

Minutes: February 10th, 1998

Minutes of Academic Senate Meeting

February 10, 1998

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

Senate Members Present: Aaron, Eunice; Bartscher, Patricia;

Bernstein, Marian; Chen, Yu-Charn; Cherny, Robert; Consoli, Andres; Craig, JoAnn;
Duke, Jerry; Eisman, Gerald; Fehrman, Ken; Flowers, Will; Gillotte, Helen; Goldsmith,
Helen; Graham, Michael; Hammerstrom, Gary; Harnly, Caroline; Haw, Mary Ann;
Hom, Marlon; Homan, Bonnie; Houlberg, Rick; Hu, Sung; La Belle, Thomas; Lee,
Wanda; Leitao, David; Lyles, Lois; Mallare, Marie; Nicholson, Joel; O'ate,
Abdiel; Phillips, Mark; Raggio, Marcia; Rivas, Mario; Smith, Nina Jo; Swanson,
Deborah; Tarakji, Ghassan; Thomson, Lana; Turitz, Mitch; Verhey, Marilyn; Wade,
Patricia; Warren, Mary Ann; Warren, Penelope; Fox-Wolfgramm, Susan; Wong, Alfred;
Wong, Yim Yu; Yee, Darlene

Senate Members Absent: Zoloth-Dorfman, Laurie; Woo, George;

Choo, Freddie; Blank, Mark; Hammett, Jennifer; Cancino, Herlinda; Barnes, Paul;
Kelley, James(exc.); Scoble, Don; Collier, James(exc.); Corrigan, Robert(exc.);
Chang, Paul(exc.).

Senate Interns Present:

Guests: J. Kassiola, S. Taylor, J. Curtin, J. Gregory, G. West,
J. Cuellar, P. Saffold.

Announcements and Report

Chair's Report

There is finally a **free speech platform** on campus. It was commissioned
by Lana Thomson and built to campus environmental standards by Julien Wade.

The 12 inch by 6 inch platform was displayed during the meeting.

There have been problems with pictures and processes of the new **One-Cards**.

There was concern expressed that the only scheduled hours were during the day,
which is especially difficult for faculty who only teach night classes. Some
evening time will be made available.

Phillips welcomed **Senator Dane Johnson**, World & Comparative Literature,
back from sabbatical; and welcomed the two new Senators present - **Charlotte**
Ferretti, Nursing and **Minnie Graham**, Special Education.

The Master Plan Projection for **M.A. in Human Sexuality Studies** was
returned to CRAC by the Executive Committee at the request of the program director.

There will be an on-campus search for the **Dean of Human Relations**.

The Policy on Consultation indicates that there must be a majority of elected faculty on the committee. The Senate Principles on Consultation allow the Executive Committee to select committee members when the time frame does not allow for an election and/or when the expertise needed for the committee mitigates against an elective process. The Executive Committee chose to hold an election for the five faculty representatives. There will be 4 other committee members; one staff representative, one student representative selected by Associated Students, one Dean appointed by the administration, and one central administrative appointee.

Phillips said that, given the nature of the position to be filled, it is essential that the committee include faculty that represent a diversity of perspectives, have knowledge of the complexities of human relations on this campus, and are also skilled in the processes of effectively screening applicants. He urged Senators to keep that in mind when finding candidates to nominate and when casting their vote. Nominations were due in the Academic Senate Office by February 13.

Over 150 faculty and administrators attended the leadership conference on campus, **Collegiality '98**. The Executive Committee is soliciting written feedback via a questionnaire/evaluation form sent to all participants. Despite some glitches in communication, early responses have been predominately positive, particularly concerning the dialoguing in the break-out groups. The ultimate success of the conference is dependent on follow-up. The Executive Committee will follow-up on issues identified at the conference. The first positive outcome is the establishment of the list-serve for Department Chairs which is a mechanism for good, quick, communications between the Senate and Chairs.

Some faculty shared disappointment that not all faculty were included. The leadership conference planners miscalculated regarding communication. The planners indicated in a memo to Deans, in the Campus Memo, and in a memo to all faculty that the plenary sessions were open. The decision was made to have a non-cost leadership focus conference and it was not possible to invite everybody to a free lunch. Phillips said that they probably should have sent a direct communication to Chairs, which will be easier now that there is the list-serve. The planners should also have explained in greater detail the nature of the conference so that people fully understood it. Importantly, they intended for the second day to be focused in departments and colleges and to include all faculty. Not all colleges and departments chose to meet that second day to increase the feedback. Overall, he thought it was successful but felt that there need to be some changes for next time.

This spring the Executive Committee plans to focus primarily on the role of **Department Chairs**. This emerges from a subcommittee that looked at the role of Chairs, debates regarding the role of Chairs in the PSSI process, and collective bargaining issues related to which unit do Chairs belong (faculty or administrative). Phillips' expectations are that recommendations will be made perhaps to the CFA bargaining team, perhaps to the Senate, perhaps to Gerald West as the head of Faculty Affairs, and perhaps to Chairs themselves. He expects to use the list-serve to communicate directly with Chairs and get feedback from them. He has been thinking of new ways of conceptualizing academic and shared governance on this campus. He felt that the model in place is extremely limited and said that he plans to bring a proposal to the Executive Committee to reexamine the process faculty governance. This proposal will not focus on changes in the Senate as much as on broadening the conception to include Department Chairs and possibly faculty councils. Presently, only two colleges have their own faculty-led councils. He wants the Senate to reexamine that and to reexamine the relationship between the Senate, college-based faculty, and Department Chairs. He asked how do chairs fit in with the overall governance structure and leadership structure? Phillips also has been asked questions regarding the Senate role in relation to the collective bargaining process, particularly issues related to salary, PSSIs, and the place of Chairs - faculty or administration. Although there are clear lines in role definition of the Senate and the CFA, he felt that there needs to be close communication, and at times close working together, between the Senate and CFA, particularly in an era in which issues related to merit pay and tenure are being hotly debated across the country. If not for the joint pressure brought by the Statewide Senate and CFA, both changes in and the changed timeline for SIP/CETI would not have happened. The lines are clearly different, but we need to work together on issues that concern us all.

The Senate meeting schedule for Spring 1998 was attached to the agenda.

Phillips recognized **Susan Taylor** and formally congratulated her on being selected as the new Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

A communication was received from Jim Highsmith, Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate, which stated that Chancellor Reed indicated he plans to seek a budget augmentation for salaries and deferred maintenance. Reed also plans to push to close the CPEC salary compensation gap over the next 4 years.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting of February 10, 1998

As there were no objections, the agenda was **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting of December 9, 1997

Darlene Yee asked to correct herself in the previous minutes. On page 7, the maximum number of units in a BA program should be 57 units not 60.

As there were no objections, the minutes were **approved as amended**.

Agenda Item #3 - Report from Vice President for Academic Affairs Tom La

Belle

La Belle welcomed the Senators back for Spring semester. He reported on what he has called "academic juggernauts". He explained that these are things that are frustrating us about day to day activities. Some of these issues include summer advising, or the lack of it; evaluation of teaching and other assessment methods; improving orientation systems for faculty and Chairs; and a number of curricular issues such as the number of times a student can repeat a course, setting limits on the number of units a student can accumulate, uses of the JEPET exam, and tightening up on controls on academic probation. He felt that most of these things can be relatively easily and quickly changed to make us more user friendly, more efficient, less bureaucratic, and maybe happier. He said that he came across these things when he arrived and people asked him why don't we change that or why don't we do this. He kept track of those items that were frequently mentioned, talked to people about how to approach them, and created a list of 28 juggernauts.

He said that when he coined the term "juggernaut" he intended it innocently to mean an obstacle to progress. However, he said that the dictionary defines a juggernaut as a massive, inexorable force or object that advances irresistibly and crushes anything in its path. He thought that was a slight overstatement. He has received e-mails saying that juggernaut has religious and mystic overtones and that it was frightening that he would use the term. He apologized if he offended anyone.

He handed out a list of the progress of the juggernauts. Mandatory advising for probationary students was put into effect in Fall 1997 and had 82% compliance in its first semester. The proposal to establish summer advising is expected to go into effect this next summer. He thanked Mario Rivas and Jo Volkert for their work on summer advising and Rivas also for his work on mandatory advising.

Liberal Studies advising has received financial support this term. Liberal Studies is one of the largest majors and the students are spread around. The advising will be centrally located in the Liberal Studies Advising Office.

Helen Goldsmith is now coordinating the selection and training of the advisors. Work is being done on prototypical majors in departments and colleges. These are outlines of what an ideal major plan would look like. This would provide

a form of advising so that students would know what courses constitute a major.

Rivas is working on making more user-friendly the hand outs and materials that are sent to students.

Exit surveys are being conducted to explore how we can learn and improve our programs from those individuals who have completed them. A pilot Alumni Survey is being conducted this spring by the Public Research Institute (PRI). Several years of data from the Graduate Program Exit Surveys are now being analyzed.

PRI is proposing to do a pilot Undergraduate Exit Survey to look at Customer/Student Services, General Education, and the major. The pilot would hopefully be conducted with August 1998 and January 1999 graduates, with the real survey, after testing, being administered in May 1999. Rufus Browning and PRI are providing the expertise on all three surveys, Gail Whitaker is working on the Undergraduate side, and Donna Schafer is working on the Graduate side.

There is a lot of work being done concerning assessment and accountability.

WASC has given SFSU a one-year extension in order to develop program assessment devices in order to measure student outcomes. It is not sufficient to measure student attitudes. WASC accrediting wants to know what are the skills and the knowledge that students acquire as a result of being in the program. They want to be able to connect cause and effect - to point to certain areas in the curriculum and to certain outcomes and see if they can make some connection. That is what is being aimed for in General Education, in Basic Skills, and in every program offered in the University.

In Basic Skills in Segment I, much of the discussion of skill attainment in written communication is focused on the JEPET. A pilot project of JEPET retesting is being done in four sections of English 414. This is a means for the English Department to assess English 414 and would provide data for accreditation. Nancy McDermid, Elise Earthman, Catharine Lucas, and Deborah Swanson are involved in this project.

In Speech and Communication, discussions continue on assessment measures for the Oral Communication requirement. The Philosophy Department has developed a statement regarding Critical Thinking evaluation and department-wide pre and post course assessment instruments. Susan Taylor is chairing a task force in the area of Quantitative Reasoning to develop a set of common learning objectives and competencies for all Quantitative Reasoning courses. Taylor is also chairing a group of coordinators from the colleges on the Evaluation of Teaching. Every college is moving toward a standard instrument for the college and hopefully toward 5 to 10 University wide items on each of those instruments. La Belle

said that in his position he is making decisions on tenure and promotions based on the current evaluation instruments with no knowledge about the validity or reliability of those instruments in actually assessing the teaching act.

Two theories about assessing Basic Skills among students are to use a standardized test or a home grown method. The English Department in the College of Humanities is designing an experiment to assess writing, speaking, and critical thinking skills for graduating seniors.

The Graduate Council under the direction of Darlene Yee is working on the assessment of English proficiency at both the beginning and end of the graduate experience. They will have a report soon on this issue. Another juggernaut is the use of TOEFL scores and whether they should be raised for international students. The Graduate Council is not recommending raising the TOEFL scores, but departments and programs are permitted to raise the standard for their program.

Betsy Blosser has been working on this in the Graduate Council.

Every college has committees working on assessment of their majors with variable progress. In the Colleges of Education and Business, accreditation has demanded assessment of outcomes and accountability, so those colleges are moving well to try and shore up the process. Other colleges are starting from scratch and it may be a big thing just to get colleagues talking, let alone make progress toward assessment.

Convenient access to courses for students is another juggernaut. Nineteen courses are currently being offered on Friday evenings and Saturdays.

Goldsmith and APC is working on the number of times a student can attempt a course, standardizing withdrawals, limiting the ability of Undergraduate students to take courses after they have reached a maximum number of units, and requiring students to declare a major and seek mandatory advising after a specified certain number of units and semesters.

La Belle invited Senators and their colleagues to think about frustrations that the system might consider changing.

The new Faculty Travel Fund has received 57 applications for the first go round in February. La Belle is working with Gerald West to identify the areas in a faculty member's career path where particular kinds of opportunities for professional growth and development are needed. This includes not just travel but program development and special opportunities to infuse courses with multicultural perspectives.

Harvey Charles developed a \$10,000 fund and is working with the International faculty to help develop programs and courses in the International arena.

The institution is attempting to identify ways to be more supportive of students, faculty, and staff in creating an academic academy that is user friendly and is still accountable to ourselves, if not the rest of the world.

Agenda Item #4 - Report from Statewide Senators

Phillips publicly thanked **Bob Cherny** for taking time to communicate with Senators about items coming from Long Beach.

Gary Hammerstrom reported that the Statewide Academic Senate held one-third of its five plenary meetings on January 21, 22, and 23. **Eunice Aaron** will report on Faculty Affairs, Cherny on Academic Affairs, and Hammerstrom on the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee.

Cherny announced that at the last meeting in November, the Senate approved the final wording of the Baccalaureate study. The report is being printed and will be available soon. There will be copies on campus to which faculty will have access. The Academic Affairs Committee only brought forward one resolution.

That resolution concerned modifying the CSU admissions standards to meet the Master Plan eligibility goals for first time freshmen. The Master Plan anticipates that the CSU will admit students in the top one-third of their high school graduating class. Given the current admissions standards, the admissions rate is under 30%. (If the CSU can meet 30%, then it is considered to have met one-third.)

The CSU has come close to 30% admissions by following the UC admissions standards with respect to course distribution rather than the CSU standards for course distribution patterns. The resolution would insist that first time freshmen meet the CSU course distribution patterns, but a student would be permitted to miss one course--either the visual/performing arts or one language course. The student must make up the deficiency in their first year without receiving academic credit for that course.

The Teacher Education Committee had a large number of resolutions. Two of the resolutions endorsed the conclusions of the CSU President's Group on Teacher Preparation in K-18 Education concerning reinforcing the importance of teacher preparation in the CSU and supporting related Title 5 provisions changing admissions to teacher preparation programs. Another resolution had to do with the State Board of Education Mathematics Standards in which the Board endorsed their own standards rather than those that came out of the commission. A resolution commended the Commission on Teacher Credentialing on its recent report. The fifth resolution expressed grave concern and opposition to actions of the Legislature which legislate the way in which reading is taught.

Aaron reported on the Faculty Affairs Committee, which dealt with the report

from the Merit Pay Task Force. The committee tried very hard to preserve the bulk of the report as submitted by the task force. Consensus was reached on the closing of the salary gap and that the CSU administration had a duty to articulate what they expected out of merit pay (the outcomes assessment door swings both ways). She reported that a wide range of individuals from all the campuses are in agreement about some core items about Merit Pay.

Action on the appointment of the Faculty Trustee is expected in early February. In terms of Faculty Productivity, the Chancellor's office has been working with SFSU, Sonoma, Hayward, and Fresno in looking for the significant savings that were discussed in Cornerstones 2. They are now unsure if the savings are significant, but they are at least looking at savings in a 10-year period.

The Accountability task force is working on Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, which is a long-term issue.

Some faculty in the system are charging students to get onto the faculty member's web site to get information needed to complete the course. The committee is trying to find out as much as they can about that issue.

The Virtual University reportedly keeps clunking along. The time line has slipped to August/September. The next academic year will see some activity in the VSU. The point was made that the CVU will compete with the CSU's Extended Education and that a lot of discretionary money comes from Extended Education. The CVU is much larger than a campus Extended Education.

At the interim committee meeting, discussion will take place on the Department Chair's role in the CSU.

Cherny reported that the Academic Affairs Committee agenda includes Outcome Assessment for General Education, information competence, guidelines on copyright and fair use under the new No Electronic Theft Act, and the California Virtual University.

Hammerstrom reported on the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee which spent most of its time reviewing the Governor's budget released in early January. A presentation was made by Richard West, Senior Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance about the results of that budget submission.

From the perspective of the CSU budget, the Governor's budget looks good.

Hammerstrom said that the CSU got almost every thing asked for and a little more. The Governor provided an additional \$500,000 for a teacher preparation initiative. Hammerstrom said that that prompted Senator Cherny to wonder if the CSU didn't ask for enough.

The CSU will be funded for a 4% increase in enrollment which is 3% over the

1% that was contemplated in the compact, so there should be funded growth within the system. Undergraduate fees have been reduced 5%, but Graduate fees stay where they are. So for the first time there is a differential between Graduate and Undergraduate fees. That will reduce revenue from Undergraduate fees, but there is a backfill for loss of fees in the Governor's budget. There is a 4% compensation pool in the budget. How those funds get distributed will be a function of bargaining. There is money to begin implementing the newest campus at Camarillo State Hospital in Ventura County - CSU Channel Islands. The process begins next year by moving Northridge's Ventura site into the Camarillo facility, although that has not been fully approved yet.

Chancellor West also told the committee that the state revenue picture is quite promising. There is a surplus of \$500 million above the requirements of Proposition 98. The Statewide Academic Senate then unanimously passed a resolution to seek an augmentation of funds sufficient to provide an additional 4% compensation pool. Chancellor Reed will only seek an augmentation for an additional 1% compensation. Hammerstrom guessed that perhaps an 8% total increase for the CSU might not be well received by the Legislature when other parts of the state have not received raises in the last couple of years. He felt that it is time to keep pressure on about closing the salary gap.

He reported that the CETI process has been slowed down. A joint legislative hearing was held in Sacramento on January 6 to provide information to the Legislature about the CETI process. Ted Lempert, Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, essentially apologized for not being able to provide the money needed for the infrastructure. Hammerstrom said that there are still a lot of questions to be raised and yet to be answered about how this will work. The hearing was limited to the raising of questions. The CFA, Statewide Academic Senate, CSU, student groups, alumni groups and business groups all made presentations. From that, 100 questions were sent to Chancellor-elect Reed. The response was delivered last week with answers to all 100 questions.

The timetable for CETI has been shoved back and no action is contemplated until the May Trustees' meeting at the earliest. They are in the process of putting together a CSU business plan for CETI, which is not the business plan from the four private companies. That should be available in early March. It will be sent to the campuses and then time will be allowed for a 30-day period of comment from the campuses. There needs to be discussion on this campus of a way to examine and respond to the plan that will address everyone's concerns.

Mitch Turitz said that he approves pushing back the CETI timeline to

May, but that is close to summer. He questioned whether that will create the same problem of decisions being made over summer when most faculty are not available for input. Hammerstrom replied that it was well understood that May would be the earliest time that action would be taken, but also the latest time. He felt that if CETI is going to go forward, then May is probably when action needs to be taken one way or another.

Aaron announced that on February 19 there will be a focus group for IT professionals on campus. There will be 20 people from SFSU, Hayward, and SJSU coming together with industry partners. The idea is to find out what the people who will be doing the work want to see happen.

Agenda Item #5 - Resolution on CSU Budget Augmentation

Rick Houlberg introduced this resolution for the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee wished to show that they are interested in this topic and it comes as a consent item.

Phillips commented that this is the least that we can do.

Hammerstrom said that ordinarily salaries are not something that Academic Senates are involved in since this is CFA's province. But when the gap in faculty salaries is as large as it is, 11.2%, it begins to have a negative impact upon educational programs. That large a gap affects the ability to hire good faculty, to mount good programs, and to deliver those programs effectively. It is for these reasons that the Statewide Academic Senate has become involved to urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to address the issue of the salary gap with greater intent and energy than they have in the past.

Jan Gregory said that she thinks CFA would view that as friendly.

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

M/S/P (Hom, Gillotte) to close debate. The vote was taken and the resolution **passed** unanimously.

Agenda Item #6 - Proposed B.A. in Criminal Justice

Darlene Yee, CRAC Chair, reintroduced this item in second reading.

She explained that the proposal is for a new B.A. to replace the current concentration. It would require a unit requirement change from 31 to 33 for the existing concentration to 41 to 44 units for the new degree. A full copy of the proposal as well as answers to concerns raised by CRAC and the University Interdisciplinary Council were attached to the agenda. She introduced **Dr. Jack Curtin, Director of Criminal Justice** and **BSS Dean Joel Kassiola** as resources.

Curtin stated that there is a correction on the fifth page of the proposal.

The second course listed under Interdisciplinary Options (SOC 394 Field Methods)

should be SOC 454 White Collar Crime. He said that that the change in no way affects the proposal, that the error was his, and he apologized.

He stated that, at the last Senate meeting, Senator Cherny had raised a challenge to the Criminal Justice proposal to which Curtin had no opportunity to respond.

He said that, taken at face value, the challenge amounted to three propositions and he wanted to respond to each in the order in which they were voiced.

The first claim was that the proposed undergraduate major in Criminal Justice is nothing but the existing Social Science major with Concentration in Criminal Justice. Curtin said that there has been more than a dozen years of curricular refinement and more than three years of considerable work by individual faculty and groups within the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences and across campus, one of which was the Academic Senate which approved the Master Plan recommendation unanimously a year ago. Curtin said that the claim is untrue, patently. As an instance, the 12 unit core curriculum in Social Science has not been included even as an elective in the proposed major.

The second claim was an accusation that the Criminal Justice Program faculty is concerned emphatically with job marketability of SFSU students and graduates.

He said that, to that charge, the Criminal Justice Program faculty, unanimously enter a guilty plea and stand ready for sentencing by the Academic Senate. As a faculty at a public university with a working class student body, they regard job marketability as an inherent dimension of a liberal arts education. If that is to be taken as inappropriate, their entire curriculum as it has developed since 1983 is tainted, and they are in no position to escape sanction.

The third claim was that the title of the proposed major must be changed from Criminal Justice because the liberal arts emphasis in the proposal may be considered unconventional among curricula bearing that label. Throughout the CSU there are two hegis code numbers for undergraduate major curricula in Criminal Justice: 21051 specifies Criminal Justice/Administration; 21052 designates Criminal Justice/Corrections.

Six CSU campuses include neither curriculum: Humboldt, the Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, and San Marcos. Among existing curricula in Criminal Justice, six campuses offer B.S. degrees: Hayward, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, and San Jose. Five CSU campuses offer B.A. degrees: Bakersfield, Fullerton, San Bernardino, Sonoma, and Stanislaus. Since the proposal before the Academic Senate was for a B.A. program, the last five were the most relevant.

Taking the Fullerton program as an example, their description refers to Criminal Justice as "the multidisciplinary study of the organization and operation

of the criminal justice system" developed in response "to the perception of many academics and criminal justice system professionals that traditional criminology neglected studies of the criminal justice process." The Fullerton document includes references to "emphases on theory, methodology, and criminal law" and "contemporary issues in justice studies as they pertain to women, minorities, court processes and correctional policies" and to an emphasis upon "internship opportunities."

He said that the proposal before the Senate for an undergraduate major in Criminal Justice at SFSU reflected the same liberal arts emphases and that it was quite distinct from the technical, cop-shop approaches reflected in the B.S. degree programs throughout the CSU. He felt that had the language of the proposal been any closer to what they discovered subsequently reflected in the documents from Fullerton, Bakersfield, San Bernadino, Stanislaus, and Sonoma, it would have begged plagiarism. That affinity among existing programs and the proposal for a liberal arts approach to Criminal Justice damaged, if it did not destroy, the third claim regarding the use of Criminal Justice as a title, within the CSU and nationally. However, he felt that there was another, more damaging matter to the claim that the curriculum ought not to be titled Criminal Justice because, in many contexts, such connotation is unconventional. The extent to which a curriculum may include faculty emphases which are, or may be perceived as, unconventional within a given academic field warrants explicit attention in the interests of liberal arts learning, to prevent students from misconstruing swimming upstream intellectually from the downstream current. The proposal before the Senate incorporated, explicitly and intricately in each and every course bearing the Criminal Justice rubric, conventional crime control, along with the more esoteric but nonetheless conventional due process, as well as an unconventional use of political economy and class analysis, as salient perspectives in Criminal Justice. When they teach race and racism, as they do in every course, they stress multiple perspectives which include 1) the ideology of justice as color-blind, 2) the critique emanating from Critical Race Theory and from the over-representation of minorities in criminal process rates, and 3) a political economic instrumentalism in which racism is understood as an indeterminate outcome of wealth and class. When they teach gender issues, as they do in every course, they call attention again to multiple perspectives rather than to any single view. They offer data on women in law enforcement, in the criminal law, and in the prison industry, as officials and as subjects, defendants, and inmates. They emphasize data on scale, on the impact of women in criminal justice despite scale, on arguments

which advance the need for explicitly feminist influences on policy, and on those arguments which insist that women must remain an ancillary consideration to the central tasks of criminal justice. At every turn and topic the curriculum has been rooted in multiple perspectives rather than orthodoxy. In sum, their proposal reflects the liberal arts as a foundation for living. They do not teach beliefs but learning, not training but education. The subject matter is criminal process and criminal justice systems in response. He respectfully asked the Academic Senate for its approval of the proposal.

Marlon Hom said that, speaking as chair of Asian American Studies, the proposal listed four Asian American classes. He asked whether the unit had been consulted. Curtin replied yes, that they had contacted the College of Ethnic Studies and various professors in Ethnic Studies. Hom replied that, as Department Chair, he felt that other courses were more appropriate than those four history classes. If he had been consulted in a timely fashion, he would have indicated the two courses that were more pertinent and appropriate to their program.

M/S/P (Eisman, Duke) to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed** with two abstentions.

Phillips said that, in light of Hom's remarks, some dialogue should take place for the good of the program. Curtin replied that they would be delighted.

Agenda Item #7 - Recommendations in Response to the Annual Report of the Implementation Committee on Multicultural Perspectives in the Curriculum

Phillips introduced this item for the Executive Committee. He also thanked **Jose Cuellar** and **Jan Gregory**, co-chairs for the tremendous amount of work they did on the committee. The Implementation Committee on Multicultural Perspectives in the Curriculum was formed in 1992 and met for 5 years, making a significant contribution to the campus dialogue on multicultural perspectives. The Committee's 1997 report was referred to the Executive Committee by the Committee on Committees (CoC). The Executive Committee focused their attention on the report during the Fall semester and now bring forward a series of recommendations. Almost every year, the CoC recommended that additional resources be provided to help support some of the recommendations coming from the ICMPC. The ICMPC functioned in a time of resource crunch, which made it difficult to run with some of the ideas that came from the committee. The ICMPC's 1997 report was referred to the Executive Committee by the CoC to transform this committee and process into something else. The Executive Committee focused on this work in the fall and brought a series of recommendations to the Senate.

The primary purpose was to suggest the next steps that can be taken with minimal

time and resources to deal with some but not all of the complexities and issues related to diversity and multicultural perspectives on the campus. The Executive Committee considered it a given that the College of Ethnic Studies is the primary SFSU locus of expertise with regard to multicultural perspectives, but they also considered it a given that there is considerable expertise on this campus outside that college. What they were seeking to do was provide some practical next steps which, through collegial cooperation, they thought this campus could move forward with regard to one of its highest priorities. He offered these recommendations for discussion and hoped that the recommendations would be accepted by the Senate so that they could be translated into action.

Gregory encouraged the Senate to accept the recommendations so that discussion can take place and action can be taken. She felt that a point of stasis had been reached. If the recommendations were not accepted and the campus could not move forward, we would lag back in stasis.

Duke reiterated that the Executive Committee was not trying to solve all the problems, just to determine the next steps. He seconded the recommendation to accept these recommendations.

Mario Rivas commended the ICMPC for the report and the Executive Committee for the recommendations regarding General Education. He said that he saw no time lines and no set goals. He agreed that the issue is important and that we need to do it. He said that we need to see time lines. Phillips replied that the first step is to accept the recommendations. The next step would be for the Executive Committee or other committees to flush out the specifics of those recommendations. Rivas responded that it should be brought back to the Senate with specific recommendations and a time line. Phillips replied that, where appropriate, the Executive Committee would charge appropriate committees to come back with plans.

JoAnn Craig asked what was meant by multicultural perspectives, whether that meant the International students here on the campus, or the ethnic diversity of students, or the international students who come in from other cultures. Phillips replied yes to all of that. Craig continued by asking about different types of enhancing multicultural perspectives in the departments. She wondered whether the recommendations addressed issues such as plagiarism and the international aspects of plagiarism, asking and answering questions, and the different ways and means of international students. Phillips replied that he could not answer that question. He referred to recommendation #6. One goal was to set a mechanism in place for what is coming out of the CUSP process. The Executive Committee

did not attempt to deal with all of that in detail but to set up mechanisms to deal with it.

Gregory responded that the definition of multicultural was explained in a prior document from 1991. She expected that the Senate could make that document available. She asked if Craig was asking whether international students could be discriminated against because of their use of print material in ways that are different than the use in this culture. Craig replied that she hadn't thought of it that way. She explained that in the International Relations Department they try to teach the cultural implications of plagiarism. Some cultures don't believe in asking questions. She asked if that is what the ICMPC were talking about and could the IR Department share their expertise. Gregory replied that they would be delighted to discuss the issues with them.

Lois Lyles asked about recommendation #3 that departments should include a three-unit course on multicultural issues as relevant to the discipline or general field of study. She said that there needs to be a mechanism for resolution of conflicts over issues of encroachment with the College of Ethnic Studies.

She said that this has been an issue between Humanities and Ethnic Studies.

Phillips replied that there are limits to what the Executive Committee was trying to do with these recommendations. They were not trying to resolve tensions that may exist on this campus. There was a suggestion for another committee and other mechanisms that may provide potential for resolution of those tensions. The Executive Committee made a conscious decision not to attempt to resolve that problem. Some things may not be reflected in concepts and skills, but in faculty understanding of, sensitivity to, and recognition of those cultural differences.

The mechanisms are there to deal with those issues in the recommendations, but it doesn't solve those problems.

Cuellar said that the process was started in part in response to a presidential initiative and in part to the Academic Senate. The emphasis was first to assess the extent to which there was curricular development that involved multiculturalism on this campus, both in colleges and departments. The second step was then to make recommendations on how to improve the incorporation of multicultural curriculums.

Specifically, in terms of International Relations, the emphasis was on teaching international students about multicultural culture in the United States. In the committee process, they found out that in the last decade there's been very little movement on this campus in regards to multiculturalism across the campus. He said that Ethnic Studies has not been blocking implementation of multicultural elements in the curriculum and that most of the conflicts have been resolved.

The ICMPC is encouraging multiculturalism across the University.

Wanda Lee wanted to address a similar issue about Ethnic Studies. As a member of the ICMPC, she recalled many, many hours of discussion upon the role of Ethnic Studies in this whole force. She learned some understanding and appreciation of the expertise and the perspective that Ethnic Studies has and the role it can play in advice and consultation to other departments in the University. She felt that there was a real consensus about Ethnic Studies, as well as Women Studies and other departments, being an integral part in offering their expertise in developing programs. She felt that it was not a territorial thing but a wanting to add their expertise and perspective to other people. Even though there was often no funding or structural support, she felt a real willingness to be collaborative and work together.

M/S (Hammerstrom, Gillotte) that the Academic Senate of SFSU endorse the Executive Committee recommendations in response to the ICMPC report and that the Senate charge the Executive Committee, or its designees, to develop a plan for the prompt implementation of these recommendations.

Hammerstrom, speaking to motion, said that as a Statewide senator, SFSU has a reputation of being sensitive to multicultural issues. He felt that it was time to start living up to that reputation.

Gillotte said that she is very aware of the issues and that a lot of those things have been and can be further addressed by these recommendations and by setting up future task forces. She felt that the Executive Committee should develop a plan of action as soon as possible.

Lyles said that, like Cuellar, she did not want to leave the impression that Ethnic Studies is blocking attempts to foster multiculturalism. However, she said that she knows it has happened in the past and because of this kind of conflict, the goals expressed in the resolution have been difficult to work toward. She felt that it was important to address the relationship between Ethnic Studies and other colleges in order to move forward. Unless that relationship is resolved, she felt it is futile to offer more multicultural courses.

Gerald Eisman also spoke to recommendation #3 saying that he was stymied about how to put multiculturalism into the computer science curriculum. Recommendation #7 states that multiculturalism criteria should be put into the Academic Program Review process which would require programs to have multicultural issues. He saw a conflict there that he would like to see resolved. Phillips replied that multicultural skills and competencies are secondary in his discipline but very much integrated into the curriculum. He said that he could suggest several things

that could help integrate multiculturalism into a computer science curriculum, and he is not an expert in the field. However, that relates to recommendation #8. If there is no support for faculty to do this, then it's not going to fly.

The assumption is that in terms of multicultural skills, sensitivities, concepts, and so on, that there is the potential for integration across the curriculum.

There is also an assumption that to just tell people to do that when they don't have the background and training is also meaningless. Part of the attitude behind the recommendations is to promote and push, but not come down heavy. A 3-unit course may not be the best way to go. A number of the recommendations have to go hand in hand. Another attitude is in recognizing those tensions, but not to get caught up in them. One of the ironies is that SFSU is perceived as one of the most integrative, contemporary, far-sighted campuses anywhere in terms of dealing with linguistic and cultural diversity. When he talks to other campuses, including other CSU campuses, what they are doing in GE does not put us in the forefront. Recognizing the tensions, we need to do something in terms of moving us along to where we need to be on this campus.

Gregory said that we can include issues of learning style, pedagogic style, and cultural awareness in diversifying curricula. She said that in some ways she would agree with Eisman that probably in terms of specific curricular issues, we might have difficulty. But there are people who could probably identify some things in a computer science curriculum that would not harm the faculty and would help the students. She suggested that people look at the words as relevant.

M/S/P (Houlberg, Fehrman) to second reading.

M/S (Gillotte, Fehrman) to close debate. The vote was taken and the motion **passed** with two abstentions.

The vote was taken and the item **passed** with three abstentions.

Phillips said that real hard work went into these documents. One issue was to define minimal resources. He said that he would push hard in any way possible to get the resources needed. He questioned whether some of the issues that play out as territorial issues are actually the oppressed fighting with each other.

If the support and resources existed, some of the other issues would not be in the foreground. He felt that if we don't get resources, the type of infusion that would be necessary would be impossible except in very small pockets.

The Senate was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Homan

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, February 10,
1998
