

Minute - m11-07-00

SFSU Academic Senate

Minutes of November 7, 2000

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Vaughn at 2:10 p.m.

Senate Members Present:

Aaron, Eunice; Alvarez, Alvin; Avila, Guadalupe; Bartscher, Patricia; Bernstein, Marian; Blomberg, Judith; Cancino, Herlinda; Cherny, Robert; Collier, James; Colvin, Caran; Concolino, Christopher; Consoli, Andres; Contreras, Rey; Cullers, Susan; de Vries, Brian; Duke, Jerry; Edwards, James; Ferretti, Charlotte; Garcia, Oswaldo; Garcia, Velia; Goldsmith, Helen; Gregory, Jan; Harnly, Caroline; Hu, Sung; Hubler, Barbara; Jerris, Scott; Johnson, Dane; Johnson, Sharon; La Belle, Thomas; Langbort, Carol; Loomis, Barbara; McKeon, Midori; Raggio, Marcia; Sayeed, Lutfus; Scoble, Don; Smith, Miriam; Strong, Rob; Turitz, Mitch; Vaughn, Pamela; Warren, Mary Anne; Warren, Penelope; Wong, Alfred; Yip, Yewmun.

Senate Members Absent: Flowers, Will;

Nichols, Amy(exc.); Shrivastava, Vinay(exc.); Chan, Jeffery; Boyle, Andrea(exc.); Elia, John(exc.); Gillotte, Helen (exc); Kelley, James(exc.); Corrigan, Robert(exc.); Sagisi, Jaymee; Pasaporte, Erin.

Guests: J. Combs, M. Verhey, G. Whitaker, B.

Blosser, R. Olesky, J. Kassiola, A. Hallum

Announcements and Report

- **Chair Vaughn** reached back into her commonplace

book for a passel of passages with a single message: Vote!

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting of November

7, 2000

The agenda was **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting of October

24, 2000

The minutes were **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #3 - Report from Vice President La Belle

Vice President La Belle brought the senate up to

date on the accountability process from the Chancellor's office, which began

with Cornerstones. He first addressed the information in the

"CSU Accountability Process" handout in the senate agenda,

first noting system accountability variables, then noting the first nine institutional

performance areas (page 4), which must be reported annually, and areas ten through

thirteen (page 5), which are reported periodically. He then discussed the 27

September 2000 memo from Richard Giardina, "CSU Accountability Report: Institutional

Comparisons," which is an attempt to see how well we did. La Belle summarized

the results as fine on all the indicators, except, perhaps, teacher credentialing.

The point is for us to set out campus goals.

La Belle then addressed the "CSU Accountability Process:

Setting Campus Goals" document, which states that campus presidents will propose

goals for the performance areas. La Belle offered the example of time-to-degree.

Our dilemma is to decide what our goals should be in each area, and he solicited

input from all. He mentioned remediation and retention as goals.

La Belle provided background on performance area eleven,

"Faculty Scholarship and Creative Achievement." This requires a report on what

the campus is doing to support faculty scholarship and creative achievement, like mini-grants. It might include forms of extramural support. The third element is how to report faculty achievement. CSU-Long Beach is doing it through the Senate with a survey aggregated to department level. There are other models, too, and we can expect a numerical report from the Chancellor's office on each campus. La Belle invited consultation on how best to do respond to this indicator.

Chair Vaughn mentioned that we have this on the agenda

for later discussion today as well as at the next senate meeting

Agenda Item #4 - Report from Vice President Collier

Vice President Collier reported on the recent accomplishments of the Office of University Advancement. Collier first offered a brief history of university advancement at San Francisco State University, which goes back to just 1996. The office has been developing a broad-based program in advancement: alumni relations, development, public affairs, government relations, community relations, special events, and other activities like overseeing the University Foundation. The advancement mission is to foster greater understanding of and support of the institution.

Collier then went into a more detailed discussion of advancement activities, focusing on development. There has been significant growth in this area in recent years with components such as major gifts, corporate relations, planned or estate giving, and the annual fund. Collier praised the work of Carol Hayashino, applauded the first million dollar endowed chair, and noted an award given to the development office, summarizing the trend as one of consistent upward growth. There has been increased participation among alumni, friends, and faculty/staff in the annual fund, significant major gifts, and a significant increase in the university endowment from \$6.3 million when he arrived to \$20.6 million.

Collier concluded by turning our attention to the handouts, which included highlights of recent major gifts and charts on giving. He ended by thanking all for their support.

Agenda Item #5 - Proposed Revisions to A.S. Policy #F87-32

Graduate Student Award for Distinguished Achievement

Academic Policies Committee (APC) Chair Sung Hu introduced

this consent item from APC who noted two changes from the version that was discussed two weeks ago: 1) 4th paragraph, c item is slightly modified with summer graduates eligible either for this or following calendar year; 2) 5th paragraph: the composition of the college-wide committee is more specific than before.

Caroline Harnly asked about the 7% who graduated, wondering if this was undergraduate or graduate. Hu said that it refers to graduates only.

M/S/P (Edwards, Duke) to second reading.

Robert Cherny suggested the following series of friendly amendments, which were accepted by Hu on behalf of APC and **Betsy Blosser** on behalf of the Graduate Council: 1) first full paragraph, substitute "that" for "which"; 2) second paragraph, last line, substitute "received graduate degrees" for "graduated"; 3) third paragraph, first sentence, delete "at the time the students are" and insert "to be"; after the comma delete "it must be assumed that they" and substitute "shall" in order to read "to be selected the students shall have already distinguished themselves . . . "; 4) third paragraph, second line, delete "in keeping with" and substitute "as specified in," and then reverse order of "criteria" and "established"; 5) third paragraph, second sentence, following "a)," insert "the candidate has" before "a minimum grade point average"; 6) final paragraph, delete "given"; delete "nominate" and substitute "forward nominations of"; at the end of the next line following "each" insert "of the

colleges"; in the next line, after "unit," delete "in the college" and substitute "that offers a graduate program." That sentence will read as follows: "Faculty from the various graduate programs in a college will forward nominations of candidates for the award to a college-wide faculty committee consisting of one representative from each of the college's department/school or equivalent unit that offers a graduate program."

M/S/P (Edwards, Smith) to close debate.

The vote was taken and the policy was **approved**.

Agenda Item #6 - Proposed Revisions to

A.S. Policy #S87-149 Policy for Articulation of Upper-Division and Lower-Division Courses

Sung Hu introduced this APC consent item who noted the rewriting of the policy in legislative language, the similarity in substance with what was before the senate two weeks ago, and the fact that only item 1.c is new.

Jan Gregory suggested deleting the use of the word "enough" in section C as a friendly amendment. Hu accepted that as a friendly amendment on behalf of APC.

Robert Cherny commented that this would mean removing "enough" from line six of the rationale, a suggestion that was also accepted.

M/S/P (Gregory, M.A. Warren) to second reading.

Mary Ann Warren complimented APC for their revision, finding this version considerably clearer.

M/S/P (Bernstein, Hu) to close debate.

The vote was taken and the policy was **approved unanimously**.

Agenda Item #7 - Proposed Certificate Program in Meteorology for Broadcasters

Alfred Wong, Chair of the Curriculum Review and Approval

Committee (CRAC), introduced this CRAC consent item, which provides certification that students interested in making weathercasting a career have completed the academic courses mandated by the American Meteorological Society (AMS).

M/S/P (Duke, M.A. Warren) to second reading.

Miriam Smith asked about the number of potential students. **Oswaldo Garc a** commented upon the intent of the program, summarized the set of courses--a meteorology boot camp--and replied that there have been eight to ten students in the past but they are hoping that the official certificate might lead to increased enrollment.

M/S/P (Duke, M.A. Warren) to close debate.

The vote was taken and the certificate program was **approved** unanimously.

Agenda Item #8 - Proposed Resolution on Core Items for

a University-Wide Assessment of Student Opinions on Teaching Effectiveness

M/S/P (P. Warren, McKinney-Aaron) to approve this resolution.

Penelope Warren, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee

(FAC), introduced this FAC consent item, alluding first to the written introduction in the agenda and reiterating that this is a resolution that outlines a process by which a core of items might become part of the university's approach to gathering and using student opinions of teaching effectiveness. She pointed out that the agenda provides the latest proposed set of items, including revised instructions. This document has been informed by the 1994 senate task force report. The resolution allows for the possibility of further revisions with additional input and item-testing. The resolution is concerned with the process by which any proposed university-wide core might come into use. She added a correction in the rationale section: please strike the word "the office of" and "planning and", so that the third line reads:

"interim coordinator of academic assessment."

M/S/P (Edwards, Duke) to second reading.

Midori McKeon raised a concern about the core questions, suggesting two items that are in the college evaluation form but not in this one: 1) instructor's expertise or knowledge of the subject matter; 2) instructor's enthusiasm. Warren reiterated that FAC is not endorsing this particular set of core items; the process that they have outlined will include the reception of just this sort of feedback. **Vaughn** clarified that we are not setting these particular questions as the university-wide teaching effectiveness instrument; we are setting a process whereby other or new questions might form the basis for such a form. **Marilyn Verhey** acknowledged that she would receive comments from faculty. Vaughn commented that it would be important in the testing process to compare these questions against what colleges are using.

Robert Cherny shares the concerns of those particular items but went on to ask about the fourth resolve clause, wondering about the committee's sense of the sequence of events, which he believe would be done before being used. Warren said that that is her understanding. **Mitch Turitz** echoed the assent and added that the committee would not be saying how the testing should be done.

Andres Consoli raised a concern about the lack of a timeline. He also commented that the keys to the scale should be 1-5 rather than a-e.

Christopher Concolino wanted to clarify that we are not voting on the form that is here. Vaughn assured him this was indeed the case.

M/S/P (duke, M.A. Warren) to close debate.

The vote was taken and the resolution was **approved unanimously**.

Agenda Item #9 - Accountability Indicator #11

Provost La Belle reintroduced this item referring to his earlier, broader report. The indicator on faculty productivity, specifically honors, awards, publications, and creative activity, has to be reported next spring and the question is how does the SFSU faculty want to be represented in this report. **Vaughn** pointed senators to p. 9, #11 of the CSU Accountability Process document, "Faculty scholarship and creative achievement." She also pointed to the executive committee's original response, bringing up as well a couple of examples from other campuses. This is an opportunity for raising questions and making suggestions about the nature of the campus's response.

Gregory recalled and lamented the Provost's allusion to comparative data: the Chancellor swears there should be no comparative data; the Provost says it should not have happened but it did. Speaking specifically of item #11, Gregory called attention to the structuring of the items: the indicators are "campus support" and "outcomes of campus support," which is not necessarily every laundry list or jotted down paragraph. This does seem to refer very specifically to campus funding for specific kinds of faculty scholarship and creative achievement, and we should keep our focus there.

Cherny first recalled the recently unanimously passed statewide senate resolution on the accountability process: "resolved that the academic senate CSU urge the Chancellor to ensure that campus senates are involved actively in the process of forming and setting goals and preparing and submitting reports as part of the CSU accountability process; and be it further resolved that the academic senate CSU urge the Chancellor to ensure that the accountability report of each campus be signed by the academic senate chair on behalf of the campus senate or to accept a separate report from the campus senate; and be it further resolved that the academic senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the

Board of Trustees to ensure, in keeping with cornerstones Principle 10, that the process not be used to compare individual campuses or to compare similar programs among CSU campuses." The Chancellor responded that the only comparison that interested him was in individual campuses over time, which also alerts us to a larger process: not just reporting but also goal-setting. Cherny suggested that the document on setting goals sounds like the president does it all by himself.

On item #11, Cherny shares Gregory's concerns completely, and added the additional context of the promise of funding in Title V for research and creative work as appropriate to the mission. The change in Title V has never really been funded, and the large share of research and creative activity takes place without direct support. Cherny strongly urged that there be a direct relationship shown between the campus support provided and the research and creative activity that results from it.

Turitz noted that though the FAR is required by the collective bargaining agreement, there is no requirement for faculty to fill out this accountability process. Gregory commented upon the "setting campus goals" document, especially the notion of "continuous improvement," which seems a bit foolish. She added that the values embedded in such language are things about which we must think.

Helen Goldsmith suggested that part of the problem is the label for #11. What is should be called is "support for faculty scholarship and creative achievement"

La Belle picked up from several comments, first addressing comparability. When campuses first went into this, each really thought that they were going into it on their own, but when those lengthy reports were boiled down to two pages and provided to the trustees in matrix form, comparability

was inherent. No one consulted with anyone with what those were going to look like. We are down to a data-driven, truncated process. As to #11 specifically, this campus is in good shape to report the kinds of opportunities available to faculty, the amount and kind of funding, the number of applications, awards, etc. When you try to put output with that it becomes very confounded. It is very difficult to disentangle what the actual source and its relationship to outcome might be.

Gregory raised a process question with two questions:

who is "us" in "setting campus goals" in the second sentence? Her next point was that she no longer understands "consultation" since she believes that it means more than informing faculty. Putting it more directly, she asked what is the calendrical difficulty that makes it so hard to bring matters to faculty at the point when consultation might be productive.

Brian de Vries raised a question of how CSU-support is defined, wondering especially about the ".2" that is not teaching responsibility, or support things that are in addition. La Belle agreed that this is a muddy slope. He noted changes over time of how research has been funded from the Chancellor's office, using sabbaticals as an example, where the Chancellor's office has no idea what the campus is doing with sabbaticals. The Chancellor's office role in this category is unclear.

Consoli commented upon La Belle's comment, commenting that that would make the report a moot point since there is nothing to account for.

Cherny remarked that time is one of the most important things for this sort of activity, and one of the things that CSU needs to aim at is a definition of appropriate teaching load being 9-units rather than 12. We would like to see that standardized and funded, and we don't want to undermine this

goal by suggesting that there is already an appropriate level of support. One way is to go to the legislature and say that they have committed themselves to do this in code, and they now need to fund it. There is a lot of work that goes on for which there is absolutely minimal campus support if any at all.

Vaughn commented on the "CSU Accountability Process, Setting Campus Goals" document that this just came to the president. Given short turnaround, she requested that the executive committee review anything forthcoming from the president's office. She also requested that the presidential and provost groups use whatever opportunities they have to educate the Chancellor, Trustees and the Legislature on what exactly the world of the CSU is like, and if that means someone other than senates saying "no" on occasion, maybe that should happen. For senators here, Vaughn charged them to go back to their constituents and focus their attention on indicator #11, present the framework of that, make sure that constituents know what the initial response of the executive committee was, which was to limit the report to existing support and direct outcomes, and be prepared to provide further input and information at the next senate meeting.

The Senate was adjourned at 3:40.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane Johnson

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive):

Tuesday, November 7, 2000
