

2012/2013 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
November 19, 2012**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Von Till, Sabalius
Worsnup, Van Selst
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Semerjian, Goyal, Hebert, Cara

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Junn, Bibb, Nance, Qayoumi

COB Representatives:

Present: Reade
Absent: Nellen

Deans:

Present: Green, Bienenfeld,
Stacks
Absent: Vollendorf

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow
Absent: Swanson

Students:

Present: Jeffrey, Postovoit,
Holsey, Condon
Absent: Lee, Miller

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Du
Absent: Backer

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Frazier, Desalvo,
Bacich, Vanniarajan
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Bros-Seemann, Cheruzel, Kress

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Absent: Norton

SOS Representatives:

Present: Heiden, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Wilson

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Winnard, Feind
Absent: Yi-Baker, Rubio

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of October 15, 2012 were approved as written.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Von Till thanked Senators for agreeing to start the Senate meeting 15 minutes late due to the last forum with a candidate for the VP of University Advancement. All three forums with the candidates for the VP of University Advancement position will be on the university website by the end of today [November 19, 2012]. Faculty, staff, students, etc. can provide feedback on the candidates and the forums either online or in hard copy.

Faculty Trustee nominations must be received in the Senate Office by December 7, 2012. There

are three methods of nomination listed on the memo on the table in the back of the room. The most common nominating method is to collect 50 faculty signatures. Other supporting documentation is required and is outlined in the memo as well. Nominations are due to the Chancellor's Office no later than January 11, 2013.

B. From the President of the University –

President Qayoumi made the following announcements/comments:

The President and Senate congratulated Associated Students on the excellent work they did to get students registered to vote. The President noted how happy he was with the passage of Proposition 30, but the CSU still faces a \$132 million cut. The next budget forum will be held next week, and the President will go over more details then.

The 2013-2014 budget approved by the Board of Trustees for the CSU has some good elements including a request for a 3.5% salary increase for faculty and staff, and some funding for renovations. In addition, a 5% enrollment increase was approved.

The VP for Advancement Search forums can be viewed online, and the AVP of Marketing and Communication Search is also moving along and may be completed in the next few weeks as well.

Chancellor White is very interested in coming to SJSU as well as to other campuses.

Questions:

Senator Rudy asked if President Qayoumi had given any consideration to taking a 10% pay cut like the new Chancellor. President Qayoumi responded that he had not.

Senator Cara noted that faculty should also be commended for their work in helping to get Proposition 30 passed. The President thanked the faculty as well as the students.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Minutes of October 8, 2012 –

AVC Ng amended the minutes she took to include President Qayoumi as being present instead of absent at this meeting.

Minutes of October 22, 2012 -- No questions.

Minutes of November 5, 2012 –

Senator Frazier asked if the Executive Committee was still discussing the recording of Senate meetings. Chair Von Till replied that the discussion was ongoing. According to Natalie King, Assistant Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (AAVP), the current law specifies that both parties must agree if a meeting is to be recorded. That would mean that every Senator would have to agree on a date-by-date basis to the recording.

B. Consent Calendar – The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as amended by AVC Ng to remove Elizabeth Favila, Student, from the Student Success Committee.

Election Calendar -- The Senate voted and the Election Calendar was approved with No Nays, or Abstentions.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

The Executive Committee members presented *AS 1498, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Commending Associated Students on the 2012 Campus-Wide Voter Registration Drive (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1498 was approved as written with No Nays, or Abstentions.**

V. **Unfinished Business** - None

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

A. University Library Board (ULB) –

The written ULB report is attached to this Senate packet.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1492, Policy Recommendation, Omnibus Recision of Lapsed and Obsolete Policies Previously Recommended by the Professional Standards Committee (Final Reading)*. Senator Frazier presented a friendly amendment to replace “superceded” with “superseded” in the table. **The Senate voted and AS 1492 was approved as amended with No Nays, or Abstentions.**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1493, Policy Recommendation, Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (Replaces S99-10 – Responding to Allegations of Scientific or Other Misconduct in Funded Research (Final Reading)*. Senator Buzanski presented a friendly amendment to pages 13 and 17 to change, “Deciding Official (The President of San José State University)” to read, “Deciding Official (The President of San José State University or his/her designee).” **The Senate voted and AS 1493 was approved as amended with No Nays, and 1 Abstention.**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1496, Policy Recommendation, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (First Reading)*. Senator Peter explained the purpose of the policy is to change the peer observation intervals to be more in sync with actual reviews. The current 1991 policy calls for a peer observation review every third semester which is out of sync with the contracts faculty receive. Another item being changed involves the passage of the new contract allowing for electronic Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTEs). The PS Committee needed to implement language for those electronic SOTEs. The Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) is in charge of adopting the structure needed to keep SOTE response rates high. In the event that SERB decides to adopt a grade withholding structure, the PS Committee “built-in a number of safeguards to make that humane and reasonable.” The current policy also needed to be revised to fit the universal language in the new contract. In addition, faculty will be able to exclude one course from their review per year, particularly if they want to try and incorporate a new course with new technology. This policy also combines nine policies

that involve SOTEs into one policy.

SERB gave the PS Committee a number of suggestions including reducing the number of peer evaluations for tenure/tenure-track faculty while increasing their quality. Many colleges have college-level or department-level criteria. In return for cutting down on the number of peer evaluations, the PS Committee wants to make sure all departments have some criteria and guidelines as to how to do the peer evaluations.

In addition, the PS Committee wants to improve the norming process. The size of a course, level of course, and other items that have some effect on SOTEs will also be able to be normed electronically. SERB recommended that all results from SOTEs be published. The PS Committee thought this would be difficult, so the compromise they came up with is to allow for one qualitative question to be asked at the same time as the SOTE, which would be made available to the public. That question would be advice students might have for future students taking the course. It would be separate from the SOTE, although it would be administered at the same time.

This draft policy also allows for SERB and the Center for Faculty Development to possibly use SOTEs for formative purposes. In addition, the draft policy also allows for SERB and the Center for Faculty Development to possibly use SOTEs for improvement of teaching purposes. This has to be done very carefully and not violate confidentiality. However, an automated program could alert faculty to opportunities that are available in the Center for Faculty Development based upon SOTE results.

Questions/Comments:

Concern was expressed that current evaluations by peers are evaluative, and not formative. The PS Committee was asked to consider revising the policy to have the evaluation by peers include checkboxes that have *meets expectations*, *exceeds expectations*, or *below expectations*, and if it is *below expectations* there would be comments. The formative review would have evidence that it occurred, but the information given to the faculty member would be confidential. This would allow the faculty to be evaluated and comments provided when needed, but at the same time provide a formative process without wasting faculty time.

Clarification was requested on item C.4.d. as to whether a department chair could request an extra observation. The PS Committee changed this language so that an extra observation could be requested for any faculty member, and not just a full professor, but as a safeguard the request would have to be made by the personnel committee and not by the chair alone.

The Senate discussed the statement in C.4.e. about temporary faculty receiving a direct observation of at least one course their first semester, but if not feasible then observations could be made as often as practicable. The PS Committee discussed this, but the problem is that this policy will reduce the number of peer evaluations departments that have many senior temporary faculty need to conduct, but will increase the number of evaluations for departments that mainly have new temporary faculty. The PS Committee has heard from some departments that they do not have enough people to do annual peer observations for all their temporary faculty members on one-year contracts. This gives those departments a way out. However, concern was also

expressed that the very next sentence calls for “observations to be made in a representative sampling of courses,” and if courses are only being evaluated every three years, how will that be accomplished.

Footnotes need to be added to E.1., page 8, to identify where the information was taken from that shows “a positive correlation between class satisfaction and effective teaching,” and “better teachers having more satisfied students and higher evaluation scores.” The PS Committee received this information from SERB and will get the citations from them.

It was suggested that item G.2., page 10, be modified to include frequency in addition to means, standard deviations, and medians, and that item H.9., page 12, be modified to require a report to the Senate when any technical and implementation details are changed by the AVP of IEA (Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics) and SERB.

Section H.1., page 11, appears to imply that all students must complete SOTEs electronically. The PS Committee did not intend to imply this, and Section H.2.c. allows a student to “opt out” of completing SOTEs. Students that opt out will also be able to get their grades early just like those completing the SOTEs.

There is no discussion in items D and E, on pages 7 and 8, about faculty informing students how important SOTEs are, or how students will be told that this information will be available to the public. The PS Committee will consider asking SERB to prepare a SOTE Interpretation Guide such as what they have for faculty for students. Currently there is a statement read to students from off of the paper SOTEs. However, the electronic SOTEs may be a superior way to communicate to students by having a screen they must read with this information prior to filling out the SOTE.

The PS Committee was asked to consider mid-semester SOTEs, or another way for students to provide anonymous feedback on a course during the middle of the semester.

The Senate discussed C.2., and what happens if the faculty member that is supposed to be observed avoids meeting with the faculty member assigned to observe them, and also who determines if there is negligence. The PS Committee will consider adding language to identify who determines whether there is negligence, and will consider changing the submission process to allow the report to be submitted to the faculty member being observed and the chair at the same time.

The PS Committee was asked to consider adding a minimum number of days that SOTEs would be available to students.

The Senate discussed whether it was necessary to withhold grades if students have the option to opt out. The PS Committee referred to a survey of students by Brigham Young in which students stated that withholding grades until a student did a SOTE was fair as long as the student had the option to opt out.

Concern was raised that the withholding of grades is referred to as an incentive, and that it

doesn't specify how long grades could be delayed if the student does not go online and complete the SOTE. It isn't clear that the student must go online to complete the SOTE, or to opt out to receive their grade. The PS Committee is leaving it up to SERB to decide if they want to withhold the grade as they do at San Diego State University.

There was discussion about the fact that faculty have a certain amount of time before they have to have their grades posted, and that the incentive of students getting their grades early for filling out the online SOTE may only work if faculty post their grades early.

Concern was raised that the SOTEs would be on MySJSU, and MySJSU is not accessible using an accessible browser. The webmaster stated that MySJSU is accessible, however, parts of Peoplesoft are not accessible. This is a CSU-wide problem.

There was discussion about the utility of having a public anonymous qualitative statement.

Concern was expressed that the direct observation could double or triple the workload for some faculty. The PS Committee was asked to consider having the indirect observation done by a committee and the direct observation done by an individual.

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

The C&R Committee is working on the 120 Unit issue, and WASC Accreditation.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) - No report.

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

Senator Du presented *AS 1497, Policy Recommendation, Enrollment Priorities for Former Students Returning (FSRs) (First Reading)*. Senator Du explained that returning students have two categories—probation or disqualified students that want to return, and students in good standing that are returning. Our current policy gives priority to new students.

Questions:

The I&SA Committee was asked to consider adding language for returning undergraduate students in good standing. There was discussion about the fact that there is no program of study available for undergraduate students like there is for graduate students. Graduate students that are disqualified can continue to enroll in classes in a program of study to regain eligibility and have uninterrupted enrollment. Undergraduate students do not have that program of study available.

Several senators expressed concern about students returning to a different major. However, departments will be able to choose whether to take the student back. The I&SA Committee was asked to consider an alternative to the phrase, “return to major.”

The I&SA Committee was asked to consider adding an implementation date for the policy.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

Roger Elrod, Director of the Student Health Center, gave a presentation on Smoking Cessation efforts on campus. The Senate passed SS-S12-4 in Spring of 2012, and since that time a working group has been created to develop smoking cessation programs. Some actions that the group has taken include doing research on effective efforts in smoking cessation that will be available on the Human Resources website. In addition, the Great American Smoke-Out was held last week. The group is also working on replacing signage for buildings on the campus, and chalking will be done by students again in the spring.

The group has also partnered with Human Resources to have a Breathe Counselor. Nicotine replacement therapy will be available free through that counselor. The working group is also combining efforts with the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAPC), and the student group called COUGH on smoking cessation efforts. In addition, employee health insurance has lots of information on smoking cessation.

Senators expressed concern that this not be a coercive police type action for employees, and asked how we would enforce a smoke-free campus. Chair Von Till noted that we are not there yet, and Director Elrod noted that efforts right now are geared toward smoking cessation.

VIII. New Business – None

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

A. Provost –

The following events are scheduled for November 2012:

- The search for a Dean for the College of Engineering is moving along. The Provost will receive an update tomorrow.
- The Deputy Provost search is still seeking nominations. The new Deputy Provost job description has more budget and strategic planning in it.
- The Provost wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance –

- As a result of Prop 30 passing, the CSU will no longer have the \$250 million trigger, which would have been \$16.2 million for SJSU. However, we do have the rollback of the tuition fee, which is a loss for SJSU of \$11.4 million. The net impact to the campus will be \$9.3 million. The President's Cabinet has not yet met to discuss how they will deal with the \$9.3 million. The student refunds will go back to their bank accounts. The refunds will be made prior to the Christmas break. This will also require recalculation of financial aid packages.

C. Vice President for Student Affairs – The application period for Fall 2013 is gearing up for admissions. The enrollment target for 2013-2014 is the same as it was for 2012-2013, 21,045 FTES, but if there is an enrollment target increase the number of FTES will also increase.

D. Associated Students President – AS President Worsnup reported that AS had recently passed two resolutions. One resolution had to do with the implementation of online SOTEs. The second resolution spoke against the proposed student fee increase that was subsequently withdrawn by the CSU.

AS has posted information for students on Senate committees that teaches them how to make a resolution.

The student Community Garden project over on San Carlos and 8th Street is moving forward. AS will be bringing a proposal to foundation soon.

The AS House is going to be having a light show on December 5, 2012 at 5 p.m.

E. Vice President for University Advancement – No report.

F. Statewide Academic Senators –

Every campus has the right to nominate faculty for the Faculty Trustee seat on the Board of Trustees. Bernadette Cheyne is the current Faculty Trustee. She may run again.

The constitutional amendment vote is ongoing and you can find the information on the Senate website.

There is a Board of Trustee proposal regarding the 120 unit limit for majors that would allow the Chancellor's Office to change a program to look like a similar program in the CSU. The CSU Statewide Senate Resolution asks that this be left up to the campuses to deal with. However, it does ask that if the Board of Trustees is going to change it that they allow the chancellor to only change general education. At SJSU we are sticking to our timeline, but the Chancellor has pushed back that deadline one year.

The CSU Statewide Senate was generally opposed to fees for course repeats.

The CSU Statewide Senate was in support of the alignment of Nursing Programs statewide.

There was a request to allow for further feedback on consolidation of International Program Executive Orders.

The general counsel confirmed that faculty have the right to prohibit recording of their lectures.

Faculty on the Monterey campus got into some trouble for promoting Prop 30. As a reminder, employees cannot use their SJSU email account when advocating for something.

Senator Van Selst gave a report from the Campus Planning Board (CPB). There are a bunch of Elm Trees on the San Carlos side that are diseased. Some are in danger of falling down. The CPB has recommended to the President that most of them be removed. The Senate suggested that this be done gradually so that the most diseased be removed first, and then additional trees would be removed and replanted the next year. Removing them all at once will make what was a shady area barren. The Senate further recommended that the CPB let the campus know what the rationale is for removal. The Arborist recommended removing all trees. Once those trees are gone, that area will be used as a staging area for construction and then replanted when they are finished.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.