Senate Minutes of February 5, 2002

Chair Vaughn called

the Academic Senate to order at 2:10 p.m.

**Senate Members Present:**

Aaron, Eunice
Alvarez, Alvin
Avila, Guadalupe
Bartscher, Patricia
Bishop, Anna
Blomberg, Judith
Boyle, Andrea
Cherry, Robert
Collier, James
Colvin, Caran
Concolino, Christopher
Consoli, Andres
Corrigan, Robert A.
Daniels, Robert
La Belle, Thomas
Langbort, Carol
Levine, Josh
Luft, Sandra
McKeon, Midori
Moallem, Minoo
Newt-Scott, Ronda
Nichols, Amy
OÄ±ate, Abdiel
Pong, Wen Shen
Raggio, Marcia
Sayeed, Lutfus
Shrivastava, Vinay
Smith, Miriam
Steier, Saul
Strong, Rob
Terrell, Dawn
Turitz, Mitch
Vaughn, Pamela
Warren, Mary
Anne
Warren, Penelope
Wolfe, Bruce
Yip, Yewmun
Senate Members Absent: Su, Yuli (exc); Friedman, Marv (abs); AdisaThomas, Karima (abs); Garcia, Velia (exc); Ganji, Vijay (exc); Gillotte, Helen (abs); Scoble, Don (exc)


Announcements
Senate Chair Pamela Vaughn that the senate is in the process of being fully electronic by 2002. The goals are to have hard copies in the library and senate office. Right now only senators will receive hard copies of senate agendas and support materials. All interested parties can get the same information form the senate web site. Chair Vaughn thanked senators Turitz, Aaron, Gregory and Cherny for organizing the fine memorial in honor of Tim Sampson?s life. Chair Vaughn also welcomed the return of Senator Wen Shen Pong from his fall semester leave. Mitch Turitz, CFA president, announced that CFA was organizing a demonstration for Saturday, 12-3, San Francisco, Marriott Hotel and a strike/work action planning meeting for Tuesday 11:30-1 and 1-3 at the University Club. CFA will also hold two lobby days in Sacramento on February 26 and 27. Jan Gregory announced
that the University Foundation is now accepting donations for the newly created
Tim Sampson scholarship fund. Information about the
Tim Sampson Scholarship fund will be sent out to all on the senate list serve.

Chair’s Report

Yesterday afternoon

we were here in this room to celebrate the life and work of Tim Sampson. Tim’s
was the fist public and very loud voice that I heard when I came to this campus
in 1993. I can still remember time spent with Tim, marching, singing, and
chanting or just listening to him on the new plans for wrongs to be righted.
As we enter the new rounds of campus strategic planning and face certain budget
short falls, I would like us all to remember that the university is not FTEF
and FTES, not policies and regulations nor programs and units, and staffing
assignments, but PEOPLE! Tim always reminded us of our own humanity and our
connection with the rest of humanity. So let us all promise to put a face
and to keep a face, a very human face, on all that we do as a university.
Thanks Tim for showing us the way.

M/S/P (Smith, Shrivastava)
to approve the agenda

Agenda Item #2: Approval of Minutes for Meeting of December 4, 2001

M/S/P (Steier, Duke)
to approve the minutes as amended.

Agenda Item #3: Report from Vice President La Belle

Vice President La

Belle presented information on the campus efforts to improve our relationships
with community colleges. Recently, the CSU has paid more attention to the
role of community colleges; remediation for example. Presently the CSU pulls
60 to 70% of its students from the community colleges. Under a new memorandum of understanding certain things were stressed. Of course articulation, undergraduate/graduate or rather lower division, teacher education and early preparation in the curricula that would articulate with the CSU for teacher education programs. Improving access. One important focus of our efforts is to increase access for community college students to the state CSU system by 5% each year. Remediation was mentioned, dual admissions programs and so on. SFSU started in 1996 having joint meeting with administrators and faculty from our principles feeder community colleges. CCSF alone is bringing us approximately half of our freshman as transfer students. Meeting again this past weeks working on a new four CSU (as in 4CSU) the new agreement focused more in cross enrollment, more advising for transfer, honors programs available for both places, email and website accounts at CSU, library for those same students (transfer students). Working toward early identification of those students who would come. Last Friday all Deans and other administrators met together with their counter parts. There were 35 individuals at CCSF and SFSU. Basically held the meeting to move the agreement along and increase the interaction between the similar colleges to increase the interaction between the colleges. Over the next six to eight months we will hold similar meetings. The next one will be March 15, 2002 with the three San Mateo colleges, De Anza and Foothill and then two more meetings in the fall. We have the same goal for all the meetings; representatives from both of the colleges at the table to try and move the agenda along between the two institutions. We are reaching out understanding that we are partners in education.

Jan Gregory asked if we have checked out the implications for the library with CCSF using it.

La Belle,
yes we have looked at that and Debbie Masters is at the table. We now have and honors program where we allow the CCSF honor students to use the library. We will be watching this and see what we are going through especially over the next several years in the renovation of our library. What we want to do is to take the CCSF students in child development and teacher education student, who will be moving to SFSU, giving them email, web sites, library access as cohorts with limited and for certain purposes and certain students.

Vinay Shrivastava asks if there were any discussion about remedial courses.

La Belle, when we drop a student from SFSU we often recommend that they return to Community College to take remedial course work. We also follow up and monitor those students and we encourage them to come back. We have a long ways to go before we are really partners in this but we are trying to change the climate to reaching out rather than choosing up sides. We are working with the community colleges to make sure the same kind of curricular standards are met there as are met at SFSU. Work together and have a long ways to go, but we are trying.

Bruce Wolfe mentioned being a CCSF transfer student to SFSU that he would hope for a more friendlier connection and that his was a very difficult and trying time for him and asked if there were any student representatives in the group and if not are you willing to have a compliment of students from both campuses to be involved in this process.

La Belle, Of course.

Agenda Item #4: Report from State Wide Senators

Robert Cherny announced that all faculty would be receiving ballots on changes in the statewide constitution that will adjust appropriation; further, that faculty salary
compensation in the governor budget is 1%, and there will be a revision in the budget numbers in May. The Governor is not considering a student fee increase. This will mean that the CSU budget will be cut. Cherny announced that the statewide academic was hearing, in first reading, a resolution that specifies that first year language courses other than English may not be used to meet the CSU first year English requirement. The California Legislator has a joint committee working on a master plan in education involving first grade through high school. The joint committee is trying to produce a final report this year. Statewide academic senate has sent representatives to each of their meetings. Eunice Aaron announced that CSU alumni would be visiting the state legislature February 20th. Jan Gregory announced that the statewide academic senate faculty affair committee has passed a resolution that encourages campuses to develop open policies for faculty evaluation.

Pamela Vaughn reminded all senators to remind their constituents that we will again be voting on the SFSU academic senate constitution changes. We failed to get a quorum last fall and will try again this semester. Additionally, on the resolution for first year language requirements, she recommends that the statewide academic senate consult with CSU foreign language faculty before pressing for a change in first year GE English requirements. Chair Pamela Vaughn welcomed Dan Butltaire as the new Dean of Undergraduate Students.

Bruce Wolfe, in regards to foreign language classes, does the SFSU senate make for our representatives to take forward to the statewide academic senate? Vaughn, since this is the first time this has been mentioned it may very well be something that we will take up as a body - we will talk.

**Agenda Item #5: Proposed Revisions to the Bachelor of Science in Business: Multiple Concentrations**

Amy
Nichols,

Chair of the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee made the following presentation:
The College of Business is proposing 3 changes in its existing undergraduate curricular program with the goal of reducing the current unit requirement for graduation from 126 to 120 units. The change is in response to pressure from within the College (especially among students who cannot graduate within four years despite best efforts and performance), from the academic administration, and form the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB).
The Changes are: Removal of BICS 263, Introduction to Computer Information Systems, from the core course requirements for all business majors. The course will remain in the College of Business’s (CoB) curriculum, but will no longer be a required course in the business core. Change the unit requirements for all undergraduate concentrations in the College of Business from a fixed level of 24 units (8 upper division courses) to variable units. The default level will be set to 21 units (7 upper division courses), but concentrations may require more units (i.e., for professional certification needs), or fewer units (to encourage taking elective courses). The approval of the Dean will be required for variations from the default level. The College of Business provided each senator with a 17 page “Summary of Proposed Change of Requirements for Existing College of Business Undergraduate Curricular Program.” A copy of the summary is also made available electronically on the senate’s web site.
The College of Business Interim Dean Gerald Platt and the Associate Dean were present to answer any questions.

Lutfus

Sayeed, a senator representing the College of Business pointed to four issues. First, it appears from the proposal that all the curricula decisions will be moved
from faculty committee to the dean rather than sharing the curricula issue between the dean and the faculty committee. Second, the proposal may set aside BICS 263 as a core requirement; however, it is still a requirement as a prerequisite for other courses. The proposal indicates that student who require the basic competencies of BICS 263 will be required to take an exam or if they fail the exam BICS 263. Those of us who teach BICS 263 believe that a basic competencies test would not replace BICS 263. It is not clear from the proposal who is going to administer the test or where the resources are going to come from.

Third, the overall theme of the proposal is to conform the degree programs to 120 units, as if this is a requirement by law, when in fact it was only a suggestion for a minimum. Fourth, the document is very long and I would like to have time to bring this document to my constituencies in the College of Business and to bring their comments to the senate floor. Interim Dean Gerald Platt provided the senators with background information on the process of this particular proposed curricula change. He stressed that undergraduate business degree are more liberal oriented and that it is recommended by their accreditation body that business related courses not exceed 50% of course work. The present College of Business degrees reflect 69 units. Susan Higgins recommend that curricula streamlining is a good thing and something we all should consider. She had concerns that the recommendations of 120 units were not meant to be an outright mandate for all programs. Additionally, that not all students are computer literate and likely may need the computer skills offered in BICS 263. Interim Dean Gerald Platt emphasized that the downsizing of the curriculum to 120 units was in response to both a memorandum from the Chancellor?s office that recommend 120 units and after analysis of business school in the US. We looked at our programs regarding computer literacy. In the college of business every student is required to take two courses in
computer literacy. We have found that more of our students come to us with preparation that is beyond BICS 263 now. Things have changed and these students can move right into 363. BICS 263 will remain for those students without the necessary computer skills. Bruce Wolfe asked if any students were consulted or were members of the committee? Interim Dean Gerald Platt. There was no student consultation directly. We did a survey of students to ask them about changes in the curriculum. There was no student representation on the committee. Robert Daniels, the issue has been very divisive within the College of Business because faculty governance of the curriculum has been tangled up with that 120-unit issue. Indicated that when a memorandum was circulated from the College of Business concerning the SFSU Senate?s resolution on the 120 units as a minimum that the CoB memorandum changed the meaning of the resolution to reflect that the SFSU Senate?s resolution had lowered the bachelor degree requirement to 120 units. A faculty committee came up with a proposal to examine two core courses to in the college of business. The former dean of the College of Business decided that one course would be eliminated; one tested out, and that all minors were to be reduced by one course. At this point the college faculty voted in a referendum with five issues for downsizing with no alternative. The referendum was approved 36 to 32 out of 110 voting faculty. I believe there is a problem with process here and we should have time to address it. Fears that this may become a precedent were the 120 units would be treated as a requirement rather than a recommended minimum. Jan Gregory interested about what Senator Daniels has indicated and wants to know if there was open consultation between the administration and the faculty of the College of Business? Interim Dean Gerald Platt, the college held two open meeting that were announced to all faculty with the purpose of allowing faculty to discuss any issue they wanted to discuss.
Out of that meeting we revised the final ballot that went to faculty. Robert Nickerson, Professor Business Analysis and Computing Science, requested that the senate send back this proposal for curricula change to the College of Business for further study. He based his recommendation on the belief that the college faculty never discussed or debated the reduction to 120 or to keep it at 126. It was given by the former dean to reduce but not faculty debate or a faculty vote to proceed in that direction. Faculty was allowed to vote on implementation issues for a reduction. The faculty was not presented with the options for not reducing it at all. The faculty was not given the opportunity to express their dissatisfaction with the units. Faculty was given the opportunity to vote only on implementation. He believes that 95% of those taking the exam to get out of taking BICS 263 will fail the exam and will then have to take BICS 263. So there will be no unit savings as indicated in the proposal. He believes that this proposal will weaken the college’s programs and that senate should send it back to the College of Business for further review and study. Chair Pamela Vaughn, we have reached our time certain, the proposal will remain in first reading. This is an opportunity for the College of Business to use the two weeks between now and our next senate meeting to clarify to its faculty that the 120 is only a recommendation minimum and not a mandated minimum.

**Agenda Item #6: Discussion: Shared Governance**

Dawn Terrell, Chair of the Shared Governance

Task Force and members of her committee conducted a discussion of shared governance issue. The task force was created last year by the senate to look at shared governance issues. Terrell began the discussion by outlining the changes of the committee and summarizing the concerns and consideration that the committee had addressed during the fall semester. Dawn Terrell indicated that
the committee focused its concerns regarding shared governance on two broad areas. First, concerns on implementation of policy and follow through on policy. Second, followed up on the statewide senate’s task force report on shared governance. The task force wanted to see if any of the statewide concerns were also issues at SFSU. The task force met for a semester and identified a couple of important issues. First, how do people understand shared governance on this campus? Second, how are policies interpreted and how is shared governance articulated? We found that it is not always implementation of policy but how policy is interpreted and consultation about. We saw that these issues were related to a few areas. The areas of retention, tenure, and promotions seem to generate a lot of questions and concerns. Not implementation of policy but interpretation, consultation, and communication among constituencies. We identified the area of allocation of resources with limited budgeting as also a problem. What, if any, role does shared governance have to do with budget cuts. Our purpose today is to hear from you about what shared governance means to you. **Mitch Turitz** gave the example of the problem with FMI and FAR reported requirements with limited consultation in relations to working without a contract. A second example was the issue of the administration implementation of a university FMI and FAR calendar due date that was not the same as the other CSU campus. **Bruce Wolfe** asked if shared governance was specific to academic areas or the entire campus. Would like to see a web site that lists all the campus committees and their membership. **Abdiel Onate**, it is an excellent opportunity to ponder how we are governed and how we administered. What is the meaning of shared governance. It is connected to democratic principles of consultation, confrontation and cooperation. We should not forget that we are a public institution where the cooperation of all the constituents will make it efficient. These three constituencies are administration, teachers,
and students. This forms the community, the institution. All have specific roles and responsibilities to play in the governance of the university. What are the roles, the fields, the areas and the prerogatives specific to these constituencies and how do they interact when it comes to a head of the two issues you just mentioned, specifically the interpretation of policy on hiring, retention, and promotion and on the allocation of money. What projects are going to be funded, what sabbatical are going to be approved, where are the resources going to go to achieve the mission of the university. It seems to me it has to be very clear between the administration and the faculty what are the areas, what are the fields of competence in which each will have the final decision or influence the final decision. Certainly academic questions, peer review, are the essence of the democratic institution would be functioning on. The problem is when is it that the administration, the deans, the provost, the president change the decision of the department. They change the priorities, or the ranking of candidate’s work, or the priority of ranking projects of candidates work. I think those are the questions that are crucial to clarify and discuss here. What are the grounds, under what conditions, can changes to department decision be legitimate. What are the grounds by which the administration would have the expertise to decide on the quality of projects, on the allocation of funds for projects that are academically significant, artistically significant or scientifically significant. It seems to me that the role of the administration essentially is one of stewardship of making sure that the academic processes are properly followed and follow the policy of the university. But the decisions themselves pertaining to academic questions that have to do with money, and there is a limited amount. Only certain projects will be funded only certain hiring’s will be made; only certain promotions will take place. I think that one of the points here then is, it is very easy to come to an understanding
as to how it is that administrators oversee, supervise, insure the integrity of the process by which academic and economic decisions are made. Rather than make the decision themselves. There is a big difference there and I think the senate and the faculty and the administration have to ponder about this. That is how I understand shared governance. This ability to come together, to talk, to come to interpretation, and then to actions to preserve the integrity of the process that we ourselves have given to the institution is the essence of shared governance. **Rick Houlberg:** I think it is a valuable discussion of - in relation to this issue - as my colleague just mentioned. However, we are dealing with many of these issues based on what kind of support we got and how that comes down. Specifically, for example the cuts which will happen to next summer’s teaching - which are now being mandated and when it was brought to our department that we were going to have to cut by X percentage our budget and what we could offer. When the Dean was asked how do we do that - don’t let you high level tenure track faculty teach. Go out and hire lecturers. That is where we were pointed. Our department chair has worked another way around that and -the ones who are going to end up getting lost and losing in this whole process - yet once again - are the students. Because the way we get around it is to up the students that we have in any one of the individual classes. The cynicism around the governor political action of not changing the fees - obliviously chancellor Reed’s disinterest in our interest, a lot of that is driven by things that we don’t effect that we don’t change - it is obvious. So I think the discussion is valuable but we have to be very careful about getting our hopes up that this is going to mean anything. Thank you.

**Pamela Vaughn** indicated that when the senate created the task force there were representatives from students, staff, administrators and faculty representation. What I would like to know is what the status of
that representation is? **Dawn Terrell**, we requested student representation from AS and have not received one. We did have a staff representative last semester; however, they have been unable to continue and we have not replaced that person. There is a web site that describes the task forces’ charge and membership of the committee. **Eunice Aaron** asked about the activity surrounding the FAR when there is no money? **Marlon Hom**, good example of the type of policy implementation that the task force is trying to resolve. Is it a policy that is supposed to be used to enhance faculty development or are we just enforcing the policy. **Jan Gregory**, senate could amend the policy and the second we make distinctions between the reasonable right of the employer to ask the employee what they are doing. FAR and the FMI, SSI etc with or without funding. Without the FAR the administration could keep money issues need to be separated. **Dawn Terrell**, we are talking about shared governance in the collective bargaining situation, a contract. Whether it is appropriate to report but what forum should it take. Should it enhance professional development of just meet the policy? We will be charged this spring to come up with some recommendations. **Bruce Wolfe**, sorry there is not a student representative. Shared governance is the lifeblood for all parties on the campus. Equal voice on the committee. Recommendation comes from the committee that receives great weight. **Susan Higgins**, I welcome the opportunity to discuss this topic. Some people do not know how shared governance is operational zed. This task force is so important. How we can operate together. If we feel good about the decision that is made, is it better versus when we are imposed upon. Maybe there are more examples. Better communication, I know that shared governance has certain responsible, law requirements and position requirement and how they operate within the system. How they impact on levels of operations. Faculty are accountable
for their action. When we don’t understand we mistrust and feel paranoid.

If this task force could take that notion of breaking down the barriers and open where the doors of communication are closed. **Jan Gregory**, early this afternoon we saw that the players did not have shared governance. Senators involved part of that discussion, may have something to learn about the understanding. Better understanding about the faculty role and others. **Pamela Vaughn**, wondering if the university council would care to comment how bound we are to follow though on the FAR. **Andrea Boyle**, questioned the need to have the university calendar established in such a way that retention and tenure candidates are required to work on their WPAF during the winter break due to meet the university deadline of late January. Would like to see the task force address the issue of faculty input when faculty are being required to complete tasks. **Jan Gregory** asked how the executive calendar works with the union calendar. **Eunice Aaron** outline that compared to other campus we have access to our administrator while on other campuses faculty are locked out from questioning how campus life takes place. I am happy that we are doing this. Use this vehicle and example what we have going for us on this campus. **Saul Steier**, indicated that he had just finished revising segment III course but been informed that that he would have to change the way in which he had written the revision. I would have to translate into action verbs many areas. Sometime what we do does not have anything do to with the intellectual development. I have more examples of administration sharing goals and using these goals to intrude in the classroom, to direct what goes on in the classroom. **Dawn Terrell**, one of the things that the task force had discussed is the role of shared governance about the allocation of resources. The senate is good about eliminating the programs, not good in decision on how eliminating the program impacts our colleagues. **Robert**
Daniels indicated that it was acceptable to him that administrators make the unpopular decisions. Mitch Turitz could see many cases when we have written senate policy and the administration refuses to follow that policy. Pamela Vaughn indicated that what we should be looking at established policy and the making of the policy and what the obligation of all parties evolved are in enforcing that policy. Part of the engagement is about what we were talking about but what rights people have but also what are responsibilities for each party when they engage the policy. Richard Giardina, there is an issue in which a faculty may well decide or have a certain unwillingness to make a decision and recognize that the role of the administration is to make that decision. The worst thing is that a decision needs to be made, but faculty doesn’t want to make that decision and doesn’t want the administration to make the decision. Jan Gregory, encourage all of you to look at the web site at the policy and procedure of the Academic Senate and its committees and how the policy outlines the duties and responsibilities of administrators. Some us have held this job for so long they believe that any new task is an additional burden. Many people do not take the time to read policy. I am concerned about the younger and newer colleague. How do they understand the role of faculty governance? Bruce Wolfe notes that one of the problems in shared governance is that it goes through committee and things are slow and sometimes difficult to get moving. Attendance is always a problem. Shared governance does slow down the process of policymaking. There are problems; however, it is very democratic. Richard Giardina agreed that the process is slow, but it also requires total honesty at all levels. I know faculty members who tell me that certain faculty or chairs should not be reappointed. However they want somebody else to make the decision. If every level is not working honestly in shared governance decision who should be the decision
maker the faculty or the administrators? Marlon Hom indicated that usually when situation arise then there is conversation with the dean to have the dean be the front man and it is not a hidden agenda. Robert Cherny, in response to Richard Giardina statement, I reference here requirements that may happen to turn in reports without a clear purpose for those reports. It reminds me of past experience where a department had bitten the bullet and written a very critical report only to have the report drop into a seemingly black hole. There was no one up the line who paid attention to that report. That being the case, should a department take responsibility? Similarly with a FAR, we are required to turn it now and what is going to happen to it? It is going to be dropped into the black hole. Who is going to read it? Are we going to get a response to it? If there is no response to a faculty report it breeds concision in the faculty when they have to turn them in. Abdiel Onate, policy decisions require administrative mechanism to be implemented. It is just an example of what Richard was saying. For us to function we need all of the elements working together. We cannot have the university without students, or imagine a university without administrators.

Adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

James Edwards

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive):
Tuesday, February 5, 2002