

Executive Committee Minutes
February 4, 2013

Present: VonTill, Junn, Ng, McClory, Du, Dukes, Nance, Peter, Bros-Seemann

Absent: Qayoumi, Lessow-Hurley, Bibb, Worsnup, Heiden, Kimbarow

Guest: Jaehne (AVP UG Studies), Van Selst (CSU Statewide
Senator representing Lessow-Hurley), Poole (COS)

1. The minutes of January 28, 2013 were approved.

2. The Consent Calendar was approved.

3. 120 Unit major requirements presentation by AVP Jaehne:

By Fall 2013, majors with 121-129 units will be brought down to 120 units. Many of the programs that are above 120 units are requesting modifications to their program and brought to the Board of General Studies (BOGS). Most majors asking for modification are asking for a modification in the A3 general education (GE) area. The Executive Committee was asked to approve waivers in A3 and PE.

Committee members asked why certain modifications were asked for in A3 or PE, and what guarantee there was that student learning objectives would be met within the major by those majors granted waivers. The Senate would need to specify the kind of accountability it wants.

A member suggested that the Senate could establish a specific (General Education Advisory Panel) GEAP for Area A3. The question is should it be ad-hoc or permanent? Some programs already have an A3 waiver, but there should be an assessment piece associated with these waivers.

A member suggested forming a critical thinking GEAP comprised of faculty. GEAP would review programs that request waivers, review proposals for the waiver to see whether they integrated critical thinking objectives into the major, and make a recommendation to BOGS or the Senate. A member suggested having a compressed timeline (short term) that has involvement of affected departments and an ad-hoc committee to discuss the GE waiver.

These are GE modifications, not waivers. We are granting modifications, because we are doing it in a different way. GE modifications are already made in several of the 120+ majors.

The long-term fix would be to make a policy change via the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) in addition to using a GEAP. There was discussion about the need to have a committee that works in concert with BOGS. A member stated "heavy lifting"

experts need to give feedback to C&R. A suggestion was also made to have consultation from the experts in the field.

The committee discussed the fact that there are strong disciplinary attitudes about critical thinking. There may not be unanimous consensus on what constitutes critical thinking.

A member suggested having a GEAP-like committee, or having an Advisory Panel on Critical Thinking.

A suggestion was discussed that involved a proposal that C&R appoint panels to advise them on requests for alternative pathways in the programs in response to the 120 maximum unit pressures (for meeting GE requirements), and other campus requirement issues.

The Executive Committee agreed to bring a motion to the Senate floor regarding the creation of advisory panels regarding modifications, or alternative pathways for majors who need adjustments to GE because of the 120-unit major requirements.

4. Updates from policy committees:

- a. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R): The major issue is how to maintain academic integrity in the face of change. C&R will bring a policy resolution on University Learning Goals (ULGs) to the February 11, 2013 Senate meeting.

Possible revision of proposed GE guidelines; GE issues will impact community colleges. The best place for change or revision is in upper division GE (SJSU Studies). One possible direction is for departments to propose different pathways to meet GE requirements.

5. Update from University Advancement: The University has reached 94% of goal in the Acceleration Campaign as of Dec. 31. 2012. In Campaign 2, University Advancement is looking for endowments and less planned giving.
6. Proposed Veterans Center in the Student Union: A petition has been circulating requesting the establishment of a Veteran's Center in the new Student Union Building. There is a Veterans Student organization and a Veterans Administration (VA) funded Veterans facility in Clark Hall. Should a consolidated Vet Center be in the Student Union or somewhere else? In a lot of campuses, Vet Centers tend to not be in Student Union buildings. They tend to be located in less-high visibility spots, and the Student Union may not be the most appropriate and friendly facility for veterans. The idea behind having a vet center is to have a presence in the Student Union building. There is a Veterans Advisory Committee, but the committee is split about where is the ideal place to have the Vet Center is.

A member asked if there had been a survey for our current student vets on campus? No—maybe we should poll the students. There's a Vet coordinator in student services.

Update from the President by the Provost: We have a distance learning policy S01-10 that needs to be updated. There are two departments interested in distance learning and wanting to do classes online (Psych 1), and possibly a Human Genetics course in Biology (23 and Me). The committee discussed the need to make sure that departments have a process for deciding who can teach the courses.

Update from the President by the VP of Student Affairs: The President is going to be reformulating and reconstituting the Campus Climate Advisory Committee. This reformulation will result in a Diversity Commission comprised of VP Bill Nance, Provost Ellen Junn, 5 faculty members, 4 staff members, administrators, and students. The committee discussed forming this new commission with the Unity Committee Chairs (Chicano/Latino Faculty Staff Association, African American Faculty Staff Association, and Asian/Pacific Islander Faculty Staff Association).

These minutes were prepared and submitted by AVC Wendy Ng on February 4, 2013. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 4, 2013.