

**2004/2005 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
November 22, 2004**

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Nellen, Van Selst, Kassing  
Sabalius, Greathouse  
Absent: McNeil

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Sigler, Ashton, Phillips  
Absent: Lee

**Deans:**

Present: Breivik, Wei, Meyers  
Absent: Stacks

**Students:**

Present: Gadamsetty, Lam, Stillman,  
Nguyen, Kelly, Bjerkek

**Alumni Representative:**

Absent: Guerra

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

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

Present: Norton

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Thames, Matoush  
Absent: Yi

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: David, Fee, Gonzales  
Absent: Hooper

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Campsey, El-Shaieb, Donoho

**ED Represent:**

Present: Parsons, Maldonado-Colon  
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

**ENG Representatives:**

Present: Singh, Choo  
Absent: Pour

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Van Hooff, Desalvo, Williams,  
Heisch, Hilliard  
Absent: Vanniarajan

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Veregge, Bros, Kellum, Branz, McClory

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Von Till, Propas, Hebert

**SW Representative:**

Present: Wilson

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –**

The Senate minutes of October 25, 2004, were approved as is.

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Nellen welcomed all Senators back, and asked what books Senators were reading. Several Senators talked about the books they were currently reading.

Chair Nellen said, “At our next meeting on December 6, 2004, I’d like to alert you to several agenda items. There will be a short presentation from the Foundation and Graduate Studies. They want to alert us to some initiatives they are working on. We are going to

have a brainstorming session on ideas for celebrating our 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary in 2007. We will also have a policy from the Executive Committee on the structure for the Strategic Planning Process that will come as a final reading.”

Chair Nellen stated, “As we all know there have been a lot of leadership changes around here. We have some new Interim Associate Vice Presidents (AVPs) and Deans. We will be having a lot of search committees in the next few years for Vice Presidents, AVPs, and Deans. I sense and hear that people are surprised by all the changes in such a short time period, but that no one seems concerned that we are strong and can continue to move forward. My experience here at San José State is that we have excellent employees that are extremely committed to San José State University.”

Chair Nellen said, “People are very open to and even looking forward to the newly instituted strategic planning process that can make us stronger, and help us better focus on what our top priorities are. We can hopefully have a more realistic workload. Rather than trying to do everything possible, we’ll be able to focus on what is most important. We won’t keep on creating more and more task forces.”

Chair Nellen said, “The Senate is a key player in this process, and you will all play key roles in helping to make the strategic planning process work. I hope we can all be leaders in the ongoing changes that are in store. I think there are some very positive changes for the campus. The strategic planning process should enable us to define for students how SJSU is different from other universities they might be pursuing. We can have more confidence that our students are becoming more educated persons and lifelong learners through their experience at SJSU. We will do this by focusing on making SJSU the best university it can be by being engaged and involved, by asking questions of our leadership, and by being demanding when necessary, while not getting up and already having the end in mind. Strategic planning can help us define what that end is, how we can get there, and continue to improve on what we do. Faculty members are encouraged to bring any questions they might have to their Senators or to me, so that I may share their concerns with the Executive Committee and the Senate. We all need to be honest in our efforts, question appropriately with integrity, and we need to work together.”

Chair Nellen said, “My final remarks relate to a General Education (GE) presentation we will have today at 2:30 p.m. University policy requires that GE be reviewed in 2005. That review started about a year ago. The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is heading up that review as called for in the policy passed back in 1998. BOGS expects to get a report to the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) in March, and then the report will come to the Senate in April 2005. Along the way there will be additional forums for discussing GE and possible changes we might want to see there. We all need to make sure we are ready for a very effective discussion, which is why we are having this presentation today called GE 101.”

Chair Nellen stated, “I teach in the Graduate program here, and I brag about that program. It is a great program. We have worked very hard to continue to make it a great program. I must admit that I don’t brag to the same degree about our GE program, but I sure would like

to brag about it to that same degree. We have outstanding GE courses, Professors, GEAP Advisors, and BOGS members that work hard to make these courses great and the assessment of GE courses is outstanding. I can brag about that. However, I think that more is needed. I'm actually a graduate of CSU Northridge, about twenty or so years ago. We had the same system there that we have here. You pick a category, and something that fits your schedule, and you meet your graduation requirements. We can do more. Our students need to understand why they are taking that liberal education. They need to see it as being connected. Some of that connection is being done through the MUSE program. I really hope we can look at what we are going to do with GE in 2005 with the goal of thinking that this is a program we want to be able to brag about. We want to see our students brag about it. Please be thinking about this when you hear the presentation today. Again, we have outstanding courses, but we need a better connection so students see all of this, and they get all the value they can, and need, out of that curriculum."

Chair Nellen said, "One more thing I would like to do is introduce and welcome some new Senators. Senator Belle Wei, the Dean of Engineering, is replacing Dean Sigler who has moved into the Provost slot, and Senator Veril Phillips has moved into the Acting Vice President for Student Affairs slot." Senator Phillips said that he has served on many Senate committees in the past, but has never actually been a member of the Senate.

#### **B. From the President of the University –**

Interim President Kassing said, "The CSU system has a budget they have reported to the Department of Finance, and the Governor's office. Some of the highlights include a 9% increase that includes an 8% fee increase, a 3% base increase from state appropriations, and a 2.5% increase in enrollment with the corresponding revenues that go with that. It includes a 3.5% salary pool, and it covers all of the benefit increases. As you might remember over the last couple of years, we have had to absorb the health benefit increases. This budget covers that which will help us out a lot. If it holds, it is a good budget for us. The economy seems to be recovering. However, there is still a \$6-7 billion fundamental budget structure problem in the state budget, so we will see how it all comes out."

Interim President Kassing said, "Chair Nellen introduced two of your new Senators today. I'd like to talk about that for a couple of minutes. At an earlier meeting I introduced Rose Lee and Dorothy Poole. I've asked Carmen Sigler to serve as the Provost and Academic Vice President, and I'm really pleased she has agreed to do that. You all know her. She is experienced and fair. She was Chair of the Senate when I first came here in 1993 as I recall. She has been a Department Chair, Dean, and Acting Vice President. She brings immediate value to the senior leadership team."

Interim President Kassing said, "Senator Phillips was introduced a few minutes ago, and I'd like to say a few things about him. He is a seasoned manager/administrator from the Academic Division. He was a Department Chair, and Interim Associate Dean. He was the VP of Faculty Affairs, and the Executive Assistant to the Provost. Most recently, Senator Phillips was the Interim Vice President of Student Affairs at Towson University. Senator Phillips has been here about three weeks and he has already made a difference. He creates an immediate link between the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Divisions. I know

him as someone that can shape a strong campus life program here. Senator Phillips also has a history in Information Technology. That will be important to the senior team.”

Interim President Kassing said, “The other appointment I’d like to talk about is Irene Miura’s replacement as Executive Assistant to the President. I will miss Irene immensely. Gerry Selter will be taking Irene’s place. Selter is a seasoned and well-thought-of Dean at the University. He brings a strong sense of the academic mission to the President’s office. He knows resource management. He also knows research, how the foundation works, and has a good understanding of information technology. Selter is honest and he tells you what he thinks. I’m really pleased that he agreed to take Irene’s position on January 1<sup>st</sup>. I am very pleased and proud these three individuals have agreed to serve. Their value will be felt almost immediately. They know us and what we are capable of as an institution. They are also very unselfish administrators, and serious about contributing to this place.”

Interim President Kassing said, “Chair Nellen mentioned a few minutes ago about Dorothy Poole’s presentation to the Executive Committee, and starting on value discussions at some forums that have been setup. I want to encourage you to attend. We want to spend some time discussing what we think the future holds. We want you engaged in that, and to get your ideas. We want you to participate and help shape what that vision might be. We also think it is important to start articulating some set of values—shared values/core values. A planning matrix is being shaped in multiple small group discussions right now, and has been going on for the last three or four weeks. It will be presented for review and discussion over the next several months to a broad audience across campus.”

Interim President Kassing said, “The Resource Planning Board (RPB) has met under the new leadership of Provost Sigler, and Acting VP of Finance and Administration, Rose Lee. They will be working on a reserve policy, student fee strategy, and trying to develop an enrollment model that shows how we will distribute enrollment funds. You have the budget report to the Senate that was distributed to you before the meeting. This coming budget cycle will be a very important one for the RPB. Particularly, if we can find more ways to get resources to teaching and learning. We’ve got through two very serious budget cuts. We cut \$23 million out the budget of this university the last two years. If this compact comes together, we’ve got a chance to begin recovering from that.”

Interim President Kassing said, “I think it is an important time for us to create a positive momentum. I think it is possible. We are in a recovery phase, both with the economy and the state budget. It seems to me it is the time to move from one of our strengths to another, and to reflect and build on those places where we are good. I think it is an important time to be confident. If we are confident we will have better results. I think we are on a trajectory of success, and I think that is important with a new Presidential search coming up in about a year.”

Interim President Kassing said, “Let me just wrap up with a few comments about Intercollegiate Athletics. We had an intense conversation at the Executive Committee meeting about it today. Bob Caret and Joe Crowley felt that it was important for us to be part of the Western Athletic Conference (WAC). Over the past weeks, I’ve come to the

same conclusion. I attended a WAC strategic planning session in mid-October. I would argue that the WAC provides better visibility and better income opportunities for us. For example, the WAC gets more basketball invitations to the NCAA tournament than say the big West. It is not uncommon for them to have two or three teams that make it into the NCAA basketball tournament. In the NCAA conference affiliation today, one of the fundamental pieces of the arithmetic isn't football, it's basketball. I said this in a newspaper interview; it is my intent in the next couple of months to come up a plan to reduce the general fund percent in the athletics budget from 3.2% to 2%. I intend to work with the Executive Committee of the Senate to do that. We had a good discussion today, and feelings were expressed strongly. I think we are going to work on a task force together. I believe you will have a resolution that will come before you this afternoon. We will have new leadership in the Athletics Department probably within the next six weeks. That search has started. I think we can find some interesting people to lead that component of the campus, and maybe contribute significantly."

Senator Van Selst asked, "So when is the decision point regarding Athletics?" Interim President Kassing said, "I don't know if I can say that. There is interesting support in the community. It is an interesting group that you don't see. They relate their association with the University to a large extent with Athletics. I think some of these people will come back to us, we'll see."

Senator Buzanski said, "If you haven't come to a conclusion by the time your 18 months is up, then you'll just be handing the problem off to the next President." Interim President Kassing said, "Good point. I won't do that." Senator Buzanski said, "We will hold you to that."

### **Questions:**

Senator Sabalius said, "Isn't it a reinterpretation of the task force when you come to a conclusion that we should stay in the WAC, when the task force was originally designed to investigate the future of the program. In the Mercury News article you referred to, you are quoted as saying that "the Task Force will not be instituted to investigate the future of the program, but rather how to finance it." This is not the charge that the Academic Senate had originally given the task force. Also, I was wondering if the choice of Walsh to head the search committee doesn't give the impression of a grandeur that San José State University doesn't actually have? Also, when you say that you will come up with new ways and methods to make the program more viable financially, President Caret tried this over the years and couldn't make it work, what rabbit in the hat do you have to make it work?"

Interim President Kassing said, "Bill Walsh has taken an interest in the university. This is important for us. I think it is a link back to an audience that has walked away from SJSU. He volunteered to help us. I think it does send a message back to the community to consider reinvesting, and getting involved in this program. As for the original resolution, I haven't looked at it recently, and I would argue that is for the Senate and me to work on. My emphasis now is going to be to bring down the general fund support from 3.2% to 2%. As for the length of time it is taking to setup the task force, I don't feel it has been that long."

It seems to me that we are spending an enormous amount of time talking about athletics. It is only 2-3% of the budget, and yet it is the primary discussion. It wears you out. There are other things that happen here that are much more important, and yet we seem to spend our time on athletics. It troubles me that we decide it is the first thing we need to do. I haven't decided that. We will work on it, and we'll get to it."

Senator Norton said, "I would submit that the Athletics question is the most obvious point for saving a large sum of money that we badly need for the academic program." Interim President Kassing said, "I would agree with you."

Chair Nellen said, "The resolution the Senate passed called upon then President Yu to form a task force to look at the appropriate makeup of our Athletic program. Obviously, the resignation of the President caused some delay as well. We had a very vigorous discussion about this in the Executive Committee today. Many of us raised some of the same questions you are today. I've had discussions with Interim President Kassing on this topic as well. I think it does come down to finances. Every ten years or so, the Senate has passed a resolution saying you have to bring down the percentage of funding for Athletics from the general fund. This discussion needs to be brought into the whole discussion of the University plan. We aren't doing what we need to be doing. The Executive Committee is holding an extra meeting next Monday to address some of this as well as strategic planning."

Senator Buzanski said, "I am a member of Spartans for Sanity, as you know. When you met with us, we tried to make it clear that we are not opposed to Intercollegiate Athletics. We are in favor of good sportsmanship. What we are concerned about is the loss of funds, particularly the \$500,000. None of us know how many teachers we could have hired, or how many classes we could have taught with that money. The San José Mercury News said that you have a plan. Every President in the past has confronted this same problem, and they all promised us they would come up with a plan. Today, we are right back where we started. Past President's have tried every thing under the sun, what can you do differently?"

Interim President Kassing said, "I'll probably be working at nights. I'm proud to be included with that group. I'm going to give it a try, and if it doesn't work, it doesn't work."

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

##### **A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**October 25, 2004**

**November 8, 2004** -- Senator Buzanski said item #6 needed to be changed to say "Undergraduate Studies Office" instead of "Undergraduate Studies Department."

##### **B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None**

**C. Consent Calendar –** Approved as is.

##### **D. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Senator Donoho presented *AS 1266, Sense of the Senate Resolution, To Co-Sponsor a Forum on Shared Values as an Initial Step in Strategic Planning (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1266 passed unanimously.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1263, Sense of the Senate Resolution, To Support an Annual Forum on Academic Freedom (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1263 passed unanimously.**

V. **Unfinished Business - None**

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

**A. Organization and Government Committee** – Senator Veregge said the committee was working on policies related to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and some policies related to changing the charge of the Continuing Education Committee, and the International Programs and Students Committee.

**B. Budget Advisory Committee – None**

**C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee** – Senator Thames said the committee has been doing some work on developing student value statements for the campus, looking at the greensheet policy, and also looking at issues involving students with disabilities.

Senator Thames presented *AS 1264, Policy Resolution, Revision of the Drop Policy (First Reading)*. A motion was made to move to a final reading. The Senate voted and the motion passed. Senator Van Selst made a friendly amendment to change the dashes in 1 a) and in 1 b) to i and ii. Senator Phillips made a friendly amendment to change 1ai and 1bi to strike “to allow for flexibility and planning of both students and departments.” Senator Branz made a friendly amendment to change “Revision” in the title to “Replacement,” and “Modifies” to “Replaces,” and to also change “revision” in the Resolved clause to “replacement.” **The Senate voted and AS 1264 passed unanimously as amended.**

**D. University Library Board** – Senator Heisch said the committee is continuing to work on Information Literacy, and also on how to accomplish a performance review. Dean Breivik announced that she is retiring at the end of the Spring semester. Dean Breivik said that she is very proud of the people that work in the Library.

**E. Professional Standards Committee** – Senator Bros said that the committee got the results of the RTP survey back and are analyzing them. Hopefully, the committee will have a report for the Senate at the next meeting.

**F. Curriculum and Research Committee – No Report.**

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

VIII. **New Business:**

**A. CSU Report on Graduate Writing Assessment:**

Professor Bethany Shifflett gave a presentation on Graduate Writing Assessment. Professor Shifflett said, “A very quick history lesson—very formal attention to writing comes to us

through Executive Orders (EO). These EOs came about first in 1976, and then in 1978, with the Board of Trustees resolutions on student writing skills. Now we are getting to some specificity with the memo coming out of the Chancellor's office regarding competency in writing. In 1987, we had EO 514, and that spoke directly to competency in English writing. Then we have EO 665, which drives our Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) in the CSU. EO 665 says that students must demonstrate competence, be matriculated in the CSU where GWAR is satisfied (that was new), have the opportunity to meet GWAR as soon as they become a junior (that was new, there was a lot of trouble with students being ready to graduate and they hadn't taken the GWAR), certification became an all-campus responsibility (this was an effort to bring faculty experience from all disciplines together on writing), and then certification was transferable (this was new, if the GWAR was satisfied at another CSU it was transferable), and then there was to be an annual update to the Chancellor's office on changes along with periodic reviews. The periodic review was meant to be done on a five-year basis. We are a little late with this one."

Professor Shifflett said, "At the graduate level, you may require proficiency as a condition for admission, some CSUs do. Writing proficiency must be required prior to the award of the degree. You may also require additional demonstration of advanced level writing proficiency as a condition for admission to a graduate program and/or award of degree."

Professor Shifflett said, "The review plan states the charge is to "review the extent to which the CSU campuses have developed rigorous and thoughtful processes to ensure that students graduating from the CSU are able to write at the level expected by employers, graduate schools, the Board of Trustees, and citizens of the state of California. The process that was setup was to pull together a group across the CSU to review the 1988 report (which was the beginning of a system-wide report), and to review material collected in 1999. In December of 2002, a call was put out to all the Provosts to update their flow charts; to update the written description of GWAR; to update the process they were following; and to speak to a wide range of issues from the scoring rubrics that were used as resources for students having difficulty passing the GWAR. The information that we collected and reviewed was wide ranging. We asked for specific information on how the various campuses were dealing with English as a second language. We asked, "Were there separate pass rates? Were there separate accommodations? Were there separate reviews in place?" Then we asked for information on GWAR for graduate students, a question that hadn't been asked prior to this review."

Professor Shifflett said, "Some of our observations include: Across the CSU, there are 10 campuses that give an exam only, 2 campuses give a course only, 3 campuses (including SJSU) give a course and exam, and 7 campuses give neither an exam or course. Across the CSU, 2 campuses have both an objective and essay component (SJSU is included), 16 campuses have 1 essay (this is the dominant method used), and 2 campuses have 2 essays. The time allotted varied quite a bit. There is an illusion that there is a common requirement for the essays that are predominantly used by the CSU campuses, but there is not. For example, in some cases a topic was presented so very little reading was required, while in other cases you needed to read a short passage and write a response, still others had a very lengthy passage and commentary based on that passage, while some had an issue presented with some statements of fact and students had to write a position paper."



Professor Shifflett said, “Then there were variations in the complexity of the passage. This was eye-opening for us. In some cases, the reading skill required before students start writing is significant, and perhaps not appropriate. In other cases, we looked at GVAR exams that looked like the English Placement Test (EPT). There was no discernable change in the difficulty, and that was a concern. Then there were variations in the rhetorical challenge. The language being used required, in some cases, very sophisticated understanding of rhetoric.”

Professor Shifflett said, “With respect to essay evaluation—only 1 campus had only one reader. Eighteen campuses had 2 readers, and 1 campus used 3 readers. There is generally more than one person evaluating the essay. The scale is generally 1 to 6. All the assessments are done holistically across the CSU. Most of the campuses are using a scale of 1 to 6 with the total score possible with 2 readers being 12. Of the 17 campuses that have this, the passing rate is 7 for 4 of the campuses, and 8 for 9 of the campuses.”

Professor Shifflett said, “We actually collected essays from the timed essays, essays from classes, portfolios from classes, etc. We asked specifically for materials to be given to us from essay that were just barely passing, and just barely failing. We did not look for the extremes. We asked for borderline material. From the classroom we collected some essays responding to literary works, there were some research papers, and there were portfolios. We compared the coursework to the essay exams. The scope, length, and level of difficulty were quite similar. The primary difference in almost all cases was that the classroom work was composed over time, and there were rewrites and revisions with feedback. The pass rate on the first try of the essay exam at SJSU was 59% and below. Pass rates for the GVAR are significantly different from the exams, but not from other courses. Our pass rates are similar to pass rates holistically across the CSU.”

Professor Shifflett said, “We got into a discussion about non-native English speakers. From the feedback the campuses gave us, and the people around the table that have been involved with GVAR for years and years, they speak very strongly to the extraordinary demands put on faculty given the diversity of our students. The students themselves report incredible challenge and find themselves succeeding in coursework, but failing the GVAR. We have reports from various CSUs of students repeating the GVAR, eight, nine, ten, eleven, or twelve times before passing the GVAR. We also heard of 1 campus where if the student didn’t pass the GVAR they graduated anyway, and a little asterisk was put on their transcript. That will probably change after this review.”

Professor Shifflett said, “The committee came up with some recommendations that I have listed here for you on your handout. Some we would recommend that SJSU adopt include: “Campuses should implement measures to ensure consistency and common standards in faculty evaluation of materials produced in courses.” It appears there needs to be some attention given to the course route through GVAR, compared to the essay route through GVAR. Another recommendation that the committee suggests we adopt is: “That the GVAR course enrollment be capped at twenty.” When you put 25, 26, or 27 people in a classroom where this is their place to grapple with their writing, the faculty are overwhelmed. We should reflect on where we are with respect to this. I don’t know where we are, but I suspect we go over. The last

recommendation we have is that we should perhaps talk amongst ourselves about developing a campus-wide GEAR policy for graduate as well as undergraduate programs. I am not certain, but my recollection is that it is very different from college-to-college, and very different even within colleges. This is probably worth some discussion.”

Professor Shifflett said, “I end with telling you that the object was to look at an overview of all the processes. We organized a report that is available on the web, and copies are in the Provost’s office as well.”

### **Questions:**

Senator Wilson asked, “What is the EPT?” Senator Shifflett said, “The English Placement Test.”

Senator Norton asked, “What is the one biggest problem that you’ve seen?” Senator Shifflett said, “The wide variation in the prompts. In some cases, it really did look like the EPT, and in other cases the reading skill required was really advanced.”

Senator Singh asked, “How do students meet this requirement at SJSU?” Someone answered, “By taking the 100W course.” Senator Shifflett said, “On our campus you have to pass the Writing Skills Test (WST) to get into the 100W.”

### **B. Understanding GE at SJSU (Presentation by Associate Dean Curriculum, Gail Evans and Bob Cooper, AVP for Undergraduate Studies):**

AVP Cooper said, “Higher Education across the country is in the process of re-conceptualizing what we mean by General Education (GE), or Breadth Education. Both Harvard and Yale just reviewed theirs and ended up deciding they were doing a very poor job of it. I think having examined their program and ours, that their judgment about their GE program is correct. A brief historical note—Breadth Education is part of obtaining a liberal education. It is called liberal education, because it was meant to liberate. The notion was that prior to be educated, in terms of deciding what was right or wrong, you had to depend on authority. A liberal education “liberated” you to make a decision, so that you could do what was right based on your own understanding. In modern terminology, it is part of making educated persons that can make educated judgments.”

AVP Cooper said, “Our particular program, as the powerpoint slides outline for you, is governed under Title V. A complaint about our GE program is that it is as small as it can be under Title V. I heard Chair Nellen say that she got her degree at Northridge. Northridge does not have a program that is as small as it is required to be under Title V, and there is a fair amount of pressure right now for them to shrink their program. The notion under Title V is that GE programs should provide students with a set of skills. GE should provide students with some specific knowledge about themselves, and provide students with knowledge about different academic disciplines. All of this should be organized in a way that makes the total more than just a list of the individual parts. It should somehow hang together as a coherent system.”

AVP Cooper stated, “As some of you may know, all departments are being asked to work on their “road map to degree.” This is the outline of the four-year program that leads to a Baccalaureate degree. Each department is being asked to specify not only what is needed for the major, but also what would be a good GE program for that major. So, rather than suggesting that students pick from a list say for area C2 (usually whatever fits into the student’s schedule easily), the department would specify GE courses that would be an important part of providing breadth and perspective for that particular major. As departments were asked to do this, it was recognized that there would be some areas where it really wouldn’t matter what GE class was taken for that particular degree program. However, there would be other areas where a particular GE class would fit with the major. This was an idea that came out of a Provost retreat at the beginning of the semester. This was considered a better way of trying to provide coherence in the GE program, rather than doing it by GE policy. So, rather than putting it in the GE guidelines, it would be put in as a set of suggestions from the departments.”

AVP Cooper said, “In that context, we have been examining our GE guidelines. As I indicated to you, one of the things that Title V specifies is an understanding of how different academic disciplines approach knowledge. One of the things that is being considered for change in the GE guidelines when they come to you in the spring, is that there be some limitation on the number of GE areas that can be fulfilled within a single academic discipline. So, rather than going through your entire breadth program, taking courses from only two or three departments, by the time you graduated with a baccalaureate degree, you would have knowledge from several different disciplines perspective.”

AVP Cooper said, “There are other things that are in the GE guidelines, some of these we don’t currently enforce. The structure of our GE program is that we have a set of skills courses, including writing skills, quantitative skills, critical thinking skills, and mathematical skills courses. We also have core GE courses that are to provide knowledge, and then we have advanced GE courses that are supposed to integrate knowledge acquired at the core level. Completion of core GE courses is a prerequisite for all advanced GE courses. Currently this is an un-enforced prerequisite. When the GE policy was written, we didn’t have a mechanism to enforce the required prerequisites. Now we have peoplesoft, which will make it easy to exclude students from registering for advanced GE if they haven’t completed their core GE. I think this is a good idea, but it will be a tremendous change in campus practice if we do this.”

AVP Cooper said, “Let me briefly read you something from the first page of the GE guidelines then I’ll turn it over to Associate Dean Evans. “A university brings together many separate areas of learning. Yet it is more than just a collection of specialized disciplines. General Education involves both the development of skills and the acquisition of knowledge through the study of facts, issues, and ideas. Regardless of the major, all who earn an undergraduate degree should share a common universe of discourse.” The question we will be asking this week is “Have we really put together a GE program, a set of requirements, that produces this common universe of discourse.”

Associate Dean Evans said, “What I’m going to talk about is what are the CSU GE restrictions on us, and how does that make our GE program look at this point. Initially we are going to be

talking about the state of the GE program right now, and then if we have time, we will go on and talk about where we are in terms of the GE process.”

Associate Dean Evans said, “I’m starting with slide 6, if you are looking at the powerpoint presentation that was distributed to you. Basically these requirements came from Executive Order (EO) 595 in January of 1993, which established the current GE pattern across the CSU. The reason it was established was for reciprocity across CSU campuses. If a student moved from one campus to another, they wouldn’t have to start over in terms of their core GE. Their courses would receive reciprocity across campuses. Each individual campus is responsible for developing and creating its own program. Along with this comes the understanding of GE certification versus course articulation. Does anyone know the difference between GE certification and course articulation? It is a misconception among many faculty and students on campus. A course can be certified in a particular GE area, e.g. D1/Human Behavior at DeAnza, and be articulated with a course certified at San José State University in area E/Human Understanding and Development. The student only gets GE credit for the course, in the area in which it was certified where he/she took it. That becomes very confusing for students and faculty. One thing we might do is not have courses articulated as being equivalent, when they are in different GE areas.”

Associate Dean Evans said, “Looking at slide number 8, the distribution of GE Breadth units, this is the way it is mandated by the CSU. As AVP Cooper said, it is a minimum of 48 semester units. Our program is 48-51 units, depending upon whether the student is required to take 100W. If a student is exempted out of 100W based on their score on the WST, then they would only have a 48 unit package. If they have to take 100W, then they would have a 51 unit package. Engineering majors have a 48 unit package, because their area D and R courses are combined into one 3-unit course.

Associate Dean Evans said, “Then it specifies the various breakdowns. We, of course, need all those breakdowns the CSU gives us, but the way it looks for us is that the 9 units in “Inquiry into the Physical Universe and its Life Forms” are met through our Life and Physical Sciences Requirements, our Mathematical Requirement, and our area R, Earth and Environment requirement. That is where we get those 12 units. Most campuses simply have some lower, and some upper division courses. Students must take at least 9 upper division units, but it can be out of any area. We specifically have core and advanced, so that in theory, students take the core courses to be prepared for the advanced courses. They do the classes in sequence. The 12 units in Human, Social, Political, and Economic institutions come out of Social Sciences and our advanced area S—Self, Society, and Equality in the U.S. The 12 units in Arts, Literature, Philosophy, and Foreign Languages would be our Arts and Humanities Requirement. English 1B is a C3 requirement, and Culture, Civilization, and Global Understanding is an area D requirement. The last one would be area E—Human Understanding and Development.”

Associate Dean Evans said, “GE at San José State University is a distributive model. It is governed by the Board of General Studies (BOGS). Since the GE guidelines were passed in 1998, about 219 courses were certified under the new guidelines. There were about 250 courses submitted for certification, less than 10 were denied certification because they did not meet the GE guidelines. The rest simply withdrew their courses, and didn’t resubmit them after the first

time. There were very few denied certification under the guidelines. Since that time, all of the courses that have been submitted for continuing certification, have received continuing re-certification. There are about 80 faculty now involved in the review of courses.”

Associate Dean Evans said, “If we go to slide 16, we see that there are two types of models of GE, they are core and distributive. If it is a core GE program, then every student takes exactly the same course. In a distributive model, the student can select which course they want to take out of a particular listing. The example I gave you in the slide is of our area S. There are over 30 courses a student can pick from in area S. However, all of those courses must meet the specified guidelines for that particular area. I believe we have an outstanding GE program. The courses are excellent and so are the faculty, but we don’t market the GE program right. Neither the students, nor the faculty know why they are taking GE. They don’t understand the purpose of it. This is what I think we really need to work on with this review. Everybody on campus needs to understand what the purpose of the breadth requirement in GE is.”

Associate Dean Evans said, “The last slide talks about advanced GE, the hallmark. In terms of the review, the only real imprint we have on our students is in advanced GE. Most of our students are transfer students, and they take their core at community colleges. However, all students must take their advanced GE in residence at San José State University. So, if there is something we want every student that graduates from this institution to have, it must be present in their advanced GE experience.”

### **Questions:**

Senator Buzanski asked, “You said we have students taking advanced GE before they complete the core GE, since we had no way of monitoring this in the past. Do we have any information on how many students take upper division courses before completing their core GE? AVP Cooper said, “That happens very rarely, because to take advanced GE they have to pass the WST. The WST is enforced by computer as a prerequisite. This effectively limits that kind of enrollment now. We have the mechanism to enforce this with peoplesoft. We just haven’t implemented it yet, because it would be a change in practice on campus.”

Senator Singh asked, “Why do some classes count in more than one area?” Associate Dean Evans said, “Are you referring to the American Institutions requirement?” Senator Singh said, “Yes.” Associate Dean Evans said, “The American Institutions requirement is a State Title V requirement, but it is not a GE requirement. However, we require it for graduation, like the physical education requirement.”

Senator Thames asked, “What kind of different marketing are you talking about?” Associate Dean Evans said, “One of the things is that we need the students to understand why they take GE. That it is more than just checking off a box in the list of courses. We have taken one small step that you might have noticed in the schedule of classes. You might have noticed that the GE list of classes in the schedule has changed in the last two semesters. Each area now has the requirement from the GE guidelines listed above it, and then the courses are listed underneath it. It also has the title of the area listed instead of e.g. C1, and what the student should get from that area to better help the student select a course. This is a first step.” AVP Cooper said, “One

group that maybe doesn't understand this is the parents of our students, but another group that expressed a lack of understanding or appreciation is our faculty. Faculty will say things to their students like, "I'm sorry you have to do this, but BOGS requires it," or "I'm sorry you have to do this, but GE requires it." This is a major task. As a faculty, we are not doing a particularly effective job of presenting a belief in GE."

Senator Van Selst said, "I know at the CSU Statewide level, Academic Affairs is looking at double-counting, are you guys looking at this?" Associate Dean Evans said, "You mean counting towards both the major and in a GE area? Senator Van Selst said, "Yes." Associate Dean Evans said, "We used to not allow it other than one or two per major. This is something we are looking at again. When the new GE guidelines were drafted, it was felt that it wouldn't matter if a course was taken in a student's major department, because if it was meeting the student learning objective, then the discipline in which those objectives were met shouldn't matter. Upon reflection 6-years later, most of us feel that that is not the case, and that we should go back and revisit double-counting. This is one of the big issues in the review."

Senator Wei asked, "Do we have a specific plan for marketing? We are losing students to other universities that require fewer GE units." Associate Dean Evans said, "That is because the UC requires fewer units than the CSU does." AVP Cooper said, "At the moment, we don't have a specific plan developed, but we have had forums already that faculty were invited to. They were not as well attended by faculty as we would have hoped. However, we will be holding additional forums as we revise the guidelines. We are hoping that will produce more faculty engagement, and therefore, more understanding of the GE program." Chair Nellen said, "We do need to be looking at what more we can do to improve student and faculty understanding."

Senator Buzanski asked, "I was under the impression that there was an attempt made to have an identical program in the UC, CSU, and the community colleges for GE." AVP Cooper said, "There was an attempt to do that. The UC decided to bail out of that. We have a common set of requirements for core GE between the CSU and the community colleges."

Associate Dean Evans said, "Let me just quickly tell you where we are in the review. We started the review last spring with the hopes of getting it completed this spring. We started early in hopes of not making the same mistakes we made in 1998. I think when the guidelines were passed there wasn't enough information dispersed around campus, there wasn't enough buy-in, and people weren't aware of what was going on. We want to make sure when the guidelines are approved this time everybody understands what is being approved. It is the intention that courses will not need to be re-certified based on changes in the guidelines, but will need to provide evidence of incorporation of any changes with the next regularly scheduled submission of assessment materials."

Associate Dean Evans said, "So where are we, we had 3 forums last spring for faculty and staff to come and discuss GE guidelines. The forums were conducted by Scott Guenter, who was the faculty-in-residence for GE. We sent out a survey to over 200 GE faculty last spring. We had over a 50% return rate, and we are analyzing that data. A survey was also sent to Chairs, Directors, and Deans this fall and we are analyzing that data. We also have the information from Chair Nellen's Educated Persons discussions. And, then most recently we had an Information

Literacy Conference sponsored by the Library and led by Senator Branz in October 2004. About 50 faculty attended that event, and out of that we got information for integrating all of the information literacy standards across the GE curriculum. That's a change that is 99.9% assured of happening in the new GE guidelines."

Chair Nellen next went over a few handouts from the Educated Persons Dialogue. Chair Nellen said, "We should be thinking about what we want to change in our GE program. I think what has come out of this presentation today, is that we really aren't doing a good enough job in helping faculty, students, and parents understand the purpose of GE. We've got a "Greater Expectations" report from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU). The report says that what students really need today is a strong liberal education that needs to be reinvigorated by making it practical and exclusive, such as including a range of teaching strategies. The report calls for making sure that our students become intentional learners by developing self-awareness about the reason for studying, the learning process itself, and how the learning process is used. How can we help our students to do this? If our students continue to come here just hoping to check off the boxes in the areas that meet the graduation requirement that fit into their schedule, then we aren't doing what we should be. We need to be thinking about this. Please look at this report when you get a chance and think about it.

Chair Nellen said, "The Harvard report asks the question, "What is it we wish to achieve in the education we provide for students at Harvard." This is part of our GE question, "What is it we wish our curriculum to do?" The Harvard report says they want to emphasize writing more, focus more on interdisciplinary study, and have a mandatory freshman seminar. Our GE review is focusing on some of the same areas. In the summary, the Harvard report reminds everybody that disseminating information is not the same as providing an education. The Harvard report reminds us that writing is important not only as a tool for communication but also as a tool for thinking. Active writing forces us to clarify our thinking. This is an area where I don't think we have done our students a good enough service. We need to make them see what the point of writing is. That it is a key part of the learning process."

Chair Nellen said, "I also included some information from the Educated Person Listserv. I encourage everyone to sign up. We also have a brown-bag lunch about twice a month. We recently had one on values."

Chair Nellen said, "The last thing I handed out was a list of ideas that came out of the brown-bag Educated Person lunches. This was also given to BOGS."

Senator Buzanski said, "When I joined the university there was a foreign language requirement. That requirement was dropped in the 1970s, and it seems to me that this might be a good time to start discussing this again. My understanding is that most of the CSUs have this requirement today, but we are one of the few that does not." Chair Nellen said, "Is the requirement to take a foreign language class, or to become proficient in a foreign language?" Senator Buzanski said, "The requirement is to become proficient in a second language." Chair Nellen said, "We need to take a look at that."

Senator Van Selst said, “There is a suggestion on the Educated Citizen’s Dialogue to require service learning research with a professor, or study abroad. At the Statewide level in Academic Affairs we are coming out very strongly against required community service. If that is not something we want to do, please let me know.” Chair Nellen asked, “Can you tell me why they are so strongly against this?” Senator Van Selst said, “They are against it because it is required “volunteer” service.”

Senator Wilson asked, “To what degree are students involved in these discussions now?” Chair Nellen said, “There are some students on BOGS, and students are involved in the Educated Citizens Dialogues. There have also been a few students that attended the GE forums.”

Senator Bros asked, “How well are GE Advisors informed about these issues? Associate Dean Evans said, “I meet with the GE Advisors over in Admissions and Records about once or twice a semester. They are the only folks on campus that complained about the new format in the schedule of classes, because they said it is so much easier to check-off the boxes. However, once I explained why we had changed it, and told them what we would like them to explain to the student, they were okay with it.”

## **IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions: In rotation.**

**A. Associated Students President** – Associated Students (AS) President Greathouse said, “The semester is winding down and finals are coming up. We are getting ready for the end of the year. We passed our Staff Recognition Award resolution, and we agreed it will be a monthly award and that students would do the nominating. The staff will be honored at our AS Award Ceremony at the end of the year. I will get you all that information as soon as we finalize the resolution. We are also going to be hosting the California State Student Association Conference in April 2005. We haven’t hosted this conference in over 3 years. We will also be hosting the Student Trustee interview process, which will be part of that conference. We are getting ready to buildup our events for next semester. We are also continuing on in our Spartan Pride campaign. We have decided that we are going to have a mid-year retreat for our Directors.”

### **Questions:**

Senator Buzanski asked, “How did AS do on the carnival finance wise?” AS President Greathouse said, “AS didn’t pay for the carnival. Butler Amusement donated it to AS. They made the profits off the ticket sales. AS did lose a little bit because we gave away some tickets to students.”

Senator Sabalius said, “What does it say about the quality of our University when there is a quote in the Spartan Daily that says, “Maybe it’s a good thing, maybe we have people in the community that are going to say, “Wow, I’d like to go to an University that has a carnival.” AS President Greathouse said, “It is important that AS bring many different experiences to this campus, and we do many different things. We hold forums for voter registration, and we also put on a carnival that was for homecoming. We are trying to appeal to all types of students. The carnival was for students and their families. I have classes with students that have families and young children that they brought to the carnival. These students may not have wanted to



participate in other activities we've had on campus. The role of AS is to provide everything and anything that we possibly can in order to give students a well-rounded college experience.”

**B. Statewide Academic Senators** – Senator Van Selst said, “There was a commendation for the voter registration effort at San José State University (SJSU). Several issues are being looked at in the Statewide Senate. One issue is lecturer representation on Senates, and SJSU is a model being used. Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility are other issues being looked at for faculty and students. There is also the issue of volunteer service being required of all students. As for the budget, Vasconcellos told us that there is no way that California can sponsor the Compact. A few minutes later Chancellor Reed came in and said that he spoke to the Governor and the compact was good. As for early assessment programs, there is a movement to test people in high school to see if they are on track. This is part of a bigger effort to warn people ahead of time to divert them from having to have remedial education. Finally, the Statewide Senate is looking at the lower division transfer program, and trying to come up with an agreement on core GE.”

**C. Provost – None**

**D. Vice President for Administration – None**

**E. Vice President for Student Affairs** – Senator Phillips said, “I am delighted to be back at SJSU. I am focusing on student success. We will succeed in our work, only if the students we are serving succeed. As far as the status of Student Affairs, I am reviewing all aspects of Student Affairs. There are many, many things I am looking at. If there is something you think I should look at, feel free to contact me.”

**X. Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.