## 2017/2018 Academic Senate

## MINUTES
## March 12, 2018

## I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-five Senators were present.

**Ex Officio:**
Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo, Lee, J., Rodan

**Administrative Representatives:**
Present: Wong(Lau), Willey, Feinstein
Absent: Papazian, Faas

**Deans:**
Present: Elliott, Stacks, Ehrman, Jacobs

**Students:**
Present: Busick
Absent: De Guzman, Hospidales, Donahue, Gill, Norman

**Alumni Representative:**
Present: Walters

**Emeritus Representative:**
Present: Buzanski

**Honorary Representative:**
Present: Lessow-Hurley

**General Unit Representatives:**
Present: Trousdale, Matoush, Higgins
Absent: Kauppila

**CASA Representatives:**
Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Chin, Sen
Absent: None

**COB Representatives:**
Present: Bullen, He, Jensen
Absent: None

**EDUC Representatives**:
Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

**ENGR Representatives:**
Present: Chung, Pyeon, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

**H&A Representatives:**
Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Bacich, Ormsbee
Absent: None

**SCI Representatives:**
Present: Cargill, White, French, Kim
Absent: None

**SOS Representatives:**
Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart
Absent: Trulio

## II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of February 12, 2018 were approved.

## III. Communications and Questions –

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

Chair Frazier announced that there are Senate elections right now in CASA and Business through this Friday, February 16, 2018. All election results will be announced at the April 9, 2018 Senate meeting.

We also have a CSU Statewide Senator election taking place and nominating petitions are due this Wednesday, February 14, 2018. We already have three nominees, so we will be conducting an election after nominations close.

Once all elections have concluded, we will send out the Committee Preference Form. All Senators are placed on the policy committees first, so fill the Committee Preference Form out quickly.

The President is at the American Council of Education Meeting in Washington and will not be here today.

**B. From the President of the University** – Not present.

**IV. Executive Committee Report:**

**A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:**

**Executive Committee Minutes of February 5, 2018**

**Q:** Item number 4 under the Professional Standards Committee update states that, "PS has started a conversation on bullying." What kind of bullying is this; faculty-to-faculty, faculty-to-student, student-to-student, etc.?

**A:** General, but there is a subcommittee that is meeting and talking about the issues. The CDO has met with them. We don't know if this will result in policy changes, or just raising awareness. Faculty-on-Faculty bullying on campus falls through the cracks in many policies and the PS Committee is trying to figure out what can be done to raise awareness.

**Executive Committee Minutes of February 19, 2018 – No questions.**

**B. Consent Calendar:**

The consent calendar of March 12, 2018 was approved as amended by AVC Riley.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

**The Senate Calendar of 2018-2019 was approved.** Chair Frazier announced that the Retreat is February 1, 2019. Chair Frazier also announced that there is no Senate or Executive Committee meeting scheduled the week of Thanksgiving. As a note, Spring break falls on the first week of April in 2019.

**Q:** Was the calendar checked to be sure it did not conflict with any major religious holidays?

**A:** Yes, we did check.

---

Chair Frazier presented ***AS 1687, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring Professor Yoshihiro Uchida for His 70 years of Service to San José State University (Final Reading).*** **The Senate voted and AS 1687 passed unanimously**

**V. Unfinished Business:** None

**VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action items (In rotation):**

**A. University Library Board (ULB): None**

**B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1675, Policy Recommendation: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA (Final Reading).*** Senator Schultz-Krohn presented an amendment that was friendly to add "the" on line 92 after "enrich." Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph under section II.B.1. The added sentence reads, "Individuals from outside San José State University may serve as Co-PI upon approval by the AVP for Research." The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed unanimously**. Senator Peter explained that portions of University Policy F69-12 are in conflict with AS 1675. Senator Peter made a motion to refer back to committee with instructions to incorporate University Policy F69-12 into this policy. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion failed (4-41-0). **Senator Stacks presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike line 304**. This is the last line of the fourth bullet under Section III.B., second paragraph that reads, "It should not be interpreted as a final agreement." ***The Senate voted and AS 1675 passed as amended (36-5-4).***

---

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1676, Policy Recommendation, Department or School Name Change (Final Reading).***

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 26 to add at the end of this sentence, "and a summary of the feedback from each academic unit consulted." **The Senate voted and AS 1676 was approved as amended unanimously.**

---

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1688, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F83-10, ELM Exam; Sanctions; Probation (First Reading)***

The O&G Committee has been sending many policies that need to be rescinded to the various policy committees for their review and this is one of those policies. EO 1110 discontinued offering entry level mathematics or (ELM) and what that did was render F83-10 inactive. C&R is asking the body to rescind that policy.

**Questions:**

Q: Is this policy recommendation consistent with the Sense of the Senate Resolution we passed that expressed sympathy with other campuses around EO 1110 and the top-down elimination of the way that we do things at SJSU? It may be that the Chancellor said that we have to do this, but I don't know that it is actually proper. Do you think it is proper? Do we just change our policy because they said so?

A: I'm not sure whether I can entertain whether or not I think that it's proper. I think that it would definitely be an advantage to have things at a local level and generate them at a local level, so in that aspect it would be not proper. However, the effect is that EO 1110 has discontinued ELM, so the existing policy on the books

that requires students to take the ELM in their first semester of enrollment is in conflict with EO 1110. The issue that you are bringing up is an entirely different issue to undertake about the proper direction. What we are faced with today is a policy that requires students to take a test for something in their first semester that no longer exists.

**C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):**

Senator Sullivan Green presented ***AS 1684, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S66-20, Control of Information Contained in Student Records (Final Reading).*** Senator Rodan made a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1684 a First Reading. The motion was seconded. ***The Senate voted and the Rodan motion passed with 5 abstentions***.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1685, Amendment A to S16-9, Section A, to include accessible syllabus template requirement, and Section B.1.e. to include expected hourly commitment for each unit of credit (Final Reading).*** Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to lines 37 and 38 to strike, "and use the appropriate syllabus template format provided by the University." The amendment was seconded. Senator Sen presented an amendment to the Shifflett amendment to change it to read, "and/or use the appropriate syllabus template format provided by the University to create their syllabus." The Sen amendment to the Shifflett amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Sen amendment failed. Senator Mathur called the question on the Shifflett amendment. The Senate voted and the Mathur motion passed with 4 Nays and No Abstentions. ***The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed with 7 Nays, and 1 Abstention***.

Senator Chin presented an amendment to add at the end of line 69, ", as an example, the expectation of work for a 3-unit course is 150 minutes of direct faculty instruction and 6 hours of out of class student work each week." The Chin amendment was seconded. Senator Lee presented an amendment to the Chin amendment to replace "credit" with "unit." The Lee amendment to the Chin amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Lee amendment to the Chin amendment passed with 8 Nays and 4 Abstentions. The Senate voted and the Chin/Lee Amendment failed. Senator Rodan presented an amendment to line 65 to strike, "with 1 of the hours used for lecture" and replace it with, "including time used for lecture." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Rodan Amendment failed with 4 Yea and 1 Abstention. Senator Ormsbee presented an amendment to strike "(with 1 of the hours used for lecture)." Senator Buzanski called the question. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed. ***The Senate voted and the Ormsbee Amendment passed with 5 Nays and 7 Abstentions***. Senator Buzanski called the question. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed. **The Senate voted on AS 1685 as amended and it passed with 1 Nay and No Abstentions**.

**D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):**

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1682, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S99-***

***8, Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom, Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee (First Reading).***

Professor Annette Nellen (former Senate Chair) asked that a reference be made to Sweezy v. New Hampshire, 354 U.S. 234 (1957) which says, "Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study, and to evaluate to gain new maturity and understanding otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die." This is one of the key court decisions to uphold academic freedom. We will be including this.

Currently we have a policy that includes both academic freedom and professional responsibility together including both the campus ethics code and statements on academic freedom. We also have one board that handles both academic freedom and professional responsibility issues. That board has not been effective over the last 25 years. It has had too divided of a mission. PS has been eager to make it more effective and focused. The strategy that PS decided to take is to separate academic freedom and professional responsibility. This is the first step in that process. The language on academic freedom that you see on the policy is unchanged from what was on the existing policy on academic freedom and that language is almost word-for-word from the classic AAUP statements on academic freedom and tenure. In 1993 we took the AAUP statements and slightly revised them to put SJSU into those paragraphs and then we put those paragraphs into the overall new policy.

The new sections are sections 2 and 3. They establish the Academic Freedom Committee as a Special Agency. The Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) is a large board and it has been nearly impossible to fill all the seats. It has typically only been half filled each year. PS thought having a smaller committee of experts would be much better. There are already rules in the bylaws for how special agencies are to be staffed. The role of this Academic Freedom Committee is mainly educational. Its role is to tell faculty and students about Academic Freedom, and to also work with the Center for Faculty Development to advise and orient new faculty on academic freedom issues.

Professor Nellen, who is a past chair of the Senate and also an attorney, has volunteered to be on the committee. PS is going to try an experiment by having one of the members of the board be an emeritus faculty member. In part PS chose this because it has been difficult to get members, but also because it would be so very beneficial to have a senior and experienced individual that know a great deal about academic freedom on the committee. PS also felt that the committee should have an administrator on it. In the future, PS will be bringing a similar policy on professional responsibility.

**Questions:**
**Q**: It strikes me that academic freedom should be very central to the Senate, and pushing it to a special agency seems to indicate a peripheral rather than central focus. Would the committee consider pushing some of the work from committees like C&R or PS that is more implementation-based to supporting committees and

instead leave the principal work of policy and policy statements to the central work of the Senate.
**A**: There is no provision in the draft for the Academic Freedom Committee to be drafting policy. That remains with PS. This is primarily an educational and advisory committee. PS could change that if you think it is advisable.
**Q**: It may be then just a different title is needed.
**A**: PS will discuss this.

**Q:** Once upon a time there was a chapter of the AAUP here. I know this because the charter said you could only be chair for two years and Senator Norton and Senator Buzanski took turns chairing this committee. One function this group had was when faculty members had some administrative difficulties with academic freedom or were being charged with certain irregularities in their teaching or what not, our local chapter of AAUP would come to their defense. Since you have also mentioned that organization here in your report might the Academic Freedom Committee consider recreating that group? In fact, the AAUP was abolished on this campus at the same time collective bargaining came into effect. At that point all the subsidiary organizations that were opposed to collective bargaining ceased to exist.
**A:** We tried to nod to the AAUP and we have occasionally invited various members of the AAUP to address the Senate, and it has always been very enlightening and helpful. It does seem to be the repository of documents about academic freedom, so we would encourage the Academic Freedom Committee to maintain a relationship with the AAUP.

**Q:** Instead of having just one student, would the committee consider having two students; an Undergraduate and a Graduate Student?
**A:** The committee will consider it.

**Q:** Can you talk about professional responsibility and the association with academic freedom and how we can strengthen that relationship in this document, or why it is being separated out? How will the faculty members be selected?
**A:** There is a deep and important relationship between academic freedom and professional responsibility. When Senator Peter first joined the Senate there was a separate Academic Freedom Committee and there was no professional responsibility document. PS crafted a professional responsibility document and attached them together to demonstrate symbolically the relationship between the two. The problem wasn't with that symbolic association. The problem was with that committee. There was not an effective group on campus to educate faculty about academic freedom on the one hand and the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility did not always have the power to really police or publicize professional responsibilities. PS put out some language linking the statement on academic freedom in section 2 to the policies on professional responsibility. PS wants to have the best of both worlds. They want to make sure people understand that tenure is a privilege that carries with it responsibilities, and that academic freedom is a privilege that carries with it some responsibilities. PS also wants to have effective committees that get their work done. With regard to the membership,

there is an agreed upon method for filling seats on special agencies. The nominees come to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee reviews the nominees and then they go to the Senate for approval.

**Q:** Once approved is it policy that applies to lecturers as well as permanent faculty? And, to what extent do we envision academic freedom for part-time faculty? Also, in line 77 there is a statement regarding academic freedom. Is this measurable or observable long term?
**A:** Absolutely, academic freedom is applicable to all faculty and students whether they are tenured or not. Tenure is a privilege that allows a faculty member perhaps to do a better job of defending it when standing up in an unpopular situation to outsiders when there is an attack on academic freedom. The AAUP was founded a little after the turn of the 20th century for their political views. Tenure was necessary to prevent that from occurring. Faculty need to have someone to watch out and alert us if academic freedom is attacked. I am not sure it is measurable in a quantitative way, but it is something that experts can recognize and look at precedent. You would have a level of expertise that would be available to advise people that currently may be lacking.

**Q:** Looking in the bylaws, the only thing I'm finding about the membership is that at-large faculty members will be nominated by the Committee on Committees. I don't see anything in particular about special agencies and in particular the special agencies. Would the committee consider spelling out the membership?
**A:** PS will scrutinize this and be more specific about the membership selection when the policy is brought back for a second reading.

**Q:** Would you take back to the committee, regarding line 101, that there might come a time when we run out of people with both expertise and interest in serving on the committee and instead have it say expertise, or interest?
**A:** PS will consider this.

Senator Buzanski presented a motion to suspend the rules and move the agenda to University Announcements. The Buzanski motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion failed (18-14-5) (Note: 2/3rds vote required)

---

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1683, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F81-7, "Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit" (GRIF) (First Reading).***
There is a category of faculty on campus called Grant-Related Instructional Faculty. There are only two such faculty at SJSU. This program goes back to 1981. When the argument was made that we ought to be able to pay certain faculty more than the collective bargaining agreement would allow provided that money came from non-general fund sources. However, the CSU policy that established this said that if you are going to partake in this you need a campus policy that allows this process. Our campus policy was passed in 1981. What we have done is try to provide an updated version. This amendment updates the policy and brings us into alignment with the

coded memorandum that the CSU issued that regulates this particular program. There were no questions.

**E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**
Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1680, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S90-13 (At Large Committee Appointments) (Final Reading).***
**The Senate voted and AS 1680 was approved unanimously.**

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1681, Policy Recommendation, Rescind F71-14: Acting Appointments: Vice Presidents or Deans (Final Reading).***
**The Senate voted and AS 1681 passed with No Nays and 1 Abstention.**

**VII. State of the University Reports:**

**A. Provost: N/A**
**B. Vice President for Administration and Finance: N/A**
**C. Vice President for Student Affairs: N/A**
**D. Chief Diversity Officer: N/A**
**E. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): Updates distributed electronically.**
**F. Statewide Academic Senators: N/A**
**G. AS President: N/A**

**VIII. Special Committee Reports:**

**Report on SOTES by Chair of the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB), Dr. Emily Slusser and Chair of the Professional Standards Committee, Senator Kenneth Peter, and Scott Heil, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics in accordance with SS-S05-6, Time Certain: 3:00 p.m.**

Dr. Slusser reported that there is a new data collection software for our SOTES and SOLATES that can be accessed in My SJSU, or you can access it via Canvas, where it will show up on the menu on the left-hand side. When you access it via Canvas you will see an ongoing report on the response rates. You can also click on the green button in the middle of the page that says view report. If you did that for any given class you would see a report of the mean or average responses to each of the questions as compared to the department (in yellow) and the entire university (in red), and also the percentile rank. Below that are open-ended responses. You will see all your strengths on one screen followed by a screen with all your weaknesses. If you click on the magnifying glass when looking at your open-ended responses, you will see a page with all of that student's responses. This helps you understand where that one student was coming from, and how that student could have impacted your scores. This is a new feature in this particular system.

Something that SERB is still working on with this system is that when you want to find the college norm, you have to access the report a little differently. In this case, you go to the little wheel on the right side of the screen and it gives you options. If you view all of your report, it will take you into the course evaluation system, and then it should have all your SOTES and SOLATES over the last few semesters. At that point when you

click to export it as a pdf, you would not only get the same information you got when you accessed it in Canvas, but you would also get additional information. First, you get the average course grade. Next, you get the average grade of the students who completed the survey as compared to the average grade of the students that didn't complete the survey. This is interesting information we did not have before. Then if you scroll down from there you get the college norms. The current state is that we can only compare the individual mean for any given class to the department and university norm. SERB is working on it. The college norms are at the end of the report.

Just a quick comparison of the report we were using before and what we have now. Students and faculty used to see the course evaluation in Peoplesoft, but now we have the Course Evaluation System. This new system is really not a lot different from the student perspective, except that the Course Evaluation System has a mobile app.

Comparing the responses from Fall 2016 to the current responses for last semester, SERB has found that the response rate is comparable. There was a 73.5% response rate in Fall 2016 with Peoplesoft, and there was a 76.8% response rate last semester with the Course Evaluation System. What SERB is seeing here is that there isn't a dramatic decrease in the response rate. The response rate last semester is also comparable to the paper response rate. The response rate with paper SOTES and SOLATES was about 73%. Student responses to the questions have not changed much as well, even though the questions have been changed a little. The mean to question 13 in Peoplesoft was 4.1, and the mean with the Course Evaluation System is 4.3. However, the questions are a little different. In the past, SERB asked students, "Overall, this instructor's teaching was?" and now SERB is asking how much students agree with this statement, "Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective." In general, SERB is seeing a notable increase of about .2 per question using the new format.

Things that are new with the Course Evaluation System include short answer reports all being clustered by question, and the magnifying glass that allows faculty to see what any individual student reported. SERB anticipated a very quick turnaround this semester. While the turnaround was quicker, it was not as quick as SERB would have liked. Ultimately, SERB will be able to turn it around just as soon as the grades are released. SERB is going to use dynamic instead of static norms. SERB wants to make sure they are comparing the responses to the current semester. For every report it will be the current semester they are reporting on before they use the static norms. In the future, SERB will have the ability to track the response rates as they come in. That is a really important point, because then faculty will be able to send out reminders if their response rate is really low. What SERB is interested in doing is exploring that functionality and ultimately talking about removing the grade hold we have been using to incentivize students. Instead, faculty would remind their students to turn their SOTES in based on their response rates. SERB will have the ability to create optional mid semester surveys, and optional questions for individual departments or colleges as well.

Things that SERB is working on down the horizon include cross tabulating the

responses by the grade earned in the class. That was on the previous report and we don't have that right now. Also, the visual representation of the department, college, and university norms as we used to see them. We used to have a pretty good visualization of all of them and now we just have the two norms (department and university). SERB would like to get the college norm back in there. We are used to the 20 to 80 percentile range, and right now we have the exact percentile by which any individual would fall. This is a more nuanced report, but faculty are used to the other format so SERB is going to see if they can make this more consistent. SERB is also hoping to integrate the reports with efaculty so the two systems can talk to each other and faculty don't have to be bothered with uploading individual SOTES. SERB will also be publishing a new interpretation guide with the new questions and software. The last time the interpretation guide was updated was 2011.

**Questions:**
**Q:** In the past, we tried not to report anything with a really low sample size. Here when we are looking at the GPA of non-respondents or the GPA by grade with many classes you are going to get into those very, very thin numbers.
**A:** The GPA is by grades we've done, so we are just trying to get back to where we were with that. With regard to the nonresponse rate, we can suppress the report entirely if it doesn't meet the minimum number of respondents. Part of the interpretation guide that is embedded in this report does instruct people to be careful if it is a low sample size.

**Q:** Is there an ability to separate the SOTE scores by gender to establish norms?
**A:** We are trying to include a lot of factors in providing the context, so I don't know of a way to reduce it down to the norm so that providing that comparison would be feasible, but SERB is going to demonstrate the literature there.

**Q:** I looked up course eval and you said it is an app?
**A:** It is not an app you download, but it is mobile friendly. When it realizes you are using a mobile device, it will adjust the screen.
**Q:** We had institutional records that in the past held the data related to course evals and now the course eval program is integrated with Canvas, is it related to Canvas Labs at all?
**A:** It is the parent company.
**Q:** I went to Canvas Labs and looked for a privacy policy and I couldn't find one, so my question is when it is integrated with Canvas will it have any protections from the data being used or matched for students and faculty online behaviors? I have concerns given the way big data and analytics are being used and are very valuable to third party companies.
**A:** Sure. First, the level of integration between the course evaluation system and Canvas is very minimal. The data never actually enters Canvas. Also, we signed a privacy agreement with the company and it meets the CSU terms for these type of agreements.

**Q:** Thank you for coming. When we do special sessions there are all kinds of odd

times they end in the semester. I haven't figured out a standard way to notify your office there should be a SOTE, so I'm wondering if there is anything proposed for that? In addition, policy says that all classes will have norms, and will you find a way to re-implement the norms?
**A:** The norms are still there. They are just presented in different ways. We will look for additional ways to show the norms. Where faculty fall within the spectrum is probably the biggest thing missing, but numerically you have all the data there. We are working on getting the spectrum back. As far as special sessions, you can talk to us about that. We worked with business on developing a system for them to notify us about their special session classes.

**Q:** Dept. Chairs have to do evaluations on lecturers and must look at SOTES that need to be within the university norm range. The way I was able to do it is to go to page 4 and then flip back and forth between page 1 and 4 to compare. This probably added about 1.5 minutes to each evaluation. Is there a way to make this more visual?
**A:** We will be looking for ways to change it. There are some special problems for lecturers that we have made available for chairs, but did not publicize it. We included a streamlined report that lets you isolate all the lecturers into one table and you see their scores in one place for a period of time. We will be looking at additional ways to handle lecturers. We realize they are a special population. If you have additional feedback let us know.

**Q:** Do you include all student responses in this, or do you have a way of excluding students that were officially enrolled but got an unofficial withdrawal?
**A:** That is a special problem. Policy tells us that we should to the extent possible try and remove any respondents who withdrew either officially or unofficially from a class. It has been our policy to do that. One thing we realized in the way we import the GPA to the class, there is only one chance to either show a grade and a respondent or not show a grade and a respondent. We have chosen to include the WUs, because it would distort the GPA measurement of the report. There is a fairly strong correlation between average grade in the class and the SOTE scores. We think that the importance of you seeing the relationship, if that is bringing down the class average grade, is more important than the effect of potential students that weren't hanging around long in the class, but decided to take the SOTE in the end anyway.

---

**Report on Board of General Studies (BOGS) Activity for 2016-2017 by the Chair of BOGS, Senator Simon Rodan, and the Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee, Senator Winifred Schultz-Krohn.**

Senator Rodan commented that it was an honor to serve as the Chair of BOGS. Over the last few years BOGS has begun to think of General Education (GE) as a program as opposed to a collection of 352 courses in the catalog. When you think about it, GE represents about 40% of all the time students spend in class. In addition, GE as a program has about 30,000 enrolled students. That makes it a significant undertaking. We did a survey as part of our self-study about two years ago. One thing that emerged

from that was the perception of GE across campus from both faculty and students as something that simply had to be gotten out of the way, or a number of boxes that had to be checked before students could get on with their major. That is a perception we need to change. We have been looking at a number of campuses throughout the CSU and the way they present GE. One of the most striking things is that when you can find GE listed for the campuses, it states that these are the requirements and not learning opportunities.

Senator Rodan came from the British education system which does not have any GE component, so he spent his entire UG degree in math and physics courses. What he has come to realize while at SJSU is how much richer his education would have been if he had the opportunity to take some of the courses he sees in our GE program. One of the first things we need to think about if we are going to change this perception on campus is reimagining the website. We've got to sell GE as something students want to do and not something they have to do. One of the things that came out of the external reviewer's report is that they were less than enthusiastic about our assessment protocol. BOGS is going to revisit what they are assessing and how that assessment is being done, and in particular ensure this is done collaboratively. BOGS is hoping to reach out to coordinators to reach out regarding assessment. In addition, Kathleen McConnell is working on GE Pathways and as those are being generated, they are going to be presented to both BOGS and C&R.

**Questions:**
**Q:** In the Self Study section of the report, one of the key issues was the governance structure and system of program oversight which was found lacking. What are the plans to address that?
**A:** I think that is under the structural changes.
**Q:** Okay, so what are the plans?
**A:** There aren't any, this is what BOGS hopes to accomplish. Senator Rodan is a big proponent of the Japanese process of going out and seeking a consensus development.

**C:** I am a course coordinator for lower GE and I'm interested in the view of GE you speak of. I have faculty that often don't want to teach GE, so lecturers are left to teach it. We need a real cultural change.

**Q:** I was wondering if you could share more about the GE Pathways and what that is would look like?
**A:** C&R has not had a presentation yet, so I'm not sure what it is going to look like. I was just contacted over the weekend that this will be coming soon.

**Q:** I would like to know what is meant by the comment that the assessment process is too granular? Also, has EO 1100 has impacted BOGS thinking?
**A:** Starting with the question about granular assessment, we really don't do any assessment at the program level. One of the things we are thinking about doing is reimagining assessment less to do with the area objective and leaving that much more to the internal process and course coordinator level and focusing assessment on the

program level objective. As for EO 1100, we approved a number of courses last fall to address the transition on qualitative reasoning portion where we were still using the non-credit bearing courses prior to entry. There has been a huge amount of controversy about the way EO 1110 and 1100 were rolled out, but that is a separate issue. We are in a much better position here at SJSU with stretch English. My understanding is that we will be ready by the Fall of this year on the quantitative/Math side.

**Q:** Did the GE Pathways come from a faculty referral?
**A:** This is something that came through Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) and that Kathleen McConnell is working on and has asked for consultation with the C&R Committee. C&R suggested that since it is GE Pathways it also needs to go through BOGS. This request just came over the weekend.

**Q:** When I chaired C&R last year, we had a presentation on GE Pathways and it is coming from an administrator and not faculty perspective. GE Pathways is not a new idea we've had versions of it in the past. There were many questions when this was brought up last year and we presented them. Maybe it would be helpful to tell the Senators where BOGS falls in the Senate reporting structure, because BOGS does not direct report to C&R.
**A:** BOGS is a standalone special agency and does not direct report to C&R. However, there is consultation between C&R and BOGS. In this particular case it just so happens that the Chair of BOGS, Senator Rodan, also sits on C&R so we have not only the consultation but also the regular communication between BOGS and C&R.

**C:** GE Pathways originated three or four years ago when we had three different groups in Academic Affairs dealing with strategic initiatives. There was a combined administrator and faculty team that was listed on the Provost website.

**C:** That is my recollection as well. I was a faculty member that sat in on some discussions.

**IX. New Business: None**

**X. Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.**