

Minutes: March 11th, 1997

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

MINUTES OF MARCH 11, 1997

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

Senate Members Present: Sanjoy Banerjee, Paul Barnes, Patricia

Bartscher, Sally Berlowitz, Marian Bernstein, Janet Buchholz, Rosa Casarez-Levison, Yu-Charn Chen, Michelle Cheng, Robert Cherny, Robert Corrigan, Jerry Duke, Gerald Eisman, Ken Fehrman, Newman Fisher, Ann Hallum, Jennifer Hammett, Caroline Harnly, Mary Ann Haw, Marlon Hom, Bonnie Homan, Rick Houlberg, Todd Imahori, Dane Johnson, Herb Kaplan, James Kelley, Thomas La Belle, Wanda Lee, Lois Lyles, Hollis Matson, Eunice Aaron, Eugene Michaels, Joel Nicholson, Abdiel OÃ±ate, Raymond Pestrong, Mark Phillips, Mario Rivas, Don Scoble, Peggy Smith, Lana Thomson, Thaddeus Usowicz, Marilyn Verhey, Kenneth Walsh, Mary Ann Warren, Penelope Warren, Nancy Wilkinson, Alfred Wong, Yim Yu Wong.

Senate Members Absent: Patricia Wade(exc.), Helen Goldsmith(exc.),

Darlene Yee(exc.), Dawn Terrell(exc.), David Hemphill(exc.), Roberto Rivera, Helen Gillotte(exc.), Peter Haikalis(exc.), Will Flowers(exc.), Gary Hammerstrom(exc.), James Collier, Lee Sprague(exc.), Gerrie Baughman.

Senate Interns Present: Sabrina Mehrok.

Guests: G. Whitaker, D. Schafer, K. Monteiro, N. Fielden, L.

Patterson.

Announcements and Report

Chair's Report

- There will be an open meeting with President Corrigan, sponsored by CFA, to discuss PSSIs and other compensation issues. The meeting will be held Monday, March 17 in HUM 133 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
- Rigoberta MenchÃ³, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, is speaking on campus at 2:30 p.m. today in Malcolm X Plaza.
- Welcome to Rosa Casarez-Levison, a new senator from the College of Education.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting of March 11, 1997

The agenda was **approved** as printed.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting of February 25, 1997

The minutes were **approved** as printed.

Agenda Item #3 - Report from Vice President La Belle

Vice President La Belle reported that Dr. Carol E. Baker, Director of the

Office of Measurement and Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Pittsburgh was on campus March 3 and 4, at the invitation of the Academic Senate. The University of Pittsburgh has used an institutional-wide process for assessment of teaching for 20 years. Dr. Baker was here to discuss teaching evaluation instruments, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the collection of data, and the use of the evaluation results.

At SFSU, beginning in 1990, the Faculty Affairs Committee studied teaching evaluation instruments. A task force was formed to develop criteria for evaluation procedures for the enhancement of teaching effectiveness, to propose guidelines to improve procedures for assessment and to develop mechanisms for making resources available to faculty. The revised report was issued in 1996. That report includes a formative section which indicates that a portion of teaching assessment is to help a faculty member learn more about how s/he can improve teaching effectiveness.

La Belle felt that the emphasis has to be on the formative side. He said that formative feedback from the students should come early in the semester so that it can be used by the faculty member during that semester. He encouraged faculty are to use classroom assessment techniques available through the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching. He also said that peer coaching, informal classroom visits, and mentoring relationships could also be used in a formative manner.

La Belle added that the summative section is quantitative and used for evaluation. A department review of assessment tools is important to assure the instrument is reliable and valid and to insure that administration of the assessment tools is consistent. Peers can review teaching, advising, theses, and course development. Class observations are conducted annually. Faculty members can develop a portfolio including evaluation results, syllabi, video tapes, and other tools to show their teaching effectiveness.

La Belle felt that at SFSU, there could be common instruments used campus-wide to cover core questions. Variable items could be added to the evaluation form by the college, department, and/or faculty member. He said that efforts should be made to link what is learned through the assessment process to the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching so that a good support system is available. He felt that the Senate has laid a good foundation and it is time to build on that foundation.

La Belle said that his office is ready to try to provide the infrastructure to move ahead with improving teaching effectiveness. Chair Phillips added that while we make teaching the primary value on this campus, he felt that through a sloppy evaluation system, we may trivialize it. He added that we have a responsibility

to make sure we have the best data possible.

Eisman stated that Educational Technology Advisory Committee (ETAC) has been dealing with faculty intellectual rights, particularly as it applies to on-line courses. Since faculty are working on new ways of delivering instruction, these courses are still experimental. He said that faculty are trying to discover what works and what doesn't work and that evaluation of these types of courses needs to be different. ETAC will be bringing a proposed policy to the Senate when it is available.

Agenda Item #4 - Proposed Revisions to MS in Psychology: Concentration

in School Psychology

CRAC Chair Ann Hallum introduced this item and Psychology Department Chair **Ken Monteiro** as resource. **Hallum** stated that this proposal changes the name of the degree from M.A. to M.S., bringing the program in line with other programs. **Hallum** added that it was also recommended by the an APRC external review. **Monteiro** added that although there is no policy within the program for name changes, they are thinking about having applied programs be M.S. and research programs be M.A. **M/S/P (Matson, Hom)** to move to second reading. **M/S/P (Smith, Fehrman)** to close debate. The item was **approved unanimously**.

Agenda Item #5 - Proposed Revisions to the MA in Education: Instructional

Technologies

CRAC Chair Ann Hallum introduced this item and Instructional Technologies Chair Gene Michaels as a resource. **Hallum** stated that this proposal makes minor adjustments to the prerequisites to ensure that all students enter the program with a similar level of understanding, and that adjustments were made to the emphases is to reflect student enrollment by replacing the Instructional Media Production with Technology Integration for Teachers, the other two emphases remain the same.

Matson asked if there will be a different process to evaluate the level of knowledge of students with different backgrounds. **Michaels** responded that in terms of computers and video, all entering students should be at the same level. If they are not at the technical skills level, there are prerequisite courses they must take.

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

Wilkinson questioned whether two common courses are enough to comply with policy. Graduate Division Associate Dean Donna Schafer replied that there is currently no policy being followed with a specific number of common courses.

Michaels added that there are more than the three core courses in common since all students take other common seminars.

Eisman asked about the *Changes to Prerequisites* section on page 2. Number 4 states that students must demonstrate a basic level of video production skills. He asked what would happen if a teacher with limited vision applied to the program. **Michaels** replied that the situation has not occurred yet, but accommodations would be made if it does. **M/S/P (Fehrman, Smith)** to close debate. The item was **approved** unanimously.

Agenda Item #6 - Up-date on the Monterey Conference

Phillips described the statewide meeting concerning Cornerstones and the Review of the Baccalaureate : This meeting brought together faculty and administrators from all CSU campuses, students and trustees. There were a series of presentations about the four Cornerstone projects or directives and a report on the Baccalaureate study.

Phillips said that there are some things that Cornerstones single out as important that SFSU is already doing and/or CUSP is already addressing. This might present an opportunity for SFSU to have a positive contribution. He felt that there are some issues not being addressed by our campus. One issue is how much are we moving to a larger incentive system; how much of the funds that are given to a campus are based on how well certain criteria are met. A second issue identified as essential for us to pay attention to is whether Cornerstones might undermine some things that we as a campus perceive to be of high value.

Houlberg said that seeing what the system is dealing with in the future is positive. He felt that elimination of seat time, Carnegie unit, testing within individual classes, and the use of technology are major changes in what we do. He said that another positive at the conference was that he was able to see how this campus is different from others. Houlberg also saw that some other campuses have come up with alternative solutions to problems that we also have. He also felt that most of what happened could have been done via e-mail and did not necessitate a 20 hour conference.

Phillips further reported that SFSU and CSU LA were the only campuses with a significant number of delegates of color. This raised some further concerns about the degree of sensitivity by the decision-makers to access and other issues that are important to this campus. In terms of where do we go from here, he felt that the senate should wait for the written report which is not yet ready for distribution.

Matson asked what the delegates found good in Cornerstones. **Houlberg**

responded that identifying the problem might be seen as positive, Since what has been done on this campus has been insular, the dimensions are much larger. He said did not find answers at the conference.

Michaels said that the emphases that he had drawn from discussions with delegates included that undergraduate education is much more highly valued than graduate education and that large sections and distance education are also valued. If that happens, he felt that the CSU will start to resemble the community college system, not UC. The collapse of the BA will reflect the AA not the MA. Michaels wondered how accurate these are as thrusts of Cornerstones.

Cherny stated that he is generally positive about the process. He felt that the Trustees are proud of the fact that their experience has been different than the experience of the UC Regents. He said that when the UC Regents moved to eliminate affirmative action, they did not consult the faculty; when the CSU was considering remediation they consulted the public and the faculty and changed their position as a result. He felt that the Chancellor's Office and the Trustees were listening. In response to Michaels question, he felt the document stated a commitment to graduate and post baccalaureate education. He further stated that the document predicted a large unmet need for both and that the CSU needs to meet those needs.

Hallum said that her break-out group dealt with active learning. As one student in her group said, faculty need to be "the guide by the side, not the sage on the stage." She said that without funding, it is difficult to do active and distance learning. She felt that Cornerstones shows strong support for graduate and post baccalaureate education, however, with the possibility of economic differentiation for those programs, it may be difficult for some people to enter professional programs.

Hom said, paraphrasing Tom Ehrlich, this is the first time that the CSU has invited 500 faculty and administrators to participate in a process like this. Hom said he sees this as positive. He sees the three types of BA as potentially scary particularly if the general BA is seen as lesser or inferior to the specialized or technical BA. If resources are limited, how will access be provided particularly concerning diversity of students? Hom questioned if Cornerstones was looking at faculty recruitment and what types of faculty will be needed to meet these changing needs. He felt that the CSU will become suburban and that urban issues will be ignored.

Kelley felt that the conference was viewed as very important by the Chancellor and the Trustees. He felt it would be important if the Chancellor

and Trustees learned anything. He stated that both UC and CSU graduate enrollment has decreased while private university graduate enrollment has increased. He felt that the CSU needs to find ways to provide more graduate opportunities since UC will not do much. He said Extended Education may be used imaginatively by offering one day courses, short courses, and weekend education. One overall impression that he got was about changes based on external events. Kelley identified four externals that have had an effect on the CSU: the emancipation of the campuses by removal of the rules from the Chancellor's Office that constrained campuses; the need to depend on external funding through development; performance based salary increases which were driven by political pressures for accountability; and technology, which is not cheap, must be used in a judicious way.

Kelley felt that the message that the delegates in his group sent back to the Chancellor's office was the need to change the behavior from the Chancellor's predecessors who penalized initiative. He felt initiative must be rewarded.

Phillips added that different campuses will respond differently to the Cornerstones report. The content of the next volume of the report is not known. He felt that since it's been said that we need to maintain unlimited access with no increase in funds while maintaining quality, the approach to the legislature is important.

Smith questioned whether there were any staff or legislators at the conference. **Phillips** replied that the only staff there were working the conference, not attending it. He said that there were two students to represent all campuses and no legislators were present.

Matson thanked the senators who went and said that she appreciated some of the interesting answers. Phillips said that he doesn't know if faculty were heard at the conference. He doesn't know how open the process is and we won't know until further along in the process. He felt that the key is to pay careful attention to Cornerstones. CUSP will deal with it, the Senate will be kept informed, and the Executive Committee will deal with it.

The Senate was adjourned at 3:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Homan

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, March 11,
1997
