

## **Minute - m02-20-01**

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

of February 20, 2001

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

### **Senate Members Present:**

Alvarez, Alvin

Bartscher, Patricia

Bernstein, Marian

Cherny, Robert

Collier, James

Colvin, Caran

Concolino, Christopher

Contreras, Rey

Cullers, Susan

deVries, Brian

Duke, Jerry

Edwards, James

Elia, John

Ferretti, Charlotte

Garcia, Oswaldo

Garcia, Velia

Gerson, Deborah

Goldsmith, Helen

Gregory, Jan

Harnly, Caroline

Hom, Marlon

Hu, Sung

Hubler, Barbara

Jerris, Scott

Johnson, Dane

Johnson, Sharon

Langbort, Carol

Leal-Idrogo, Anita

McKeon, Midori

Moallem, Minoo  
Amy Nichols  
Odate, Abdiel  
Raggio, Marcia  
Sayeed, Lutfus  
Shrivastava, Vinay  
Smith, Miriam  
Steier, Saul  
Strong, Rob  
Turitz, Mitch  
Vaughn, Pamela  
Warren, Penelope  
Williams, Robert  
Wong, Alfred  
Yip, Yewmun

**Senate Members Absent:** Su, Yuli (exc); Gillotte, Helen (exc); Avila, Guadalupe (exc); La Belle, Thomas (exc); Kelley, James (exc); Scoble, Don (exc); Collier, James (exc); Sagisi, Jaymee; Pasaporte, Erin;

**Guests:** S. Shimanoff; D. Fendel; J. Combs; R. Maghroori; J. Monteverdi; G. Whitaker, D. Fox; L. Zoloth; J. Volkert; B. Perttula

### **Announcements and Report**

**Robert Cherny** announced a new URL for the report on the CSU in the 21st century:

<http://bss.sfsu.edu/cherny/AAC/draft4.pdf>. He also announced the following URL for a joint committee of the legislature that is developing a new master plan for K-university; there are interesting and potentially troubling things with attempts to link testing in K-12 to admission to higher education standing out: [http://www.sen.ca.gov/ftp/sen/committee/joint/master\\_plan/](http://www.sen.ca.gov/ftp/sen/committee/joint/master_plan/)

**Chair Pamela Vaughn** reminded senators to respond to master plan by the end of month, respond to the hiring manual as soon as possible.

Vaughn sent out her Chair's report electronically prior to the senate meeting. In it, she highly recommended the provocative articles in the special issue of the Hedgehog Review entitled "What's the University For?" She especially singled out Jackson Lears' article "The Radicalism of Tradition: Teaching the Liberal Arts in a Managerial

Age," which is worth noting for its comments on tenure and on the "current academic crisis." With SFSU's state mission of balancing "liberal" education with a career-focus, these articles are good food for thought.

As additional food for thought, Vaughn added that Vice Chair Helen Goldsmith is coming to the end of her second senate term and Secretary Dane Johnson will be on sabbatical next year, which means both positions will need to be filled. Vaughn intends to run again for Senate Chair.

**Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for February 20,**

2001

The agenda was amended to withdraw Agenda Item #4, Proposed Change in Membership to the Franciscan Shops Board of Directors, with subsequent agenda items being renumbered to reflect that deletion.

The agenda was **approved as amended.**

**Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting of February**

6, 2001

The minutes were **approved as written.**

**Agenda Item #3 - Report from Marilyn Verhey, Interim**

Coordinator of Academic Assessment

**Marilyn Verhey** reported on the development of a core set of university-wide teaching effectiveness items, first recounting recent Senate action on this issue, then making reference to the strategies that will be used in 2001 to fulfill selected clauses of the Academic Senate Resolution under the following title: "Strategies for Continued Development of University-Wide Core Items to Assess Teaching Effectiveness. These have been developed with collaboration of Provost Thomas La Belle, Verhey, Vaughn, and Penelope Warren, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair. Senator Alvin Alvarez has been designated as a liaison to work directly with Verhey in order to have a Senate presence in the testing that will be done. There will be a web page in order to come up with some consensus on the items and the rating scale. They will also use different methods to compare items with national instruments. They will use panels of experts from across campus and colleges are welcome to submit anonymous aggregate data from their instruments. Verhey also summarized other types of analysis and the process for sampling.

Verhey added that at Asilomar there was very good attendance at a workshop on measuring teaching effectiveness, and she was struck by how qualitative that feedback was. Quantitative measures are important for reliability,

but we should all be using qualitative measures to capture things that are going on in the classroom that no instrument can capture.

**Agenda Item #4 - Proposed Revisions to the Charge and**

Membership Composition of the University Committee on Written English Proficiency

**Helen Goldsmith**, Vice Chair of the Academic Senate,

introduced this consent item from the Senate Executive Committee by first remarking that many committees, departments, and entities on campus are concerned with

the written English proficiency skills of our students. Thus, it is

important that a single body on campus serve as a clearinghouse

and expert body for policies regarding written English skills. The committee

charged with literacy issues is the Committee on Written English Proficiency

(CWEP). In consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, CWEP reviewed its

charge and recommended changes, although it is not that different than the old.

It has always been the charge of CWEP to provide guidance on undergraduate and graduate

writing; the changes stress the advisory and consultative

role, and make sure the representation on it reflects the nature of its involvement.

**M/S/P (Goldsmith, Gregory) to accept the proposed revisions.**

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

**Jan Gregory** spoke from the perspective of having

served many years on this committee, noting that it is under-noticed and under-used

by other segments of the campus. She encouraged faculty from other departments

to acquaint themselves with what the Committee can do.

**Jerald Combs** spoke of the committee's importance,

but also raised the difficulty of CWEP and GEC meeting at the same time, which

makes it impossible for the Undergraduate Dean to go to both meetings. He urged

CWEP and GEC to have meetings at different times in the future.

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

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

**Agenda Item #5 - Proposed Discontinuance of the Minor**

in Meteorology

**Educational Policies Committee (EPC) Chair Sung Hu**

prefaced the series of five discontinuances by summarizing the discontinuance

policy: the proposed discontinuances were publicized to the campus community,

then the EPC met and approved all five, which will be presented individually.

The Minor in Meteorology is part of the Department of Geosciences'

plan to discontinue an old minor in favor of the new Certificate in Meteorology for Broadcasters, which has already been approved by the Senate.

**Oswaldo Garcia** from Geosciences and Meteorology clarified a couple of items.

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

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

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

**Agenda Item #6 - Proposed Discontinuance of the Bachelor**

of Science in Business

**Administration Logistics Management Concentration**

**Sung Hu** introduced this consent item from EPC, noting retirement of faculty, low student

interest as reasons. The Department is also considering a new program with International Business in this area.

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

**M/S/P (Duke, deVries) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #7 -- Proposed Discontinuance of the Minor**

in Intercultural Skills

**Hu** explained that this minor in the College of Humanities had been approved but never implemented.

**M/S/P (Steier, Sayeed) to second reading.**

**M/S/P (Steier, Wong) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #8 - Proposed Discontinuance of the Preschool/Daycare/Early**

Childhood Education Certificate Program

**Hu** explained that the university established a new

BA degree in Child & Adolescent

Development that has a Concentration in Young child and

Family. This new degree has decreased interest in the CEL certificate program.

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

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

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

**Agenda Item #9 - Proposed Discontinuance of the Construction**

Practices Certificate Program

**Hu** explained that CEL has found this certification program to be no longer economically viable due to decreasing enrollments in recent years.

**M/S/P (Sayeed, Wong) to second reading.**

**M/S/P (Duke, Shrivastava) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #10 - Proposed Revision to the Minor in Jewish Studies**

**Alfred Wong , Chair of the Curriculum Review and Approval**

Committee

(CRAC), introduced this first of four consent items from CRAC by noting that the College of Humanities and the Department of Jewish Studies recommend the addition of JS 633/HIST 633 to the minor in Jewish Studies.

**Caroline Harnly** asked about whether the total number of units will remain the same. **Susan Shimanoff** explained that this course replaces a course in the core with no change in total units.

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

**Jerry Duke** asked whether the proposal should mention the deletion of courses. Shimanoff pointed out that the attached documents show the current Bulletin copy and the proposed change. Duke followed up by asking whether the course being deleted will be going into the electives.

**Laurie Zoloth** explained the new course changes the focus in the core to history as a discipline within Jewish Studies, tied to a series of courses.

**M/S/P (Duke, Steier) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #11 - Proposed Revisions to Bachelor of Science**

Degree in Business

**administration Distributed Office Systems Concentration**

**Wong** summarized the proposed revisions in the Concentration in Distributed Office Systems: revisions include changing the concentration name to Distributed Commerce Systems, and adding and deleting course from the list of electives to reflect the rapidly changing high-tech environment.

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

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

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

**Agenda Item #12 - Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of**

Science Degree in Business Administration Concentration in Computer Information Systems

**Wong** explained that this revision consists of adding a JAVA language track option and additional elective courses to the concentration to reflect the rapidly changing high-tech environment.

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

**Gail Whitaker** noted that "option" is problematic in Bulletin copy, as it is equivalent in the CSU to "concentration." She suggests changing this to "emphasis" or another appropriate term.

The suggestion to use "emphasis" was accepted as a friendly amendment by the department and college.

**M/S/P (Concolino, Hubler) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #13 - Proposed Revision to the Minor in Computer Information Systems**

**Wong** noted that the BACS department is proposing changes to the list of electives in the minor to reflect the rapidly changing high-tech environment.

**M/S/P (Sayeed, Steier) to second reading.**

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

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

**Agenda Item #14 - Proposed Reinstatement of the "U" Grade**

**Academic Policies Committee (APC) Chair Hu** introduced this proposal to terminate Academic Policy #S83-109. In re-examining our grading systems, it was found that this policy is in violation of Executive Order (EO) #268 (from 1977). Thus, it is imperative that SFSU reinstate the "U" grade.

**Gregory** asked for a reminder on the retreat from the "U" grade. **Penelope Warren** remarked that one problem was that students did not know what it meant to them, and some thought there were no consequences for their grade point average. Gregory followed up by suggesting that those are some of the same students who do not "discover" until their second semester senior year that they are required to take JEPET between 54 and 72 units. **Robert Cherny** recalled things a bit differently, noting that some people thought this was raising our standards to give "F's" instead of "U's," though he found the "U" to be an appropriate grade. **Helen Goldsmith** remembered her support of the "U" grade but emphasized the need for educating everyone on this campus about its use and abuse.

**Harnly** asked how dropping students who are not showing up in the first weeks links up with the "U" grade. Hu replied that faculty can still drop students using the bubble drop. **Vaughn** suggested that the "U" is particularly for those students who have been coming regularly but disappear all of a sudden. Gregory suggested adding to the policy language that this is intended to describe the performance of students who "disappear" after the formal drop period.

**Robert Williams** asked if this language will be on the transcript. Hu said that the transcript explains each letter symbol, and Goldsmith elaborated that it is explained as an unauthorized incomplete. Vaughn added that there is more expansive language in the Bulletin.

**M/S/P (Gregory, Hu) to second reading.**

**Steier** asked what advantage having the U provides us. Vaughn answered that, first, it puts us in compliance with the Executive Order and it provides another option. Goldsmith added that another useful use of the "U" is in providing evidence of extenuating circumstances for late semester problems that might be different than "F's."

Harnly asked if Gregory's friendly explanatory language is included in what we are voting on. Steier offered the following language for Bulletin copy: "The symbol 'U' indicates that an enrolled student did not drop or withdraw from the course before the published dates to drop or withdraw without penalty and that the student failed to complete a substantial portion of the course requirements." The Senate agreed to include clarifying language.

**M/S/P (Duke, Steier) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #15 - Resolution Regarding Faculty Merit**

Increase Program and CSU-CFA Contract Negotiations

**Gregory** introduced this consent item from the Senate Executive Committee by making note of an Executive Committee change in the penultimate resolve clause: "That any future CSU 'merit pay' program be modeled on the principles articulated in the final report of the CSU Academic Senate Merit Pay Task Force of the Academic Senate CSU; and be it further" Gregory explained this change by first referring to the attached report from the CSU Merit Pay Task Force, noting the difference between the final recommendations and the principles that underlay those recommendations. The Executive Committee is not inclined to guide anyone toward a particular model, but that the principles are ones that we would want to see adopted.

**M/S/P (Cherny, Steier) to approve the resolution.**

**Cherny** spoke to the motion by providing background on the CSU Academic Senate Merit Pay Task Force. This committee conducted a great deal of investigation: we talked to faculty members at every CSU campus, reviewed collective bargaining agreements from across the country, interviewed experts in the field, interviewed a former member of the Board of Trustees who is also a CEO. The final report is an effort to bring all the sources together in a set of recommendations, and the Task Force members have been disappointed that the recommendations have not been followed. By re-endorsing these principles, this may have some effect on the negotiations for the successor agreement.

**Duke** asked if the new language of the penultimate resolve clause replaces the original penultimate resolve clause. **Vaughn** affirmed that this was indeed so.

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

**Dan Fendel** spoke in favor of the resolution. He noted that this resolution speaks to future contract negotiations while he has received news of review for the current process. He would like to see the resolution say that nothing should proceed until things have been clarified. Vaughn replied that our intent was to not merge the two issues: contract negotiations for the future and the local situation. She added that the situation for this spring is still under review. Harnly asked when such discussion would be appropriate given the deadline of February 16 for FMI committees to proceed. Vaughn answered that she is still in conversation with University Counsel and the President with the goal of making progress on the issues around spring review.

Gregory spoke in favor of retaining the separateness of the two issues, adding that we should remind ourselves and our colleagues that the FARs themselves are not due for some time.

**Sayed** asked about the possible impact of this recommendation.

Cherny responded by first noting the final resolve clause, which lists who will receive this resolution. This is advice to the Chancellor and CFA regarding the process of bargaining that should begin soon. Vaughn added that there are other campus senates which are considering similar resolutions, and she also recalled President Corrigan's wish for responses on how to proceed with merit pay, and this resolution is a response to that request for suggestions.

**Mitch Turitz** asked if these recommendations can take place on this campus without negotiations at the Statewide level. Vaughn replied that this is directed statewide.

Gregory clarified the nature of this resolution: it does not put us in a position as an Academic Senate of doing anything or negotiating; what this does is to say to the Chancellor, CFA, and the Board of Trustees that we want them to pay attention to some carefully thought through principles if a merit pay program is included in the upcoming round of bargaining. Cherny added that it is appropriate for an academic senate to do this: HEERA reserves to Academic Senates decisions about criteria and standards, including criteria and standards for merit pay. This has nothing to do with whether we on this campus go through a FMI process this spring.

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

The vote was taken and the resolution was **approved without** dissent.

The Senate was adjourned at 3:35.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane Johnson

Secretary to the Faculty

**Meeting Date (Archive):** Tuesday, February 20,  
2001

---