

2008/2009 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
November 17, 2008**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-six Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Lessow-Hurley,
Meldal, Whitmore,
Cavu-Litman
Absent: Sabalius, Van Selst

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Najjar, Phillips, Sigler, Lee

Deans:

Present: Parrish, Merdinger, Stacks,
Meyers

Students:

Present: Cerda, Hypes, Levy, Lichty,
Linder, Palumbo

Alumni Representative:

Absent: No representative assigned
yet.

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Sivertsen, Romo, Fujimoto

CASA Representatives:

Present: Fee, Hendrick, Kao, Canham
Absent: Semerjian

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey
Absent: Roldan

ED Represent:

Present: Maldonado-Colon, Rickford, Langdon

ENG Representatives:

Present: Gleixner
Absent: Du, Backer

H&A Representatives:

Present: Desalvo, Vanniarajan, Brown, Van Hooff, Mok
Absent: Butler

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Kaufman, Hilliard, McGee, d'Alarcao

SOS Representatives:

Present: Hebert, Von Till, Lee, Heiden

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes – Senator Merdinger asked if the minutes of October 20, 2008, could be amended to reflect new information she had received regarding the Post-Promotion Increase Program. Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that corrections to the minutes should be made only if there is an error, however, today's minutes can reflect the new information. Chair Meldal and Senator Merdinger asked that today's minutes reflect that the members of the Post-Promotion Increase (PPI) Program department committees must be tenured full professors who are not eligible or applying for the PPI. If the department does not have enough full tenured professors, full tenured professors from the college or other colleges can serve on that department's committee.

The Senate voted and the minutes of October 20, 2008 were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Meldal shared some thoughts on Thanksgiving and its opportunity to reflect upon good people and experiences in the past year.

Chair Meldal and the Academic Senate congratulated Senator Sivertsen on her recent marriage, and announced that a card was circulating for anyone that wished to sign it.

Chair Meldal sadly announced that Mrs. Whitmore's father passed away last week. A card for Mrs. Whitmore is also circulating for those Senators that wish to sign it. Chair Meldal and the Academic Senate expressed their condolences.

Chair Meldal reminded Senators to bring the budget books they received today to the December 2008 Senate meeting. VP Lee will be giving a budget presentation at that meeting.

B. From the President of the University –

The President informed the Senate that there was a Board of Trustee's (BOT) meeting tomorrow in Long Beach and that he would be attending. The BOT will be discussing the budget on the second day. The CSU system has already received a \$31 million cut. We may be cut an additional \$66 million. If we get both the first and second cuts SJSU will be cut about 3%, or \$6 million. President Whitmore said, "This is not good, but manageable." The President will know more this week and will inform the Senate as soon as he can.

Chancellor Reed is expected to discuss CSU systemwide impaction with the BOT. SJSU has approximately 2,500 to 3,000 students that we are not getting paid to teach. This stretches our resources. The President's goal is to get the number of students down to what we can effectively serve. If SJSU is declared impacted, we will only have to accept those qualified students from our service area, which is Santa Clara county. Different standards can then be used for students outside of the service area. If SJSU is not declared impacted through CSU systemwide impaction, then the President has asked his team to develop a plan for us to become impacted. If SJSU goes through the impaction process alone, it will take about 18 months. The idea is to align the number of students we have with the amount of money we are getting. Right now we are out of alignment, and the budget cuts will make us even more out of alignment.

Questions:

Senator Sivertsen asked, "What will happen to those students from San Mateo county that maybe don't have a service area?" President Whitmore replied, "We don't have to answer that right now, we will need people to look at this issue. We have a group coming from the

CSU on Friday that know how to do this to advise us. We are just trying to figure it out right now.”

Senator Heiden asked, “Is this a written policy?” President Whitmore said, “Yes.” VP Phillips said, “The CSU policy pertains to the local area. Our local area happens to be Santa Clara county. The local area is defined differently for different campuses.”

Senator Mok said, “I am interested in this because we have students standing in the hallways, is this impactation?” President Whitmore said, “Not officially, but it certainly impacts your lives.” Senator Mok commented that this might be a good time to use more online classes.

VP Lee said, “While President Whitmore was out of town, Chancellor Reed had a teleconference with the media about the issue of impactation, and I’m sure San Mateo county was covered. If we become impacted that doesn’t mean we cannot take people from other areas such as San Mateo county, we will have to prioritize.” President Whitmore commented that he would like to see a balance of incoming freshmen and transfer students, and to remember that we are not impacted right now.”

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Minutes of November 3, 2008 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar – The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved unanimously.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Chair Meldal presented *AS 1405, Senate Management Resolution, Process to Elect the Members of the Post-Promotion Increase Program Appeals Committee (Final Reading)*, on behalf of the Executive Committee. There were no questions or debate.

The Senate voted and the resolution passed unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –

Senator Sivertsen presented *AS 1400, Policy Recommendation, Repetition of Courses; Academic Renewal (Final Reading)*. Senator Sivertsen presented a friendly amendment in I.C.3. 2nd line, to stike “Eligible courses include those courses with earned grades lower than a C (including WU, IC; but excluding NC).” This information is included earlier in the resolution.

Questions:

Senator Hebert asked, “What is meant by the “pool” in section I.B.2. 8th line?” AVP Stephen Branz responded, “It may not be the best word, but what we were trying to do is come up with a way to say that there is an absolute cap placed by Executive Order (EO) 1037. In some cases a student won’t be able to get the 16 units. These units will then be added to the 12 units that can be used for grade averaging after the grade forgiveness. This will be implemented by Peoplesoft which will automatically have counters for lower and upper division general education. These two will be summed until you hit 16, and then it will stop the grade forgiveness and go into the category of grade averaging.” There was no debate. **The Senate voted and AS 1400 passed unanimously as amended.**

B. University Library Board (ULB) –

Senator Desalvo reported back to the Senate about the filtering issue at the MLK Library. The city council vote is still indefinitely postponed. Dean Kifer has assured the ULB that under no circumstances will there be overall filtering in the MLK Library. However, there may be filtering in the Children’s and Teen’s rooms. The only way that widespread filtering could be imposed is if the city of San José and the MLK Library renegotiate the contract. As for the history of this proposal, Senator Desalvo directed Senators to the Academic Senate website and commented that a Sense of the Senate Resolution, SS-S07-5, was passed last year on November 19, 2007, by the Senate regarding this issue that states why the university is opposed. President Don Kassing followed up by sending a letter to the San José City Council after the resolution was passed.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski inquired as to whether “indefinitely postponed” meant the issue was dead. Senator Desalvo said, “That is our hope.”

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Chair Meldal announced that *AS 1397, Policy Recommendation, New Sabbatical Leaves Policy (Final Reading)* had been withdrawn from today’s meeting due to some editing problems.

Senator Maldonado-Colon presented, *AS 1404, Policy Recommendation, Departments/Colleges/University Committees Recordkeeping (First Reading)*.

Senator Maldonado-Colon stated, “This policy is in response to a referral the PS Committee received requesting that units be required to keep records of policies and committee working discussions. We are seeking to increase collegiality, efficiency, transparency, and also to help new faculty that come on board know the history of policies in the department, and also the history of any committees they might be asked to serve on. For example, when I became chair, I needed to know where some of the policies in the department came from and it was very helpful to have records of the discussions.”

Questions:

Senator Buzanski asked, “Why is there a split infinitive in the first sentence?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “I will take care of it.”

Senator Norton said, “How long are the records to be kept?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “We discussed this, but there was an issue with storage space, so we were not sure what would be the pleasure of the body.”

Senator Sigler said, “I am curious as to why this policy is coming from the Professional Standards Committee?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “Because, we got the referral.” Senator Sigler commented, “It seems to me it would be more appropriate coming from another committee.”

Senator Lee asked, “Does this apply to all committees across the university?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “Yes.”

Senator Norton said, “Does this apply to RTP and similar units or departments where confidential matters are discussed?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “If it is not a public meeting then it cannot be shared, should I add language?” Senator Norton said, “There should be language that refers to excluding confidential meetings.”

Senator Heiden commented that there should be language that explains the detail of the minutes for certain meetings, such as a record of those in attendance, the vote, main outcomes, etc.

Senator Kaufman said, “I have two questions. What is the procedure if a department doesn’t do this? Who is the enforcer?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “The Chair or an Administrator.” Senator Kaufman said, “In the scope of the policy it refers to the records being accessible, I’m assuming this means we know where to find them, and not to making them accessible to persons with disabilities? Maybe, we could come up with some other language to distinguish this.”

Senator Van Hooff asked, “Can we record only the action items?” Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “On the 3rd line it says a description of the decisions made.”

Senator Langdon asked, “Would these records be required to be on paper, or on CD?” Senator Maldonado-Colon replied, “It is up to the department.”

D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –

Senator Von Till said, “Today we have two reports from AVP Bob Cooper. The first report is on the Board of General Studies (BOGS), and the second report is on the General Education (GE) Taskforce.

BOGS Report

AVP Cooper said, “I’m not sure how many of you remember last year, but there was a recommendation by the Senate that BOGS spend this year focused on assessment of the overall GE program. BOGS agreed to do that, and put the continuing certification of GE courses on hold. With respect to its normal functioning, BOGS has been cleaning up some leftover work from last year and doing certification of new course proposals as they come in. All current courses were given an additional year in their current certification until new processes are worked out.

As part of acting on the recommendation from the Senate, there developed two different threads in the BOGS with respect to assessment of the GE program. One is responsive to the letter from WASC that continued our status as a university in good standing and is focused on assessing student learning of the goals and outcomes defined in our GE guidelines. The other is an assessment of the structure of how we do GE by comparing it to what other universities are doing and looking at whether we should reconsider our whole strategy of infusing GE across all the colleges and allowing any department that can provide a proposal that is judged adequate to teach in any area of GE. I was surprised by that latter thread, because it developed late at the end of discussion in the BOGS, so I am not going to detail that any further.

The more pressing part to me is the part required by WASC for our accreditation that we focus on assessing the student learning of the goals in GE. There has been a slight change in context from when the Senate considered this last spring. There is a new EO that defines the GE program for the CSU system. Happily, we were ahead of the curve in two ways. First, the guidelines that we adopted in 2005 were designed with the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Liberal Education and American Promise Initiative, so we have to do very little with respect to the definitions of our categories in GE. There are some minor modifications, but very little. The other fortunate situation for us is the policy with respect to syllabi or greensheets that was adopted by the university, because it already requires everything in the EO on our greensheets.

We lost Gail Evans to San Francisco State, but she was very instrumental in providing input to the Chancellor’s Office in designing this new EO, so we owe her thanks for the degree to which our policies and practices on this campus are compatible with what is required in the new EO.

The challenge for us in assessing student learning of the overall outcomes is that it has to be done at the very end of the student’s completion of the GE curriculum. For us, that means in one of the SJSU studies courses in the R, S, or V categories, or alternatively in one of the degree program capstone courses. In discussions with the council of chairs and directors, many departments expressed little enthusiasm for increasing what they are already doing in their capstone courses, which they feel are already overloaded, so the BOGS is focused on the R, S, and V courses. There are two problems. First, we do not currently have those sequenced, so no one of them is always the last. One alternative is to make one of them capstone that follows the 100W, and the other two SJSU studies courses. This has the

advantage of then always being put at the end of the SJSU GE curriculum. However, this has two disadvantages. One disadvantage is that it constrains the order in which the students have to take those courses, since some of them are also used to complete a requirement in the major. The other disadvantage is that there could be some limitation on the offering of courses potentially delaying student's graduation, because we now have a more highly sequenced prerequisite structure for GE. The other alternative is to do assessment in all three categories, R, S, and V. Then to only use for assessment of the overall GE program data from students that are at the end of their GE curriculum. Approximately, 1/3rd of the data in each area would be useful.

I'm laying this out because the BOGS is interested in input from others on ideas as to how to do this, because each of the ways we could do this has both positives and negatives.

In assessing the overall GE program, the strategy will be like we used in the major programs, focusing on one or several student learning outcomes per year, so we are not assessing everything we are trying to do in the program each year. The notion is that over a sequence of years, all of the outcomes in the program would be assessed.

The further addition from the EO is that we will probably be doing something very similar to program planning for the GE program. This sort of overall review with an external reviewer is required by the new EO.

The goal for BOGS now is to try and get a preliminary draft that can be circulated to the campus by the end of this semester, and then to gather input from the rest of the campus. We would then come to the Senate in the spring, since some of this will require change to the guidelines which are endorsed by Senate policy. This is where we are with respect to BOGS.

Questions:

Senator Kaufman asked, "Suppose a student takes this presumed exit exam and doesn't know any of the parts of it, what would the consequences be?" AVP Cooper said, "I think the consequences have to be that we examine how we are structuring our GE program. As we talked about the assessment of the program, we realized it would be very interesting to have the opportunity to separate transfer students who took a majority of their core GE elsewhere from students that came here as first-time freshmen and therefore took their GE here. Just as happened in the past with respect to preparation in writing at the lower division level and the differential passage of the WST test, if we found big differences then we would have to work with the community colleges. If we find no differences, and our students as freshmen maybe are not doing well, then that will take us to the other half of this which is assessing how the individual courses are doing in meeting their student learning outcomes. Senator Kaufman said, "The goal then is not to put in place an exit exam for students, but to merely assess the GE program?" AVP Cooper said, "That is correct. Your question points to one of the challenges we have in how we are going to assess the GE program. If the assessment done in one of the SJSU studies courses has no impact on the grade, then the student is not likely to take it very seriously and it won't be a real assessment of the GE

program. If the learning objective chosen for that year happens to be breadth of knowledge and natural sciences, and it happens to be an Area S course, Self and Society, the instructor may not be very pleased by having some of the grade in the course determined by how they do on a question assessing their natural science knowledge. That is one of the things that has pushed us towards thinking about writing questions from each of the areas of GE, but just using the data from the overall assessment of the program for those students at the very end of their GE curriculum.

Senator Cavu-Litman asked, "Is the test for assessment supposed to be a continual assessment, or is the test optional?" AVP Cooper said, "The notion is that it will happen every year, but will be focused on different student learning outcomes. If we do it the same as program planning, then every 5 years we would cover all the outcomes in the GE program."

Senator Fee asked, "I wonder who is going to be responsible for designing this assessment tool?" AVP Cooper said, "Excellent question. We are in fact doing some pilot designing right now. The notion would be that if we are going to require this to be done in one of the R, S, and V courses, we need to figure out how to build a support structure for designing the assessment and for evaluating the student's performance without adding to the workload of faculty. It may be that part of what BOGS ends up doing is in fact looking at the products from those courses and providing feedback to the instructor. In saying that, we realize an instructor might want to design their own. It is not that we would take that possibility away from them, but we need to find a way to make it workload neutral if the instructor does not want to do that.

Senator Cavu-Litman asked, "Will we be the first campus to do something like this?" AVP Cooper said, "We may be the first in the CSU. Among the campuses in the CSU, our assessment in GE is ahead of the other campuses. They have been emulating our GE program, because everyone is required to do this both by WASC and EO 1033."

GE Taskforce Report:

AVP Cooper said, "The GE Taskforce was tasked with working on two issues. The first task was assessment within courses and the second was the certification process, in particular continuing certification. Some of the ideas that were circulated last spring with respect to continuing certification, for example that once a course is certified it is certified for life, are precluded by EO 1033. That has helped to provide some focus on that issue.

The taskforce has been meeting weekly since September, 2008. I think it is making progress. I thought about writing up a summary of what they have done to bring today, but decided against it because it is all tentative. That is the taskforce is committed to getting input in at least 3 ways. First they are going to the colleges to get input from the curriculum committees, then they are going to have an open forum, and once they get a draft together they are going to have a mechanism for getting email responses to that draft so that people that are not on the college curriculum committees and cannot attend the forum have ways to get input to them. With that disclaimer about this being tentative, the focus is on a couple of

things. One is to make the assessment process simpler and more focused in ways that will help improve student learning. The idea is to focus on one or a few student learning outcomes each year so that there is more focus on fewer things at any point in time, and therefore better assessment that could lead to improvement in our instruction. The second component is simplifying the reporting process. The taskforce is working on a mechanism that will both be flexible to allow different departments to report in different ways, and if they meet their goal, will involve a one-page report. Each year there would be a one-page report on assessment of one or two student learning outcomes. The third piece is to integrate the overall look at these assessments into the program planning process. There would be an added piece of the self study that used the annual assessment reports as data and then allowed the department to reflect on that data. That is the general structure that is being discussed in the taskforce today.

There are two activities going on right now. One is the designing of that one-page report, and the other is the designing of the system to make sure that all the student learning outcomes are assessed during a program planning cycle. Attaching it to program planning means that not every department will be on the same cycle, because program planning for accredited departments is tied to their accrediting cycle. Some departments might have to do that reflective piece on their assessment as frequently as every four years, while other departments might do it as infrequently as every seven years.”

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –

Senator McClory presented *AS 1402, Policy Recommendation, Changes to the Composition of Professional Standards (First Reading)*. Senator McClory stated, “This referral came to the O&G Committee. The O&G Committee felt that because of the nature of the issues discussed by the PS Committee, the chair of the PS Committee should be a full tenured professor and that as far as possible tenured faculty should make up the rest of the committee. We added the “as far as possible,” because policy committees are constituted by Senators. Sometimes we have the constraint of how many Senators are full tenured professors. The policy is that half of the committee has to be Senators, but the reality is that we place all Senators on the policy committees.”

Questions:

Senator Maldonado-Colon asked, “Is it possible to have a committee of just tenure-track and lecturers, given that there is no limit to the number?” Senator McClory replied, “The preference is to have a committee made up of tenured faculty. It could happen because of the constraints of the availability of tenured faculty as Senators.”

Senator McClory presented *AS 1403, Policy Recommendation, New Bylaw 16 (First Reading)*. Senator McClory stated, “This is housekeeping primarily. Sometimes policy committees overlook previous policies that really should be rescinded because of the new policy, and this allows an automatic removal of any policy that has been overlooked.” There were no questions.

VII. Special Committee Reports – None

VIII. New Business –

Senate Election Calendar for 2009 – The Senate voted and the Election Calendar was approved as is.

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

A. Vice President for University Advancement –

VP Najjar said, “The Alumni Association has worked closely with the Beach Blanket Babylon production. Many of the members are SJSU alums. They are performing on March 9th in the California Theatre from 6:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. There will also be a VIP reception with the cast.”

B. Statewide Academic Senators –

Senator Kaufman said, “Most of the discussion at the CSU Statewide Senate was about the budget and we will know more about that after the BOT meeting going on right now. Besides that, most of the discussion was around agreeing to work as a collegial body with the administration to get through this tough budget time.”

C. Provost –

Provost Sigler stated, “First, I would like to tell you that this week, next week, and the following week, we will be conducting interviews with finalists for the Dean of the College of Applied Sciences and the Arts. We already interviewed one finalist, and the second one will be on campus tomorrow. I am really pleased, because we have a really strong pool. I’m sure we will be able to appoint a new dean.

This week is International Week and I hope you can participate in some of the activities. Tomorrow we have an outstanding speaker that will be delivering the Peter Lee Memorial Lecture. The speaker is Dr. Yolanda Moses from UC Irvine. She will be talking about the intersection between multiculturalism at home and an international global society.

Next week is Thanksgiving, and it is my favorite holiday. Forty-two years ago, I celebrated my first Thanksgiving in this country. I really realized what a wonderful holiday it is. It is an opportunity for all of us to focus on what is important—family, friends, and the blessings that we have. Among my blessings is the extraordinary opportunity to work at this university and to be your colleague. I wish you, your colleagues, and your families a joyous Thanksgiving Day.”

D. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No Report.

E. Vice President for Student Affairs – No Report.

F. Associated Students President –

AS President Cavu-Litman said, “Associated Students (AS) met with Chancellor Reed this weekend to discuss the California State Student Association (CSSA) membership.

We are working to bring back all campuses to the CSSA. Right now about 10 campuses are representing all 23. That meeting will take place in December in San Francisco.

Last week we had our first MySpace party. We are also having an open house today through November 20th. All of you are welcome to come by.

AS also recently hired our first Human Resources manager.”

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.