Minute - m02-22-05

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

MINUTES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2005

2:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Meeting

Attendance:

Abella, David
Gonzales, Dan
Ritter, Michael

Alvarez, Alvin
Gonzalez Marty
Scoble, Don

Axler, Sheldon
Gregory, Jan
Smith, Brett

Bartscher, Patricia
Gerson, Deborah
Steier, Saul

Bernard-Powers, Jane
Guerrero, Jaimes
Stowers, Genie

Bernstein, Marian
Heiman, Bruce
Suzuki, Dean

Blando, John
Irvine, Patricia
Todorov, Jassen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrington, Christopher</td>
<td>Hom,</td>
<td>Marlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelberg, Gene</td>
<td>Klingenberg,</td>
<td>Larry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Yu Charn</td>
<td>Langbort,</td>
<td>Carol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvin, Caran</td>
<td>Li,</td>
<td>Wen-Chao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contreras, A. Reynaldo</td>
<td>Liou,</td>
<td>Shy-Shenq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigan, Robert</td>
<td>Mak,</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehrman, Kenneth</td>
<td>Meredith,</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielden, Ned</td>
<td>Nichols,</td>
<td>Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia, Oswaldo</td>
<td>Noble,</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemello, John</td>
<td>Palmer,</td>
<td>Pete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Absences:**
Boyle, Andrea  
(exc); Daley, Yvonne; (exc); Fung, Robert (exc); Kim, John (exc);
Midori, McKeon (exc); Morishita, Leroy (exc); Trijilo, Michael

**Guests:**
Benno Nagel, Kevin Soares, Mikhail, Osipov, Marie Serrano, Jeff Johnson, Tracy

Cumming, Tim Pridmore, Justin Switzler, Gnia Archimede, Mido Gordon, Batbileg Bor, Luis

Cortes, Scott Hand, Matt Pederson (supporters of the SFSU Athletics Program).

Suzanne Dmytrenko, Denise Fox, Gail Whitaker, Marilyn Verhey, Ann Hallum, Dan Butltaire,

Michael Simpson, Mitch Turitz

**CALL TO ORDER:** 2:14 p.m.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Colvin announced that there would be a meeting on campus regarding the lower division transfer issues with campus representatives from other community colleges around the Bay Area to talk about transfer patterns within the 30 disciplines under discussion in the CSU. A report would follow at the March 29 senate meeting.

Colvin also announced that online voting for the selection committee for the search for a new VP of Advancement. An email had been circulated the day before announcing nominations for this search committee.
Colvin urged senators to be alert to their college elections for university and college committees.

The March 8 senate meeting would be a town hall meeting with Leroy Morishita to discuss the revision to the campus' physical master plan, with a special guest, new member of the Board of Trustees Jeffery Bleich, in attendance. No agenda will be distributed.

Secretary Fielden noted that the campus would be participating in a system-wide large scale assessment of a test developed in conjunction with the non-profit testing service ETS, to be called the ICT initiative. Senators had a handout at their places that outlined the purpose of the initiative and some details regarding the test, which would be occurring in a ten-day period beginning March 4. Senators were encouraged to share this information, which would also be distributed to colleges and departments. Senators were urged to encourage undergraduate students to sign up to be test-takers. Incentives for the students included a 25 dollar gift certificate and a chance to win an iPod in a lottery (50 to 1 odds.) The test was designed to test Information communication Technology proficiencies, and could potentially be utilized by the campus in several ways.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Vice-chair Williams reported on the senate chairs' meeting on February 10 with topics that included the applied doctoral degrees to be jointly offered by the CSU and UC systems. Academic technology forums were also on the horizon, with the goal to help CSU leaders learn about issues in academic technology. Williams noted the senators' concern whether this was an opportunity to use technology to increase class sizes.

Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) an arm of California Education Round Table, whose mission involves preparing students for the workplace, had concerns that included students transferring from community colleges to the CSU. One issue for our campus was that this group had the attention of the legislature, particularly regarding K-12 education. There did not seem to be enough concern about graduate education, and there was a need to keep aware of what this group was doing. He mentioned the Institute for teaching and learning and summer scholarships, and what kind of support faculty needed to be better teachers. Lastly there was the student grievance process issue with the most important element being that senators know what process was present at the department, college and university levels, and that everyone needed to know that the grievance process existed and was in a position to serve its purpose.
AGENDA
ITEM #1?APPROVAL of the AGENDA for FEBRUARY 22, 2005

AGENDA
ITEM #2?APPROVAL of the MINUTES for FEBRUARY 8, 2005

Senator Abella asked that on page 3, Agenda item 6, in the first reading the minutes list the action phrase m/s/p? when in fact the item had not actually passed.

Yee, Gregory m/s/p

Statewide Senator Gregory expressed thanks to Chelberg as last session?s visiting minute taker.

AGENDA
ITEM #3?REPORT from SUZANNE DMYTRENKO, UNIVERSITY REGISTRAR & DENISE FOX, AVP, HUMAN RESOURCES, SAFETY & RISK MANAGEMENT: EMPLOYEE STUDENT INFORMATION PRIVACY (ESIP) WEB TUTORIAL

Fox announced that there was now a brief, twenty-minute tutorial mandated by the chancellor?s office that provided education to faculty and staff regarding student privacy and security. In past campus employees had had to sign confidentiality requirements, and this tutorial would negate this need. It was on the verge of being launched, and would be available March 9. All faculty and staff would be required to view the tutorial, which Dmytrenko would describe. This was a quiz that could be taken anytime, anywhere.

Dmytrenko indicated that campus already had a tutorial up on the web that dealt with privacy issues and contained a test, and this served as a beginning point for this newer product. It would be a one-time requirement for all employees. If an individual staff member did not have access to the web, their office could do one-on-one training. There were a number of key issues that all employees needed to be understood. New information would be included at a later date.

Senator Gregory posed what she surmised was a dumb question, as to whether the use of the word ?PC? excluded Macintosh computers.

Dmytrenko responded that the tutorial would work on any platform, any browser.
Statewide
Senator Yee thanked for the report, and asked about monitoring compliance.

Dmytrenko responded that it would be possible to see who had completed the training. No real deadline was envisioned yet but that the motivation was that no one would be able to access student records without doing the tutorial.

Fox indicated that the tutorial was educational in nature, rather than something just to pass.

Senator Heiman asked about those dumb enough to have done the earlier version, whether they would still need to complete this new version.

Dmytrenko responded in the affirmative.

AGENDA
ITEM #4?REPORT from DAVID ABELLA, CO-CHAIR, STUDENT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE: ATHLETICS FEE REFERENDUM

Senator Abella spoke as Co-chair of the Student Advisory Committee and as a participant for the past two years. He indicated that the Voter pamphlet in front of senators had been approved by the committee last week, and concerned the March 14-16 referendum, and provided some background. Last year the students had voted on four items in a referendum. Athletics had been on the ticket and had lost by a very narrow margin, unlike the other items which had been approved. Since then, reductions had taken place with five sports lost. Based on this and the narrow margin for victory, the president had charged the committee to review this action, resulting in two town hall sessions, the first focused on the athletic community, the second with a more general focus. The response from the community was that athletics should be supported again. The committee was charged to do a survey, with strong campus support indicated. Alumni, faculty, and staff were all committed to the program. Realistically it seemed unlikely that general fund support could be expected in the near future. The only real source of support would be a student fee increase. To build a stable program, campus would need this.

Currently students paid $24 to the athletic fund and the proposal would increase the fee by $17. He mentioned the difference between Intramural and other sports. The fee would rise in future years, until year 5 when the fee would be pegged to the CSU fee percentage increase. He spoke to the need for stable funding.
As to process, the proposal had come to the committee over a month ago; the committee responded with diligence and had to consider its referendum policy. It was necessary to waive the 60-day notification period, and the 30-day pamphlet notification period. The whole process normally needed a whole year, but circumstances suggested a change in policy in this particular case. His feeling was that support of the athletic department helped make SFSU a university. If this passed, the whole athletic department would be funded by student fees, so he expressed some hesitancy in having student fees assume the entire burden. Second, looking at fee increase, there were also some issues for the year 2009-10 when fee would hit a phase adjusted to the university budget. The university would still not be contributing any general fund support. As a student, he thought it desirable to keep athletics.

Senator Yee thanked Abella for his efforts and observed that SFSU had a relatively low athletic fee compared to other campuses, and she questioned an item on the inner panel of the pamphlet as to what the budget increase meant.

Senator Abella responded that he did not know exactly how that particular provision would play out. He deduced that it was based on the general fund support given to campus, the percentage increase allocated for that.

Senator Velez asked about what intercollegiate sports had been discontinued.

Senator Abella responded that M/W swimming, M/W outdoor track, Women’s tennis and Women’s volleyball had been cut, but that volleyball would come back.

Senator Axler had concerns about the percentage of athletic moneys going to intramural sports, which seemed rather small.

Director of Athletics Michael Simpson responded that the actual budget for intramurals would double with the passage of the measure.

Colvin asked for the information to this question return back to senate.

Vice-chair Williams noted that faculty had encouraged the student vote and hoped it continued.

Senator Abella thought this a good note to end on, as he had a strong belief in student voting. Students did not always vote in large numbers, yet he had been encouraged by the large turnout the previous year. Faculty had been encouraging, and the stakes were high now.
Senator Suzuki asked where the pamphlet would be available and how it would be distributed.

Senator Abella responded that distribution places included the student building, the administration building, the library, all across campus. The Website location was listed on the front page with more information.

Senator Chelberg indicated that an email had already gone out to students and would be repeated.

Senator Abella indicated that this had already happened, and that the committee would employ as many avenues as possible.

Chair Colvin indicated that Axler’s question would go to the student committee for a response.

**AGENDA**

ITEM #5?REPORT from OSWALDO GARCIA, CHAIR, ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE:

UPDATE from the TASK FORCE on GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

Chair Colvin commented on this update on the committee’s activities, and was hopeful that the report would serve to engage the campus community in discussion. She urged senators to regard Garcia as the “messenger” of the committee.

She thought that this topic needed to be on the senate’s agenda for the rest of the semester, as it was a difficult issue, and hard to handle in the normal first and second reading format to reach resolution. Ideas needed to get placed on the table for discussion, the only way to make good policy.

Senator and Chair of APRC Garcia began with some background. APRC was about to finish its fifth cycle of review and each cycle had proceeded according to senate policy. A ten-member task force had been constituted in the fall, with the goal of a draft for the senate early in the spring semester. The focus had been on the most pressing issues first. One priority that emerged in aftermath of the last WASC accreditation review was some noted deficiencies in graduate programs at SFSU. The committee had to deal with this without abandoning its other tasks.
The task force has developed a draft policy that would have further discussion in committee later this week. Some careful analysis was required so that the committee’s evaluation could guide university policy and process. He noted that the document took a historical view of the cycles of review and included new items that had not been included in the past. He spoke to the currency of graduate programs, and the need to set standards for quality, which had only marginally been done before. Some accrediting bodies handled individual programs, but there were issues university-wide regarding graduate programs. The document intended to include specific standards to be considered as a ‘floor’ and that each department would be able to define their own standards. Some things to consider were: number of students per program, graduates per year, administrative requirements, course offerings, most of this detail had not been present in past. He was not prepared to discuss all the details at this time, but felt the need to present this to the campus community beginning with the senate.

Senator Suzuki asked if there was any chance of coordinating these reviews with reviews from those units that had outside accreditation reviews, so that two reviews could be done at the same time, and not do two reviews.

Garcia responded that it seemed to make sense to coordinate these two different reviews, and that perhaps campus might ask further questions at the same time.

Senator Suzuki asked who would be contacting outside reviewers, and who would be doing the extra work.

Garcia differentiated between the task force and APRC. The task force would need to develop feasible guidelines.

Senator Stowers commented about APRC in general. From recent senate experience, it was apparent that program reviews were not that useful in developing policy for suspension and discontinuance. She hoped for some notion of quality indexes to be developed and observed that a lot of program reviews did not do this.

Garcia was aware of this, and commented on the disconnect between the discontinuance proposals and APRC reviews. Campus needed better standards, but also needed to recognize that ‘one size does not fit all.’ Departments need some autonomy, ability to make their own decisions, yet there were some university issues too.

Senator Velez asked whether these guidelines would be aligned with assessment activities.
Garcia thought this a good question. Assessment had not been so important in the past, and had not even had much in the way of resources. This was addressed in the new policy.

Senator Yee thanked Garcia, and spoke to the importance of student advising at the graduate level. She asked if there were any plans to develop roadmaps, visual aids, or the like for graduate students, to provide guidelines for timely graduation etc.

Garcia agreed with this suggestion. He hoped the committee would go beyond this, and consider not only how to make it easier for graduate students, but also to address admission requirements.

Chair Colvin noted that a time certain had been reached, and asked permission to extend discussion.

Senator Heiman spoke as member of both APRC and task force and thought it appropriate to put all the cards on the table. He asked if Garcia would address the size of APRC and the workload issues involved.

Garcia responded that APRC had a well-defined workload, but faced a very intense task. Normal workload guidelines were in place, but the job takes a long time to finish. The new policy might dictate a revision of the guidelines, but if the committee already were booked, it would not be able to do this. The committee might require more members from senate to be included in their roster to finish their work.

Garcia requested senators to contact him if they had any good ideas, and he expressed hope to have a new draft for the next meeting.

Senator Stowers suggested that Dean of Graduate Studies Hallum and her office had done some data collecting and analysis, which had never before been available.

AGENDA

ITEM #6?RECOMMENDATION from the EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE: DISCONTINUANCE of the MINOR in CALIFORNIA STUDIES PROGRAM, 2ND reading

Chair Colvin noted that she had received a message from the dean of BSS who held a preliminary meeting to solve issues regarding the California Studies program. She asked for further time for the college to reach a balanced resolution and would entertain a motion to postpone the motion?s second reading to March 29.
Carrington, Gerson m/s/p

Unanimously passed.

AGENDA
ITEM #7 RECOMMENDATION from the FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: RESOLUTION in SUPPORT of a UNIVERSITY CLUB, 1st reading

Pong, Fehrman m/s

Senator and chair of FAC Pong indicated that the committee had strongly endorsed this resolution given the urgency of the situation. Finding a permanent home for the University Club (UC) seemed highly important.

Senator Yee thanked Pong and the committee. She spoke in favor of the resolution, and provided an informational update from the Board of Directors (BOD) for the UC. The BOD was here today to hear advice from the senate. The UC had been in the Franciscan building since the mid 70s, a building that would close this year to accommodate the library renovation. A study had been conducted to find another home, which outlined the advantages and disadvantages of every option. No viable space options existed. Now there was a plan of action in place. Core paid membership was low, income was poor, and strong campus interest was insufficient for support. Despite all efforts, membership and attendance were down. Statistics indicated some 462 members in 1997, a number which was now down to 167 as of today. In 2004 income was $45,000, and expenses were $53,000: a loss of $8,000. The various issues were listed on the handouts. The BOD had passed two items of business: payroll deductions would begin to cease and all operations would terminate by June 3. The UC would still commit to graduation ceremonies, but could not continue after that. The BOT had tabled a motion to dissolve corporation. They had also tabled discussion and any move to handle residual funds, but needed to decide these last two issues soon. She appreciated the resolution from the senate, but sought guidance on how to proceed from here.

Senator Heiman asked about the cost of membership and benefits to the members.

Senator Yee replied that membership dues were indexed proportionally to salary, specifically 1 percent of an individual’s salary. Benefits included use of rooms through reservation, parties, other special activities, receptions, and campus-wide activities.
Turitz thought that the last "resolved? clause in the resolution might be superfluous.

Senator Ulasewicz remembered an earlier survey that had been done and asked what exactly the UC wanted from the senate.

Senator Yee indicated that the senate has offered advice in past. Do we want to dissolve, is there reason to continue.

Senator Meredith encouraged suspension of the corporation rather than disbanding completely. Any issues of liability might be handled by a member vote.

Chair Colvin indicated that this resolution would return at second reading at the next senate meeting.

AGENDA
ITEM #8?RECOMMENDATION from the FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:PROPOSED POLICY for a FACULTY HONORS & AWARDS COMMITTEE, 1ST Reading

Pong,
Meredith m/s

Senator and chair of FAC Pong indicated that past senate chair Cherny had provided good guidance in this area. FAC had conducted a broad review of programs at other CSU campuses, and had developed this current document to help honor our faculty and recognize their achievements.

Senator Gregory thought this a good idea, especially in context of the current low morale situation on campus. She thought it wise that we look at ways to contribute to the university community in this manner. On line 21, it did not seem clear what "established procedures? meant. Also, she suggested that some way of making sure that the process did not follow that of the previous effort, the OPA, which was flawed, be found.

Pong responded that the intent in line 21 was that the committee would establish the procedure.

Senator Velez noted that it would be up to the committee to decide what the award looked like and how it was handled. If a monetary award was included, the committee would decide that too.

Senator Gregory would be happy with greater precision in the process description.
Pong responded that there was no intent to create a competitive award, but rather a distinguished teacher award, that could be interpreted liberally and in multiple ways.

Senator Smith asked about the perspective from the staff, and asked whether there was a parallel structure or committee for staff on campus to do something similar.

Chair Colvin thought it appropriate to think about staff awards as well.

CEL Dean Whitaker responded that campus already had the ?star of the month? award with a yearly winner who received a sizable monetary award.

Senator Smith was aware of this, but thought it a different matter than something coming from the senate.

Senator Chelberg indicted that the bylaws had changed some years ago, when there was a staff seat on senate appointed by staff council, and that currently there was work on a process by which a staff member could be elected by staff to participate in the senate.

Senator Van Cleave thought the concept of recognition a good one, but noted that not all faculty teach, and encouraged an award that would include faculty who do not teach as their primary activity.

Pong expressed willingness to consider this.

Senator Palmer asked if there was any reason this process could not fall under the purview of FAC.

Chair Colvin asked whether FAC considered this.

Pong responded that FAC had thought that the awards current committee, for the honorary degree, might do this, and perhaps it would work to expand their charge. After some discussion FAC decided that the current committee did not take all the different elements of this new award into account, and thus drafted this new policy.

Senator Palmer responded that FAC included professional development under their jurisdiction.
Senator Ulasewicz asked about service learning.

Pong responded that this had been one of FAC’s concerns. OCSL (Office of Community Service Learning) has an award, but this new award would have a higher profile. FAC had given more guidelines to recognize faculty, not just for our own campus but nationwide.

Pong encouraged colleagues to look at the document and provide feedback. New faculty members had an opportunity to help craft this policy to honor faculty. He thanked FAC members for their work, particularly Senator Velez.

AGENDA
ITEM #9 ?ADJOURNMENT? 3:50 p.m.

Meeting Date (Archive):
Tuesday, February 22, 2005