

**2002/2003 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
October 28, 2002**

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. and attendance was taken. Thirty-seven Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Lee, Goodman  
Absent: Kassing, Rascoe

**Deans:**

Present: Andrew, Breivik  
Gorney-Moreno, Meyers

**Students:**

Present: Tsai  
Absent: Grotz, Yuan, Greathouse,  
Lee, Ortiz, Yuan

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Guerra

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Present: Norton

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Main, Liu

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Gonzales, Yen, David  
Absent: Palakurthi

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Donoho, Onkvisit

**ED Represent:**

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz, Rickford

**ENG Representatives:**

Present: Pour, Singh  
Absent: Hambaba

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Williams, Sabalius, Van Hooff, Desalvo  
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 corrected:  
September 30, 2002

**III. Communications**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate –**

Chair Brent said that we tried something new this time by distributing the entire Senate Packet

by email. Chair Brent said we realize this is a new procedure and that some Senators will need time to adjust to this. Therefore, we have brought some hard copies with us. Chair Brent said he would appreciate any feedback Senators may have regarding this new procedure. Senator Matthes sent Chair Brent some suggestions for making the process smoother, his suggestions will be adopted the next time the packet is sent out. Senator Buzanski asked that page numbers be added to Senate minutes. Senator Norton said that his computer is old and slow, and he can't download the packets. Chair Brent said the reason we tried this new procedure this week was that none of our policy committees had passed any policies to be included in the Senate packet last week. Chair Brent said we will continue to fine-tune this process.

Chair Brent welcomed our new Senators from the College of Applied Sciences and the Arts; Senator Yen, Senator David, Senator Palakurthi, and Senator Gonzales. Chair Brent also welcomed our new Senator from the College of Humanities and the Arts; Senator Desalvo.

Chair Brent also welcomed Dean Meyers from the College of Education, and Dr. Mary Jo Gorney-Moreno.

Chair Brent stated that President Caret will once again host the members of the Academic Senate at his home for a holiday reception. This year's reception will be held on Sunday, December 8, 2002, from 3-6 p.m. A formal invitation will be sent to Senators from the President's office in the near future.

Chair Brent turned the meeting over to Senator Sabalius who is our representative to the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP). Senator Sabalius said the ACIP met Thursday and Friday of last week in Long Beach. They discussed the various campus partner programs. Two of the programs were suspended. The Zimbabwe program was suspended due to costs associated with the exchange rate, rampant inflation, food shortages, and the fact that the University is on strike. The program in Israel was suspended largely due to financial reasons. Although there is hope that Israel will be reinstated in future years, ACIP is looking to replace the Zimbabwe program. The ACIP discussed the International Faculty Partnership Seminar. We currently have a faculty exchange program in which our faculty teach up to a ten day seminar at our partner campuses. This year was the first year this was done, and we had exchanges with our Mexico and Germany partner campuses. This semester a German delegation even visited San Jose State. Senator Sabalius said many thanks go out to Senator Liu who was a facilitator on our campus, and involved with bringing the delegation to campus. This summer there will be an exchange with our partner campus in Paris, France. All faculty members are encouraged to apply. The exchange will probably be around the end of June for ten days to two weeks. Our partner campus in Paris will send a delegation to CSU campuses a year later. There are future plans made for exchanges with other countries, such as Japan, Canada, China, and Chile. Senator Sabalius said that applications are available for the positions of Resident Director in our campuses in China, France, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and Spain. Senator Sabalius has brochures to hand out on the Resident Director positions, and he will also be sending them

out

to the Deans.

Chair Brent announced that the Executive Committee met today and approved a resolution (AS 1190) Authorizing Sponsorship of a Forum with Provost Goodman concerning the Academic Affairs Budget. This is not listed on your agenda. However, if we have time for New Business at the end, it will be introduced.

Chair Brent announced that Bob Cooper, AVP for Undergraduate Studies will be giving a presentation at 2:45 p.m. on the Senate's role in WASC Accreditation.

#### **B. From the President of the University – None**

### **IV. Executive Committee Report**

#### **A. Minutes of Executive Committee**

September 30, 2002

October 14, 2002 – Chair Brent announced that the Executive Committee had made several changes to these minutes at today's meeting, and he explained those changes.

#### **Minutes of Budget Advisory Committee**

September 23, 2002

October 7, 2002 - Senator Shifflett asked for a brief summary of Sandy Dewitz' budget presentation. Chair Brent said that with regard to Spring 2003 various

recommendations were considered. For example, one set of recommendations had to do with the enrollment dates for Spring 2003. The committee decided that the dates should not be changed, but rather that they should be strictly enforced. They haven't been strictly enforced in the past. They also considered the possibility of a 20% cut to the O&E budget going to departments. Last year there was a 20% increase so this would just cut it back to the level it was before.

They also discussed the possibility of dramatic cuts in the budget for equipment. They are still continuing to work on strategies for Fall 2003, but that is still a little way off. However, the committee has decided to move up the enrollment date for Fall 2003 applications. Chair Brent said as recently as two years ago there was no deadline for applications for admission at SJSU. Last year, for the first time, the university instituted an application deadline of April 1, 2002. Chair Brent said that this year that date has been moved up from April 1 to February 1, 2003. Senator Shifflett asked if this information will be widely publicized. Chair Brent said yes, that was his understanding. Senator Singh asked what happens if we don't have enough students by Feb. 1, 2003, when the cutoff date occurs. Chair Brent said we are currently so far over our target in FTES that we couldn't possibly end up short on students.

October 21, 2002 - Chair Brent announced that the minutes have been revised. Chair Brent said that with regards to item number 2, where it states that the committee opted not to take any action regarding a referral from the English Department, there were two reasons for this decision. The first reason is that the BAC is currently working on a document called Principles and Strategies to be followed in times of Budget Cuts. The BAC felt that they were already dealing with the issues raised by the English Department in this document. The second reason was that the English Department had recommended that any budget cuts of 5% or less should come entirely out of the non-academic programs. The BAC wasn't sure exactly how non-academic would be defined. The BAC also felt that if Academic Affairs was entirely shielded from a 5% budget cut, that would result in 20, 30 or 40% cuts in other vital portions of the university, and this wasn't an approach the BAC could support.

Senator Shifflett recommended that "1,500 FTE" be changed to "1,500 FTES." Senator Stacks recommended that "88 searches" be changed to "88 faculty searches."

**B. Consent Calendar** – Senator Stacks expressed concern that several students were being appointed to more than one committee, and that the Senate had previously decided to limit the number of committees that a student could be on. Chair Brent stated that he had advised Associated Students that students could be on no more than two committees. The consent calendar was then approved as it.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items** - None

**V. Unfinished Business** – None

**VI. Policy Committee & University Library Board Action items. In rotation.**

#### **A. University Library Board**

Stephen Branz, Chair of the University Library Board, presented *AS 1188, Policy Resolution: Modification to Library Policy Regarding Eating and Drinking in the Library (First Reading)*. Chair Branz said that last Spring there was a modification to the existing policy to allow a pilot project in Clark Library allowing covered drinks. Chair Branz said that the pilot project was a success. There were no major spills, accidents, etc., in Clark Library. There are two parts to AS 1188. The first part is to extend the pilot project in Clark Library until May 30, 2003. The second part is to allow the Dean of the Library, in consultation with Library staff, the University Library Board, and the Director of the San Jose Public Library to decide what the policy regarding eating and drinking in the Library will be.

#### **Questions:**

Senator Hamill asked why “New” is always in italics. Chair Branz said to distinguish it from the existing King Library until that library is closed. Senator Norton said that he is strongly opposed to food in the Library, because this could lead to damage to the books from greasy fingers, etc. Senator Breivik said right now when library staff and students take books home, one of the first things they do is sit down to eat while reading. Senator Breivik said what she has found is that people are basically very responsible in this area. Senator Breivik said there will be no eating on the top two floors where the academic stacks will be kept. There will also be a coffee shop in the new library. Senator Singh asked for clarification as to what a covered drink was. Senator Breivik said it is a Coke can, a Starbucks cup with a lid on it, a cup with a lid and straw, etc. Senator Ray said the proposal states that there will be no financial impact. She asked if there won't be a need for more janitorial service. Senator Breivik said no, they do not anticipate the need to do anything differently. Senator Shifflett made a motion to move this to a final reading. The motion was seconded. The motion passed and the Senate moved to debate.

#### **Debate:**

Senator Norton said if this is the final reading, does the language about adopting the new food policy leave it entirely in the hands of the library people, or will it come back to the Senate at some point? Chair Branz said it won't come back to the Senate. However, they would certainly make it an information item and seek broader consultation. Senator Nellen commented that the University Library Board is a Senate body. Senator Goodman asked whether the profits from the coffee shop will be used to pay for cleanup in the Library. Senator Breivik said they are negotiating a contract with Spartan Shops right now. Some money will come back to the Library, but they haven't earmarked that money specifically for cleanup. The workload for cleanup is not anticipated to be any more than what is normally required by the library. Senator Sabalius made an amendment to strike the second resolved clause. The amendment was seconded. Senator Sabalius said that by striking the second resolved clause, it would allow the issue to be brought back to the Senate for future consultation. Senator Stacks said she is wondering when the Senate will allow the Library to do implementation, and that the Senate should try to segregate out implementation issues versus ones that perhaps should be left in the hands of professional librarians, who presumably also have great concern for the books and facilities. Senator Shifflett spoke against the amendment. However, she said she would be open to a substitute amendment. Senator Nellen spoke against the amendment, stating that the librarians know what is best in this matter and this is micromanagement by the Senate. Senator Singh spoke against the amendment, he stated that the everyday running of the library should be left up to the librarians. Senator Donoho called the question.

A vote was taken on the Sabalius amendment. The Sabalius amendment failed. *A vote was then taken on the main motion and AS 1188 passed unanimously.*

## **B. Professional Standards Committee –**

Senator Katz presented *AS 1189, Policy Resolution: Procedures to be Followed when Administering SOTEs (First Reading).*

Senator Katz said he wanted to be clear that they were separating the administrative procedures from the reconsideration of the SOTE, for the time being. Senator Katz thanked everyone, especially Senator Onkvisit, who provided comments on the evaluation process. Senator Katz also thanked the members of the Professional Standards Committee for their hard work, especially Gilda Pour, Joe Merighi, Shannon Bros, Abdel El-Shaieb, Peter Lee, and Carol Ray. Senator Katz said the Professional Standards Committee is following some of the recommendations of the SERB regarding the administering of the SOTE. Senator Katz said that the procedures have been designed to create as uniform a process as possible. This process will reduce the possibility of tampering, irregularity, and have as much accountability as possible. Senator Katz said some of the major recommendations for changes were; having the SOTE forms collected in the ten business days prior to dead day; increasing the uniformity of the proctor's role; and having the process occur at the beginning of the class and not in the last few minutes of the class (within the first 30 minutes of class). The instructor will be asked to leave the room and not say anything. Senator Katz said probably the most significant change they are recommending is the possibility of having lock boxes be put at different parts of the campus at a cost of \$2,000 per lock box, or for evening classes, having designated people placed in four designated locations across campus from 5 - 8 p.m. to collect the SOTEs. The proctors would deliver the SOTEs to one of the four locations across campus. For off campus classes, the Professional Standards Committee is recommending that a prepaid mailer be created that can be distributed to people that teach off campus to hand out. The instructor and proctor will sign a checklist saying they followed the procedures precisely, and the proctor can then drop the mailers in any mailbox. Senator Katz said that the faculty member's role is virtually eliminated.

### **Questions:**

Senator Shifflett suggested that the instructor checklist be changed to add a statement that says "take 10 minutes during first 30 minutes to give the SOTE", this would indicate to the instructor that they don't have to use a whole 30 minutes to administer the SOTE.

Senator Singh asked what the motivation was for stating that the instructor will make no comments. Senator Katz said this is to avoid comments by instructors such as "the average SOTE rating is 4.5", and "these forms will have a great impact on my well-being at SJSU, etc." These type of comments can create bias, Senator Katz said. Senator Lee said they have had situations where faculty in classrooms have said to students that their job is at risk, and they need student support to avoid this situation.

Senator Buzanski said that the committee has done an excellent job. However, he does not agree with the SOTE having to be given in the first 30 minutes of class. Many instructors have an office in one location on campus, and a class in a different building. In the past, Senator Buzanski has passed the SOTE out in the last 30 minutes, and then left to go back to his office across campus. This new procedure will require Senator Buzanski to remain in the hallway while the SOTE is administered. Senator Buzanski asked if this is really necessary to cover all the previous misuses of the form. Senator Katz said that having to remain in the hall awaiting the administering of the SOTE is a necessary consequence.

Senator Stacks asked whether the committee considered using other faculty members as proctors for the SOTE. Senator Ray said the Professional Standards Committee had considered this, but it

presented some problems with colleagues teaching at different times, etc. Senator Stacks said the issue of students wanting training on what the SOTE was all about came up at a Senate last year as well as the issue of whether there were other methods of evaluating instructors. Senator Stacks asked whether the Professional Standards Committee had addressed these two issues. Senator Katz said the Professional Standards Committee had an extensive discussion about whether or not they should recommend or encourage an orientation process for the proctors. The committee decided to leave that up to the departments. The Professional Standards Committee didn't feel comfortable making this a requirement. Senator Stacks clarified that what she meant was that the students in the classes didn't have a good feeling about what the SOTE meant, not the proctors. Senator Katz said that the Professional Standards Committee had not addressed this issue, nor had they addressed the issue of other methods of evaluation.

Senator Rickford commended the committee. Senator Rickford asked whether we can really control the number of people that will sign checklist even though they really didn't comply. Senator Bros said that the Professional Standards Committee tried to address this problem by having the proctor selected ahead of time. Senator Katz stated that any reduction in the tampering with this instrument would be a change for the better.

Senator Williams stated that her students have asked her what the purpose of the SOTE is. Senator Williams asked if the Professional Standards Committee had considered some way of informing students about the purpose of the SOTE. Senator Williams suggested something could be put on the SOTE itself explaining the purpose. Senator Katz said the Professional Standards Committee had not addressed that issue. Senator Katz asked if Senator Williams was suggesting that another paragraph be added giving students instructions. Senator Williams said yes.

Senator Hamill suggested that the Professional Standards Committee change the wording "dispense of this packet" to "return this packet." Senator Katz said that this change had been made, but isn't shown in the handout. Senator Hamill said if someone really wants to be dishonest, they can just fill the SOTEs out themselves, then scribble a name on the back and turn it in. Senator Hamill said there is no way to stop that from happening.

Senator Matthes asked if someone had to say what the course code was. Senator Katz said no they had done away with that. Senator Matthes suggested replacing the second whereas clause with the rationale for some of the changes stated earlier.

Senator Ray said that it might be possible to educate the students about what the purpose of the SOTE is by putting the information on the green sheet. Senator Ray said placing instructions on the SOTE itself could bias the student. Senator Katz asked for a count of how many people thought instructions should be added to the SOTE, and where they should be listed. Senator Nellen said years ago when she chaired the Professional Standards Committee, they did write language about what the SOTE was. She will try and find the background information for Senator Katz. Senator Nellen said that there was also discussion about why the SOTE should be done during the first part of the class. Senator Nellen said that students rush through it at the end of class, because they want to leave early. Senator Katz said he will review what Senator Nellen has on this.

Senator Singh asked if there was a way of enforcing the selection of the proctor ahead of time. Senator Katz said no they don't have a way of enforcing that, but the Professional Standards Committee thought it was a good idea to have the proctor selected ahead of time. Senator Singh said that if we can't enforce the selection of the proctor ahead of time, then we shouldn't make that a requirement. Senator Singh also said we should be very careful not to imply that the professors

are dishonest. Senator Katz asked for a straw vote on whether the proctor should be selected ahead of time. The Senate voted informally and appeared to be split in the decision.

Senator Stacks asked whether the Professional Standards Committee had considered having a resolved clause that indicates when the SERB should give the Senate an evaluation on how the SOTE process is working. Senator Katz said no the committee did not consider this. Senator Stacks then asked if the Professional Standards Committee had considered having all classes evaluated, but let the faculty pick the two classes ahead of time that would be used in the RTP process. Senator Katz said no they had not discussed this.

Senator Van Selst said he was curious why the Professional Standards Committee would consider hiring extra people to stick around to collect the SOTEs on campus, when the Library should be open and could be used as a drop off point at that time. Senator Katz said that the Professional Standards Committee thought that four locations would be better than just a couple of places for the proctors to easily get to, and then get back to class.

Senator Onkvisit asked what happens if the proctor doesn't follow the instructions exactly, and what if the proctor is late or absent on the day the SOTE is to be administered. In addition, Senator Onkvisit asked what would prevent the instructor from making comments to their classes the day before the delivery of the SOTE. Steve Aquino said that Instructional Planning and Research (IPAR) does get calls from instructors saying they missed giving out the SOTE. IPAR has them return the SOTEs immediately, and then redistributes them at a later date. Senator Onkvisit asked if we could be doing more harm than good by putting so much emphasis on the SOTE, when there are many factors to consider. Senator Katz said that he was not sure how to answer that. However, he felt that incremental progress was better than no progress at all. Senator Katz said he agreed with Senator Onkvisit that it would be a good idea to have the peer evaluation carry more weight than the SOTE evaluation, but he wasn't sure how to make that happen.

Senator Donoho asked if IPAR discarded the 37% of SOTEs that are returned opened. Steve Aquino said no they never discard SOTEs. Senator Donoho asked what they are going to do about the high percentage of SOTEs that appear to be tampered with. Senator Lee said that all the contract requires is that you have two SOTE evaluations per year. If there is any suspicion of tampering, Senator Lee's office conducts investigations and then takes over the proctoring of the SOTE for that instructor for two semesters. Senator Lee's office also talks to the proctor and other students in the classes. Senator Lee said that this is a standard procedure. Senator Donoho asked why there isn't a resolved clause that says that the SOTE will be discarded if all the boxes aren't checked and the procedures aren't followed. Senator Lee said that it could be incorporated into the policy.

Senator Van Hooff suggested that if there are any irregularities in the proctor checklist, however slight, they should be reported to the department chair immediately. Senator Van Hoof said that sometimes the proctor makes mistakes. Senator Tsai asked if it would be possible to have the selected proctor submit their name and phone number to the department chair ahead of time. This way if there are problems with open SOTEs, they can call the proctor and ask why.

Senator Shifflett made a suggestion with regard to location to take the language from Professional Standards and have the second sentence that the proctor reads say, "I am distributing a rating form to each of you."

Senator Katz asked Senators to send suggestions via email to him.

**C. Curriculum & Research - None**

**D. Organization & Government -**

Senator Stacks presented *AS 1187, Policy Resolution: Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)*.

Senator Stacks said that this resolution is asking for a change in policy F98-2. Senator Stacks said that during the four years since the policy was passed, there have been some questions as to what is actually meant by nomination of the department chair. Senator Stacks said as Senators may know, there are actually two kinds of nominations that actually occur. One is within the department itself whereby a number of people will have nominations for department chair. After this, a vote is usually taken and then that vote is a recommendation or nomination for the President's consideration. Thus, it is not really an election of a chair, but rather a nomination or recommendation that goes through the Dean to the President for approval. Senator Stacks said that this is the current process, with the voting population being only tenured and tenure-track faculty. Senator Stacks stated that the concern that has been raised is that there is no role for the temporary faculty within our departments. The Organization and Government Committee attempted to come up with a way to include temporary faculty in this process. Senator Stacks said that when the Organization and Government Committee first wrote this policy four years ago, they thought that this was strictly a personnel issue. Senator Stacks said that it turns out that there is a specific section in the faculty contract that deals with the selection of department chairs, and it is separate from personnel issues. The Organization and Government Committee is suggesting a process whereby departments hold a meeting at which all temporary, tenured, and tenure-track faculty can discuss those individuals recommended for department chair. Senator Stacks said the next step would be for the tenured and tenure-track faculty to take a secret vote determining which names should be forwarded to the President via the college dean. The President would then make his selection for department chair.

**Questions:**

Senator Goodman stated that he thought the fourth whereas clause needed to be more definitive before we change the policy. Senator Stacks asked Senator Lee for comments. Senator Lee said that we could just refer to the pertinent article instead of talking about the interpretation.

Senator Nellen suggested changing the numbering in item number one.

Senator Hamill said he was really confused. Does this change mean that part-time people can or cannot vote for the department chair? Senator Stacks said that part-time temporary faculty would now be involved in the nominations process, but would not be involved in the vote. Senator Hamill asked what is the difference between this policy and the current policy. Chair Brent said that he was the Chair of the Organization and Government Committee in 1998, and he stated that he has always interpreted the existing policy as saying what the new policy codifies.

Senator Shifflett suggested that there be a whereas clause that states that the current CFA agreement clearly places the selection of department chairs as a non-personnel issue.

Senator Martinez asked what the current procedure is, and why there is a secret vote. Senator Stacks said that the selection of department chairs is being done differently across the CSUs. Senator Stacks said that currently there are two steps to the process at SJSU for department chairs. First, there is the nomination of faculty members for the department chair, and then there is a vote for the selection of nominees to be sent to the President for selection/approval. Senator Stacks said that there was confusion about whether temporary faculty should be included in the initial nomination process. In the past, it was determined that this was a personnel issue. Senator

Lee stated that the dispute involved the CFA contract, and that the CFA argued that temporary faculty are department members and that the contract states that department members should be able to nominate faculty for department chair. However, temporary faculty will not be able to vote.

Senator Nellen said this was a very serious matter and that they have been discussing this issue since 1998. Senator Stacks stated that only other way is to provide the president with the vote from Lecturers, Tenure and Tenure-Track faculty. Senator Singh said they did provide participation for lecturers by allowing them to submit nominations.

Senator Katz stated that they had spent four months when he was the Chair of Organization and Government Committee on this very issue, only to see it come to a 4-4 vote after four months. Senator Katz stated that there are very strong feelings by people regarding temporary faculty. Senator Katz pointed out that we are a Senate that does not allow Senators to be temporary faculty. Senator Katz asked if the Organization and Government Committee has considered allowing representation on the Senate by temporary faculty. Senator Stacks said they currently have a referral on this issue.

**E. Instruction and Student Affairs - None**

**VII. Special Committee Reports -- None**

**VIII. New Business --**

**Special Presentation: The Senate role in WASC Re-accreditation (Presented by Bob Cooper, AVP for Undergraduate Studies) (Time Certain: 2:45)**

AVP Cooper said Senators received a copy of our WASC proposal in their packet for today, and the material he just circulated is to provide a little bit of context for looking at that proposal. AVP Cooper said for those Senators who went through our prior WASC review, the process has changed entirely. AVP Cooper said things we learned the last time around are not particularly useful this time around. AVP Cooper stated that there is a new accreditation handbook that came out in 2001. Under the old standards there were 9 standards and 268 sub-standards. We now have 4 standards, that are on the handout he just passed out, and 41 sub-standards that support those 4 standards. The proposal that was just handed out to Senators was written last spring by a proposal writing committee. This was the first phase of the WASC review. The committee consisted of some administrators, and some representatives of the Senate. A draft of the proposal was submitted to a proposal review committee at WASC, and they asked for changes. AVP Cooper prepared those changes over the summer, and the proposal Senators currently have is that revised proposal. This revised proposal will guide the rest of our review process. The review process consists of writing two major documents. One of these documents is the Preparatory Review, which will be due in Fall of 2004. The other is the Education Effectiveness Review, which will be due in Fall 2005. There will be two site visits, one for the preparatory review, and one for the effectiveness review. The preparatory review has some of the features of the old review process, AVP Cooper said. It is the part of the review that looks at our resources; financial, library, faculty, our government structure, and so on. The educational effectiveness review is the part that is really being emphasized right now. It is the part where we try and document the evidence that we have that we are delivering a good education; that we are supporting academic values of a variety of sorts; and it is the piece that contrasts most substantially with our last WASC report. AVP Cooper said what we were criticized for in our last WASC review ten years ago was lack of assessment of student learning. For this review, we are in good shape with regard to our assessment for our GE program. Where we aren't in good shape is in our assessment of major programs. The academic programs that have external accrediting agencies, are already pretty far down the road on that

issue. AVP Cooper said we will be in better shape in 2005 than we are now simply because the program planning process requires assessment in the major as departments go through it, and that will be further along than we are today. AVP Cooper said the first place we need help from the Senate is in selecting a Chair of the Steering Committee to guide us through WASC. This is a position that will receive .50 assigned time in the spring, and next academic year 1.0 assigned time, or be split between two people each with .50 assigned time each. AVP Cooper said that person who will help organize this whole process will be selected jointly by the Executive Committee and the committee that drafted the proposal. AVP Cooper has asked for nominations, and he has twisted the arms of several talented people on campus. However, he has yet to come up someone willing. AVP Cooper said he would be interested if anyone has a nominee that is someone good at writing, and relatively well connected across campus. AVP Cooper said the handbook of the standards and guidelines is relatively large. However, anybody who would like a copy of the accreditation handbook should contact him in Undergraduate Studies.

### **Questions:**

Senator Bros said that the Assessment Committee discussed having a retreat once a year for each department with a facilitator to assist. AVP Cooper asked if anyone had used the current Director of Assessment in that way. Senator Bros said not yet to her knowledge.

Senator Shifflett asked what kind of feedback have they gotten from other CSUs that have been through this process. AVP Cooper said there was a meeting last spring where several campuses that had been all the way through the process reported on it. AVP Cooper said he suspected they had been carefully selected. They had nothing but praise for the process. In the discussion around the room of those people that weren't on the panel, some alternative positions were presented. AVP Cooper said it seemed to depend primarily on how well the campus was able to get buy-in from the faculty. Those campuses that got large buy-in from the faculty did quite well. AVP Cooper said that the new standards leave you a lot of flexibility as to what you are going to do. What that means is that you can either take that as an opportunity to decide what you really want to work on, or you can see that flexibility as simply lack of structure and sit there spinning your wheels, which is what some campuses have done. However, there are some that are very happy with the results of this new process.

Senator Shifflett asked, "of those that are happy, is your take that they had a very good proposal going in?" AVP Cooper said it hinged more on how well they got the expanded groups that consider different pieces of it to function after they got going. AVP Cooper said those universities went through it at a different time, when the university could afford to have retreats of a couple days duration where faculty could escape to some relatively peaceful place. It will be harder to try and fund this type of event, given our current budget situation, over the next couple of years.

Senator Singh said they went through something similar to this in his department. There were 11 different objectives. Each department had to take this vague language and break it down to show how it applied in their department. Senator Singh said he thinks every department needs to be given concrete goals, and told how to assess those goals. AVP Cooper said the ABAT accreditation process does for the undergraduate programs in engineering, what the program planning process does for departments that don't have an accrediting agency. AVP Cooper explained that it really is one level of extraction above what Senator Singh described that WASC is interested in. They are not interested in the specific measures that a particular department would use, but rather they are interested in what processes and policies are in place for the university that assure that each department does what you are describing was done in Engineering. AVP Cooper said that the last time, all of the self-studies from program planning were located in a set of file cabinets, one of the visitation committees came in and just sampled departments. They read the

overall description of how the university was ensuring quality within programs, and then they picked two or three departments to see how that played out in specifics. AVP Cooper said the WASC Self-Study that we will deliver to the review committee will be at this extraction level one about what Senator Singh just described.

Senator Donoho said that we might be facing a solvency issue within the next two years. Senator Donoho also said that she really thinks this will a very positive experience for the campus with all the new initiatives.

AVP Cooper said that one of the things he would point out about the proposal is that there are a lot of goals followed by challenges that are in the proposal. There is a paragraph on the first page of the proposal that AVP Cooper tried to write very carefully to indicate that we will not be addressing all of those goals. These are examples of the kinds of issues that the university will be turning its attention to during this review process. AVP Cooper stated that this is going to make the expanded committee really important, because in the next six months we have to decide which of those goals we are going to look into deeply. AVP Cooper said that there will be representatives from the Senate as well as representatives from around campus on the committee, and we need to be sure we have broad enough representation so that each of the constituencies on campus believe they had a shot at getting the issues they are most concerned with on the table.

**Senator Stacks presented AS 1190, Sense of the Senate resolution: Authorizing Senate Sponsorship of a Forum on the Budget and Academic Affairs.** Senator Stacks said that these forums would be offered by the Provost to update the campus on the budget, and any possible budget cuts we could be facing this year.

#### **Questions:**

Senator Buzanski asked if we could eliminate the first word in the fourth whereas clause, “whereas”. Chair Brent said we would take that as a friendly amendment.

#### **Debate:**

Senator Shifflett proposed an amendment to eliminate “or early Spring 2003”. Senator Goodman said he would be happy to do two forums. Senator Shifflett modified her amendment to say “and early Spring 2003 semesters the Academic Senate sponsor forums”. This was friendly to the body. **The Senate voted on AS 1190, as amended by the Buzanski and Shifflett Amendments, and it passed unanimously.**

### **IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In Rotation.**

#### **A. Provost -**

Senator Sabalius asked why the Provost’s office has to approve international travel. Senator Sabalius said this requires the individual to fill out a form 60 days in advance. Senator Goodman said there have been abuses of the process, such as non-approved travel, and travel to restricted countries. Provost Goodman said our insurance does not cover travel to certain countries. Provost Goodman also said the Chancellor has made it clear that, given current resources, international travel needs to be reviewed. Provost Goodman also said that he needs to ensure someone is covering the classes of the traveling faculty member. Provost Goodman said that he feels this is a function that should be dealt with by his office.

Senator Onkvisit asked for information about enrollment. Provost Goodman said right now we stand way over our target for FTES generation. We have received instruction from the Chancellor’s office that we should be at target, or slightly below our target for this year. However,

our current projections are that we will be 9% over. At the current pace we are growing, we will be substantially over our FTES target. Provost Goodman said it isn't necessarily a bad thing to have less class sections in the Spring, because of our instructions from the Chancellor's office. However, Provost Goodman said, the problem is how do we meet our duty of access to students, while taking budget cuts of the magnitude we have been taking. We have already taken two major rounds of budget cuts, and the Provost's office has managed to absorb these cuts. However, if we have another budget cut, the Provost's office can't absorb these. We have already taken 3 ½ million in budget cuts.

Senator Buzanski asked what was the FTES for Fall. Provost Goodman said we had 23,100 FTES, and our goal was 21,500 FTES.

**B. Vice President for Administration - None**

**C. Vice President for Student Affairs - None**

**D. Associated Students President -**

Senator Martinez asked Senators to please try and recruit students for committee vacancies. Senator Martinez said that Associated Students still has a vacancy on AS Board of Directors. Senator Martinez said there will be a referendum in November.

**E. Statewide Academic Senate -**

Senator Shifflett said that the legislature has asked the CSU trustees to give them a report by January 1, 2003, on how service is counted in the RTP process. Every CSU Senate has been asked to provide RTP policies from all their departments. Chair Brent is working with Faculty Affairs to prepare our official response that is due by November 1, 2002.

X. Adjournment - 5:00 p.m.

