE was what the Senate would be voting up and down on.

Senator Bros said she had some concern about the rating scale. There seems to be three ways to get an agreement and two ways to get a disagreement. Senator Bros asked why "not applicable/no opportunity to serve students" wasn't used in the scale. Jan Johnston said that the SERB had a lot of discussion about this. One of the problems was that there is an all out rating on both the old SOTE and the new SOTE that has been highly skewed towards the high-end scale. The SERB looked at what other colleges had done, and decided to go with the five-point scale with three on the high end and two on the low end.

Senator Liu asked if there were additional questions on the supplemental part of the questionnaire, or what this section was to be used for? Jan Johnson said that this section is for the departments to insert their own questions that are relevant only to them. This section will not be evaluated by anyone but the department.

Senator Singh asked if by voting up or down that meant the Senate would not be able to recommend any amendments to the SOTE, and that they must vote for it or against it? Senator Katz said yes, but if Senator Singh wanted, he could vote against it. Jan Johnston said she would try and answer any questions any Senator wanted to ask about why the SERB did what they did with regard to the SOTE.

Senator Onkvisit said if the old SOTE and the new SOTE are highly correlated won't we have the same problems with the new SOTE that we had with the old SOTE? Jan Johnston said that the new SOTE taps new dimensions that were never tapped before. Specifically, there is nothing in the old instrument that dealt with helping students think, or with the relevance of what they were learning. Senator Onkvisit asked whether the SERB had considered the 7 and 10 point rating scales. Jan Johnston said that they were limited in their funding, and had not experimented with different scales.

Senator Sabalius asked what analysis the SERB would be doing of items 16 and 17, and why the instructors and chairs would not be informed about these items. Senator Katz said that the Professional Standards Committee was very unclear about what kind of impact items 16 and 17 would have on the RTP process without further examination. The Professional Standards Committee has been making efforts to standardize the SOTE, and to ensure a reduction in the possibility of undue influence. The Professional Standards Committee came to the conclusion that they weren't ready to have items 16 and 17 evaluated by the RTP committee.

Senator Buzanski asked how one would determine whether the course content was relevant in question number one. Jan Johnston said the students themselves have to define whether the course content is relevant to them.

Senator Shifflett said that although the SERB had done a fabulous job on the SOTE, she recommended that today's reading be a first reading, and that the Professional Standards Committee take notes on the feedback given today and bring it back to the Senate for a final reading at a later date. Chair Brent said that the proposal was listed as a final reading because he was initially told by the SERB that they wanted to implement the new SOTE in Fall 2002. However, Chair Brent has since been told that the new SOTE won't be implemented until Fall 2003. Senator Shifflett asked whether the median scores could be included on the report. Jan Johnston said there was no reason that couldn't be.

Senator Van Hooff asked whether the qualitative data on the new SOTE will replace what they have in the departments now. Senator Peter Lee said that departments can still do their own evaluations in addition to using the new SOTE.

Senator Stacks asked why the SOTE and the implementation procedures were being

separated. Senator Katz said that his understanding from Chair Brent was that there was a certain degree of urgency in getting the SOTE approved. If there is no degree of urgency, then the Professional Standards Committee has time to include the implementation procedures with the SOTE. Senator Stacks asked about the diversity question. How would a student visualize this question, what did they think it meant. Jan Johnston said it meant a variety of things, such as diverse culturally, diverse in ability, diverse in language, etc. Senator Stacks said that the question is very open-ended. Jan Johnston agreed.

Senator Martinez said that some of the questions have vague language, e.g. question number 12. Jan Johnston said that the language was vague, because there are students from all departments being surveyed and the questions need to apply to all departments.

Senator Tsai said that she like having questions 16 and 17 on the SOTE. She asked why they wouldn't be reported back to students. Chair Brent said that it was his understanding that this was prohibited by the faculty contract. Senator Peter Lee said that you can ask for this information, but there is no provision in the faculty contract for providing information that doesn't address teaching effectiveness. Senator Katz said that the Professional Standards Committee wanted to ensure that there was as little bias and undue influence as possible. This is why they want to study questions 16 and 17. It is not clear what they want to communicate to other people making decisions at this point. Senator Katz said he does not have an answer right now as to how the Professional Standards Committee wants to recommend using the information from these two questions.

Senator Onkvisit asked how the SERB was defining teaching effectiveness. Jan Johnston said that it is the student's opinion of what teaching effectiveness is.

Senator Singh said he wanted to recommend that items 16 and 17 go to the chair, but not be counted in the evaluation.

Debate:

Senator Shifflett made a motion to change the proposal to a first reading.

Senator Peter seconded the motion.

Senator Stacks made a friendly amendment to have the proposal not only be made a first reading but also come back with the procedures for how it is to be administered.

Senator Peter requested that the Professional Standards Committee consult with Faculty Affairs with regard to the subject of contract and the number of evaluations that must be done.

Senator Nellen requested that when the proposal comes back, that it come back for a yes/no vote on the SOTE.

A vote was taken on turning this into a first reading and it passed unanimously.

IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation. B. Vice President for Administration – Time Certain 3:30

Susan Hansen from Housing, and Alan Freeman, the Director of Planning, Design, and

Construction gave a presentation on the Campus Village Project. Susan said that Silicon Valley is one of the most expensive housing markets to live in. Susan said that what they are trying to do on campus is create an affordable living environment of transitional housing for staff, faculty, and students. Right now we have six residence halls, one twelve story high rise, and one apartment complex. The current residences are 31-42 years old. The Housing Department did a market study in 1999. They found it would have taken \$22 million to upgrade the buildings with sprinklers to code, air conditioning, etc. Housing also does an annual survey called "The Educational Benchmarking Survey." According to this survey, the primary reason students move off campus is that they want an apartment. SJSU currently has about 1800 residence hall beds and 200 apartments. SJSU on campus housing was designed for about 2000 students. The Housing Department is hoping to get 20% of SJSU students to live on campus. We currently have about 7-10% of SJSU students living on campus, and about 1800 beds occupied. The apartments are the most sought after. Traditionally, housing captures 22% of Freshmen, 26% of Sophomores, 7% of Juniors, and 1 to 2% of all other students. If enrollment increases the way housing predicts it will, all new units will be full and more units will be needed within three years of opening the new facilities. The proposed suite building is planned around a first year student's experience. They will have academic support programs, peer mentoring, etc. The suites have kitchenettes in them and students helped design the bathrooms. The Housing Department thought that students would want a single room, but students wanted double rooms. The tallest of the new buildings will be 15 stories high. The upper division apartments were designed to capture those students who want to move off campus to live in an apartment. Then there are the faculty/staff guest units with 196 beds. Alan Freeman said he is very excited about this program. It will bring a total of 2,279 new beds to campus. The resident activity center will include facilities and activities for students so they won't have to leave campus, such as a recreation room, convenience stores, and laundry areas. There will also be 700 underground parking spaces. The Housing Department's goal is to keep the rents at 75-80% below market. Alan said that the new facility will have more ADA compliant apartments than required by law. In addition, all units will be internet ready.

Questions:

Senator Peter asked "what happens if we build all these units and can't get students in them?" Alan Freeman said that they can fill vacant units with any state employee, so he isn't really worried about filling them. Senator Buzanski asked whether the 75-80% below market pricing applied to students as well as faculty/staff. Alan Freeman said that it applied to both. A question was raised about security for the housing units. Alan Freeman said that UPD will be hiring additional personnel for security, and that security cameras will be installed throughout the housing area.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

July 10, 2002- No Questions

Aug. 26, 2002 – Senator Buzanski asked how the Senate was going to be involved in the campus no-smoking policy. Chair Brent said that a survey was

going to be sent out to faculty and staff to get their feedback, and an email account will be setup for people to send their comments to.

Sept. 16, 2002 – No Questions

Budget Advisory Committee Minutes –

July 10, 2002 – No questions

Sept. 9, 2002 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar – The consent calendar was approved with the addition of the September 30, 2002 nominees.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

1) Vice Chair Nellen took over the meeting, and Senator Brent presented *AS 1184 – Sense of the Senate Resolution: Honoring and Celebrating the Life of Senator Roy E. Young (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1184 passed unanimously.

2) Senator Rickford presented *AS 1185, Senate Management Resolution: Authorizing Creation of an Ad Hoc Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of a Diverse Task Force (Final Reading)*. Senator Breivik presented a **friendly amendment** to change "4 additional faculty members, one from each college not represented above" to read "**5 additional faculty members, one from each college and the University Library not represented above**". Vice Chair Nellen presented an amendment to reduce the number of students from 3 to 1. The Nellen amendment failed. The Senate voted and AS 1185, as amended by the Breivik amendment, passed unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business - None

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee – None

B. University Library Board –

The Chair of the University Library Board, Stephen Branz, gave a presentation. The new library is on time and on budget. The website is also up and working. The strategic plan that was reviewed and approved by the University Library Board will be available online soon. New online tutorial services (GetText) are now available to help students understand Library resources, and an online reference person (QandA Cafe) is available to answer questions and direct students 24 hours a day. These services are linked to the Library's home page. Chair Branz said that University Policy S02-2, allowing covered drinks in Clark Library, was a complete success. The University Library Board will be bringing a similar policy to the Senate for the new Martin Luther King Jr. Library. The University Library Board will also be developing a policy to address the library needs whenever a new program is established.

C. Professional Standards Committee – See above.

D. Curriculum and Research Committee – None

E. Organization and Government Committee – None

VII. Special Committee Reports

Senator Nellen presented *AS 1186, Sense of the Senate Resolution: Endorsing Budget Priorities for AY 2003/2004 "The Priorities Resolution" as per S02-1, 2.4 and 2.5 (Final Reading)*. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to add "and resources" to the 4th bullet. **The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed.** A motion was made to extend the meeting for five minutes. The motion passed unanimously. **The Senate then voted on AS 1186, as amended by the Shifflett amendment, and it passed unanimously.**

VIII. New Business – None

IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

A. Vice President for Administration – None

B. Vice President for Student Affairs – None

C. Associated Students President – None

D. Statewide Academic Senate – None

E. Provost – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.