

Minute - m04-01-03

MINUTES OF

THE ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING OF April 1, 2003

Senate Members Present:

Aaron, Eunice Avila, Guadalupe Bartscher, Patricia Bernard-Powers, Jane Bernstein, Marian Blando, John Blomberg, Judith Carrington, Christopher Chen, Yu-Charn Cherny, Robert Colvin, Caran	Consoli, Andres Daniels, Robert Edwards, James Fielden, Ned Fung, Robert Garcia, Oswaldo Garcia, Velia Gemello, John Gerson, Deborah Gill, Sam Gregory, Jan	Houlberg, Rick Jerris, Scott Johnson-Brennan, Karen Kassiola, Joel Klironomos, Martha McKeon, Midori Meredith, David Morishita, Leroy Nichols, Amy Palmer, Pete Pong, Wenshen	Raggio, Marcia Smith, Brett Steier, Saul Strong, Rob Su, Yuli Suzuki, Dean Terrell, Dawn Turitz, Mitch Vaughn, Pamela Warren, Penelope Williams, Robert
---	---	---	--

Senate Members Absent: Corrigan, Robert A. (exc), Yang, Nina (exc), Short,

Larry (exc), Stowers, Genie (exc), Smith, Miriam (exc), Gonzales, Dan (exc), Collier, James (exc), Otero, Aina J. (abs), Noble, Nancy (abs), Newt-Scott, Ronda (abs), Wolfe, Bruce (abs), (exc), Warren, Mary Anne (abs).

Guests:

Gail Whitaker, Marilyn Verhey, Dan Buttlair,

Ann Hallum, Jim Orenberg,

Jonathan Rood, Helen Goldsmith, John J. Kim, Donald Zingale,

Vicki Casella, Nancy Byl,

Linda Wanek , Cristina Ruotolo, Eva Chuck,

Gerald Eisman, Nancy Byl.

CALL TO ORDER 2:10

p.m.

Senate Chair Robert **Cherny**

noted that the honorary doctorate would be conferred on Peter Yarrow of the famous folks singing group of Peter, Paul, and Mary at commencement.

Senator Mitch **Turitz** announce

that on Thursday, April 3rd, there will be legislative hearings in Sacramento on the CSU Computer Management System (CMS). The system implementation is more than two hundred million dollars over budget. CFA is willing to reimburse anyone who want to go to these legislative hearing. If you want more information please contact Mitch after the Senate Meeting.

Senate Chair Robert **Cherny**,

on behalf of the Academic Senate, congratulated and welcomed our new Provost and continuing member of the Senate John **Gemello**.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Senate Chair Robert **Cherny**

noted that in December the Senate created the new Enrollment Management Advisory Committee and elected three faculty members to that committee. The committee has met twice. The membership of the committee consists of the Senate Chair, Chair of EPC (Senator McKeon) and Chair of SAC (Senator Gerson), and Senator Johnson-Brennan, along with two other faculty members who are not senators. At its first meeting the committee elected Darlene Yee and Karen Johnson-Brennan as the committee's co-chairs. The committee's first decision was to recommend to the President that the closing date for application for fall semester to be established as May 1st, which was accepted by the President.

It has been a very positive beginning for the committee. At the second meeting the various options were discussed on ways in which we can manage enrollment on campus. The committee will continue to meet and consider enrollment management options.

The other committee that is

generating a lot of interest at this time is the University Budget Committee (UBC). UBC has met several times and has scheduled an all day retreat, which will take place on April 17th. However, much of the business of UBC is on hold until it is determined the state adopts a budget. Today's Senate agenda includes a briefing on the state budget process.

AGENDA ITEM #1 - APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

FOR April 1, 2003

Senate Chair Bob Cherny outlined the procedure used to create the agenda. He indicated that it is his intent not to have any more time certain items than is necessary. Time

certain items are scheduled to accommodate guests who are required to be present when the item is discussed. The agenda is sequenced with second reading items first, followed by first reading items. Cherny indicated that agenda item 1, the presentation on the state budget approval process by Brian Murphy would be moved to a time certain items for 3:45.

m/s/p (Carrington, Colvin) to approved the

agenda as amended

AGENDA ITEM #2 -

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR March 11, 2003

m/s/p (Houlberg, Steier) to approved the

minutes as corrected

AGENDA ITEM #3 -

California Budget Approval Process Briefing by Brian Murphy, Executive Director of the Urban Institute (This item was moved

to a time certain of 3:45)

Brian Murphy presented a short briefing on the state budget process. He focused on how the budget will pass through the legislature and to final approval by the governor. The process is relatively straightforward. The governor and his department staff put together a budget during the fall of every year. The budget is presented in the first 10 days of January. That budget is the basis for committee hearings in the Senate and Assembly budget committees. Those committees have subcommittees numbering four, five, or six depending on how each house is organized. The CSU budget, for example, is heard in the Sub1 Education Committee of the Senate budget committee. Similarly, it is heard in the Assembly subcommittee on education and the budget. The state budget is not heard in the policy committees, Education Committees of the Senate and Assembly, despite the obvious nature of the budget having a profound impact on policy development. Everybody knows that what ever goes on the policy side does not mater unless there is budgeted money to support it. The governor presented this year's budget with either a 28 or 34 billion-dollar budget deficit, which is roughly, one third of the state budget. The governor made proposals on correcting for the deficit. The proposals by the governor included specific mid-year correction for this year's budget. Some, but not all of the requested mid-year corrections have been completed. Those that have not been completed will compound the budget deficit problems that we will face at the turn of the physical year. There is no agreement in the Senate or Assembly in regard to the budget cuts or revenue enhancements that would bridge the budget deficit. The Republicans and Democrats in both the Senate and the Assembly

must take the action to bridge the budget gap. This action is called the "end-game" in the budget deficit drama unfolding in Sacramento.

The budget subcommittees will begin hearings on the budget and the recommended cuts by the governor. The hearings are generally filled with constituents asking that their budget not be cut. Since the budget deficit is huge any cuts not taken from one constituent must be taken from another, or revenues must be raised. There is competition between programs each pleading their own special case. In the period between the introduction of the budget and the May revision of the budget by the governor, special pleading proceeds.

Two weeks ago the Community Colleges came to Sacramento and mounted a march and demonstration with over 7,500 participants in front

of the capital. That was an effective lobbying day for the Community Colleges.

The next day the CSU appeared with, an estimated 23 University Presidents, 23 student body presidents, about 23 senators, and various other governmental affairs personnel. All together the CSU had about 200 people for their lobbying day. The governor's budget had a much larger cut for the Community Colleges in comparison with the CSU, and it is very likely that some of the Community Colleges cuts will be restored. All of the lobbying and committee work comes together in May when the Governor provides the revised revenue estimate from the department of finance. The Governor then sends back to the Senate and Assembly a revised budget. It is always hoped that the revenues in May will be higher than expected so that the revised budget will have a small deficit.

Presently, the thinking in Sacramento tends toward the conclusion that the May revised budget will not be significantly different from the Governor's January budget.

In May, the Senate and Assembly continue the process of committee hearings with the Governor's new revised budget. These are the final numbers from the Governor. Those committees in the Senate and Assembly recommend their portion of the budget, and each of the committees, in both the Senate and Assembly, construct a budget. The various budgets are always different from each other and different from what the Governor had proposed. There is the requirement that on June 15 the two houses are supposed to pass their budgets and send them to a conference committee made up of three people from the Senate and three from the Assembly. The conference committee then produces a single budget by the first of July. This process has been successful twice in the last 20 years. It is normal not to have a state budget by July 1, and we should expect them to go beyond that date this year.

This year the process is complicated by three critical things. The first, and the one that is most critical, is that California is one of three states in the country that require

a two thirds majority to pass the budget. In California, in both houses, the Republicans have more than a third of the members. This allows the Republicans to control the final stage of budget approval. There can be no budget unless there is an agreement with the Republicans. The second thing is that the Republicans have announced that there will be no new taxes on their watch and have proposed an across-the-board budget reduction instead of raising taxes. The Governor's proposed budget depends on a 8.5 billion dollar tax increase. Historically, the Republicans have held firm and the Democrats have given up their position in order to pass a state budget. The best case for the CSU, if this were to happen, is that it would force the CSU to increase student fees by 105%.

m/s/p (Meredith, Aaron) to extend the Senate meeting to 4:15.

The Senate and Assembly committees that have the most impact on the budget process are the Senate Budget Committee and the Assembly Budget Committee.

The chairs of these two committees govern the process of budget formulation and approval. The place where it matters that voices be heard is between the May revise and the coming to conclusion on budget approval in August. Unfortunately, this is the period when most of us are on summer break.

AGENDA ITEM #4 -

Recommendation from the Educational Policies Council: Approval of the Joint Doctoral Program in Physical Therapy.

Senator Amy Nichols, chair of the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee introduced the item in second reading. She indicated that the proposal before the Senate reflects changes and revisions that were recommended at the last Senate meeting. Additionally, that the authors of the proposal have met with SFSU library representatives and assert that the library collection will adequately support the new degree program. The proposal has also been strengthened with the inclusion of the budget agreement between SFSU and UCSF. The faculty and administrator that were present to answer questions were Dr. Linda Wanek, Acting Chair, Department of Physical Therapy and Coordinator of the Graduate

Program; Dr. Nancy Byl, Chair Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation

Science, UCSF, School of Medicine; Ann Hallum, Acting Dean SFSU Division of Graduate Studies; Associate Vice President

Gail Whitaker; and Donald Zingale, Dean of HHS.

Senator Bernard-Power asked for clarification on the budget in relation to the proposed low student faculty ratio and its ability to self-support the degree program through student's fees alone? Gail Whitaker indicated that the proposed joint doctorate degree required just an additional year after the

completion of the MS degree and the MS degree has been established for some time and is state supported. Whitaker agreed that the SFR was low, but believed the fees generated from the student enrollment would self support the additional year. Senator Houlberg asked for clarification on the ability of the proposed soft money to support faculty and staff salary? If the program did not draw enough students would the faculty and staff hired for the additional year program be laid off? Gail Whitaker assured the Senate that they have looked very closely at the program and believe that it will be supported. Linda Wanek indicated that we are not talking about soft money in the traditional use of the term. Our past history with our first joint doctoral program demonstrated that, within a two year period, the program was completely enrolled. We feel that the enrollment pattern will be duplicated with this newly proposed joint doctorate and that it will be self-supporting.

Voting on the proposal - passed.

AGENDA ITEM #5 -Recommendation

from the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee: Certificate in Study of Public Accountancy.

Amy Nichols, chair of the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee, introduced the Certificate in Study of Public Accountancy. She indicated that her committee met with the accounting representative and noted that appropriate revision had been included. Additionally, Accounting Department faculty met with ASVP and Dean of CEL, Gail Whitaker and clarified issues that were raised in the last Senate meeting. Dr. Joanne Duke, Accounting Department, was present to answer questions.

Senator David Meredith asked if students are expected to complete the program in one year? Joanne Duke replied in the negative. Senator

David Meredith asked for clarification on how a student would be able to deal with the annual CPA changes in the program requirements? Joanne Duke indicated that the annual changes in CPA requirements evolve very slowly and will generate only minor changes in course content. Generally what happens is that CPA makes the change and it takes effect one year ahead. We then have a year to change course content to better serve our students. ASVP Gail Whitaker pointed out that the proposal has changed its entry requirement from a 3.0 GPA to a 2.0 GPA. However, to earn the certificate the student must have a 3.0 GPA in program course work. Senator Brett Smith asked for assurance that the 3.0 GPA requirements for the certificate would be calculated from program course work and not over all? Joanne Duke reemphasized that the certificate could only be earned when the student complete the program with a 3.0 GPA calculated for program

course work.

Voting on the proposal

- passed unanimously

AGENDA ITEM #6—Recommendation from the Faculty Affairs Committee: Revision of the Policy on Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness.

Senator Caran Colvin, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced the revisions.

The revisions add to the previously approved policy of a set of core evaluations items that, if approved, will be included in all departmental or college evaluations.

Senator Rick Houlberg asked for the total number of University mandated items?

Senator Colvin indicated that there would be a total of six items added to department forms.

Voting on the revision, passed without dissent

AGENDA ITEM #7—Recommendation from the Faculty Affairs Committee and Student Affairs Committee: Resolution Urging use of University-Assigned identification numbers in place of Social Security numbers.

Senator Caran Colvin, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), introduced the resolution in second reading (originally introduced

at the March 11th Senate meeting). Vice President and Senator Leroy

Morishita and Associate Vice

President Jonathan Rood were present to answer questions.

Senator Jane Bernard-Power asked if using the last four digits of the Social Security numbers would be simpler than going to all new numbers?

Senator Leroy Morishita indicated that using the last four digits of the Social Security numbers would incur the same security and privacy issues as with

using the whole number. Senator Mitch Turitz asked for clarification on the cost of assigning everybody

a new identification number? Senator Leroy Morishita indicated that the

change to new identifiers for students would be accomplished with existing

staff. On the faculty side the new identifiers would be accomplished when

we convert our HR to the new PeopleSoft software. Senator Mitch Turitz noted that the new

PeopleSoft software was in the news recently because of a problem of open

access to Social Security numbers. Have they fixed the problem? Senator Leroy

Morishita asserted that PeopleSoft

had agreed to fix the problem and would be assigning unique identifiers for

employees. Senator Brett Smith asked if the Social Security numbers would still be in

the system and accessible for some who need the information? Senator Leroy

Morishita indicated that the

Social Security numbers would be farther down in the systems and that the

unique identifiers would be overlaid on top of the Social Security numbers.

He also asked that staff be added to the second resolved clause. Senate Chair

Robert Cherny accepted the addition of the word staff to the second resolve clause as a friendly amendment.

Voting on the resolution

- passed unanimously

AGENDA ITEM #8—Recommendation from the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee:

revision of the B.A. Degree Major Program in Liberal Studies.

Senator Amy Nichols, chair Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC) introduced the proposal

for revision of the BA degree program in Liberal Studies. She indicated that

the proposal has the unanimous recommendation from CRAC is presented as a

consent item. Acting Undergraduate Dean, Helen Goldsmith and Professor Cristina Ruotolo were present to answer questions.

Goldsmith asserted that the

changes to the program would allow for better coordination and articulation

with other liberal studies program throughout the state. Senator Saul Steier asked for clarification

on the difference between the old program and what is being proposed? Goldsmith indicated that the changes include the addition of several new courses that

did not exist before and some minor changes in the options. We have also removed

several courses that are not longer offered. Senator Pamela Vaughn added that the changes

help to clarify the process and goes a long way in making the program comprehensive.

m/s/p (Meredith, Turitz)

to second reading

Senator Ned Fielden asked for clarification on the changes to the format?

Helen Goldsmith pointed out that the changes to the format provide much needed clarification

for the students and add a new look to the program.

Voting on the proposal - passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #9—Recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee: Designation

of Community Service Learning Courses in the Bulletin and on Students' Transcripts.

Senator Midori McKeon, chair of the Academic Policies Committee, presented

the recommendation for designating community service learning courses on the

students' transcripts. She indicated that one of the important rationales

for placing CSL designation on student's transcripts is that many graduate

schools are looking specifically at student's transcripts for community service

learning hours. The CSL hours will be noted next to the student's GPA information.

Both APC and SAC have reviewed and support the recommendation. Senator Deborah

Gerson, chair of the Student Affairs Committee indicated that her committee had

reviewed and discussed the proposal and support its

approval.

m/s (McKeon, Gerson)

to approve

Senator Pamela Vaughn asked if the office that published the bulletin had

been consulted? Senator McKeon indicated that they were informed and are fully aware of the need to designate CSL courses in the

Bulletin. Senator Bernard-Powers asked how would the CSL be monitored?

Senator McKeon indicated that the field supervisor or the course faculty members keep track of the CSL hours and report them using the web reporting system. Senator

David Meredith moved the recommendation to second reading in hopes that its passage will clear the Senate's busy calendar in two weeks.

m/s(Meredith, Vaughn) to second reading

Voting on the recommendation - passed unanimously

Senator Penelope Warren announced that we would celebrate Senate Chair Robert

Cherny's 60th birthday. Cake will be provided at

the end of the Senate meeting and all Senators and guests are invited to the

5th floor of the administration building, directly after the Senate

meeting, for an informal celebration in honor of Dr. Cherny. The senate sang

happy birthday to Bob.

AGENDA ITEM #10—Recommendation from the Executive Committee: Resolution

Mitigating the Effects of the Budget Crises in 2003-2004.

Senator Jan Gregory, acting on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee,

indicated that it is the intent of the resolution to support the administration

in the development of creative ways to avoid layoffs of lecturers and staff.

Layoffs are going to affect the quality of programs and campus life and it

is important that all parties: administrators, faculty, staff, and the CFA

leadership work together to avoid layoffs.

m/s (Gregory, Steier)

to approve the resolution

Senate Chair Robert Cherny reminded all senators that the resolution is in first

reading and will return in two weeks in second reading. Senator David Meredith asked that staff

be mentioned in the resolution along with faculty. He indicated that what

we want to do is to maintain instruction so we need to include all involved

in the instructional process. Senate Chair Cherny indicated that the suggestion for the inclusion of staff

along with faculty is accepted as a friendly amendment. Senator Saul Steier asked if the resolution

was intended to be directed just for lecturers? Senator

Gregory indicated that the dilemma would have to be resolved by the Executive Committee

before it comes back to the Senate in two weeks. Senator Mitch Turitz asserted that the

resolution's intent was basically to mean no layoffs for anyone: faculty, staff, lecturers, etc.

Senator Chair Cherny indicated that the resolution would return in two weeks.

AGENDA ITEM #11—Recommendation from the Executive Committee: Resolution Opposing Certain Provisions of the U.S.A. Patriot Act of 2001 and Endorsing Corrective Legislation.

Senator Jan Gregory, acting on behalf of the Executive Committee, introduced the resolution. She indicated that certain portions of the U.S.A Patriot Act adversely affect academic freedoms. The language of the resolution draws much of its language that was first used by the American Library Association. She indicated that other CSU Senates have passed similar resolutions. The resolution comes to the Senate with the unanimous support of the Senate Executive Committee.

Senator Marian Bernstein asked if the resolution could not be expanded to include similar safe guards from actions by the police and FBI. This could be added at the end of the third whereas. Senator Gregory stated that another whereas clause could be added that would focus on all law enforcement agencies. Senator Jerris indicated that a second Patriot Act was in the development stage and asked for another whereas clause that would focus on guarding against the erosion of civil liberties.

Senate Chair Cherny indicated that the proposed resolution would return in second reading in two weeks.

AGENDA ITEM #12—Information Item: External Review of University Literacy Program, information item from the Academic Policies Committee

Senator Midori McKeon, chair of the Academic Policies Committee, introduce a four page handout that outlined for the chronology of events that has led the committee to the recommendation for an external review of the University's literacy programs, the proposed recommendations from APC, and a copy of the memo sent explaining the recommendations to senate chair Robert Cherny, Provost Gemello and Dean of Undergraduate Studies Dan Buttlair.

She indicated that in late September of 2002 the APC was charged to examine the issues involving a possible external review of the university's writing programs and to make a recommendation regarding the specific nature and conditions of an external review if such a review were to be considered advisable. The APC constituted a subcommittee comprised of faculty members versed in literacy issues as well as key administrators. The subcommittee then established a sub-sub committee to look specifically at the external review issues. The sub-subcommittee and subcommittee presented their unanimous recommendation for an external review to APC. Their recommendation was unanimously supported

by APC. The external review will consider all SFSU graduate and undergraduate writing programs/policies and would also assess student literacy and support services needs, adequacy of fiscal and other resources available to address these needs. The review will also consider faculty time and expertise required for improving writing proficiency across the university, and administration of university literacy endeavors.

Senator McKeon acknowledge the following faculty and administrators for their diligent and professional work as members of APC's subcommittee and sub-subcommittee:

Senator Brett Smith, Sub-Sub Committee Chair, Student Affairs, DanButtlaire, Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Senator Jan Gregory, Graduate Essay Test Coordinator, College of Humanities,

Jim Kohn, Chair of the All-University Committee on Written English Proficiency,

College of Humanities, Kathy Mosier, Chair Graduate Council, Paul Sherwin, Dean College of Humanities, and Deborah Swanson, Coordinator of JEPET, College of Humanities.

Senator Rick Houlberg asked for an explanation of the purpose of the external review? Senator McKeon indicated that the purpose of the external review is to assist us in determining practices and policies most apt to improve the written English proficiency of all. Senator Christopher Carrington asked for clarification on the process of collecting and evaluating information from across the campus and all departments. He indicated that the amount of information would be large and wanted to know what mechanism would be used? Senator McKeon indicated that the information would be gathered by the reviewers; first from previously obtained information and then new materials would be added through a review of new documentation and interviews. All departments would have the opportunity to supply additional information as necessary. She agreed that there will be a lot of information and that it will take a great deal of time to properly evaluate it all. That is one reason for having external reviewers who can devoted much more time to the process than an on campus unit. Senator Gregory indicated that it is important to remember that we all have a stake in improving the written English proficiency of our students. The purpose of the external review is to provide us with an unbiased review and to help us clarify our goals.

AGENDA ITEM #13—ADJOURNMENT

Senate adjourned

at 4:15 PM

Respectfully Submitted

James Edwards, Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, April 1,
2003