

Minute - m04-02-02

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting

April

2, 2002

The

Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Vaughn at 2:10

p.m.

Senate Members Present:

Aaron,			
Eunice		La	
Alvarez,		Belle, Thomas	
Alvin	Edwards,	Langbort,	
Avila, Guadalupe	James	Carol	
Bartscher,	Fung, Robert	Levine,	
Patricia	Garcia,	Josh	
Blomberg, Judith	Oswaldo	Luft,	Steier, Saul
Boyle,	Garcia,	Sandra	Su,
Andrea	Velia	McKeon,	Yuli
Cherny,	Gerson, Deborah	Midori	Turitz,
Robert	Gregory,	Moallem,	Mitch
Colvin,	Jan	Minoo	Vaughn,
Caran	Harnly,	Nichols,	Pamela
Concolino,	Caroline	Amy	Warren,
Christopher	Hom, Marlon	Oñate, Abdiel	Penelope
Consoli,	Houlberg,	Pong,	Yip,
Andres	Rick	Wen Shen	Yewmun
Daniels,	Hubler, Barbara	Raggio,	
Robert	Jerris, Scott	Marcia	
Duke,	Kassiola, Joel	Shrivastava,	
Jerry		Vinay	
		Smith,	
		Miriam	

Senate Members Absent: Warren, Mary Anne (exc),

Strong, Rob (exc), Terrell, Dawn (exc), Sayeed, Lutfus (abs), Adisa-Thomas, Karima (abs), Ganji, Vijay (exc),

Higgins, Susan (abs), Gillotte, Helen (exc), Henry, Margaret (exc), Scoble, Don (exc), Collier,

James (exc), Corrigan, Robert A. (exc), Newt-Scott, Ronda (abs), Wolfe, Bruce (exc), Bishop, Anna (abs).

Guests: Paul Barnes, JohnGemello, DanButtlaire, Gail

Whitaker, Roy Conboy, Lisa Jordon, Mary Beth Love.

Announcements

Robert Cherny, CSU Academic Senator, encourage all Senators to contact their colleagues and to vote on changes to the statewide CSU Academic Senate Constitution.

Chair?s Report

Chair Pamela Vaughn encouraged all Senators who haven?t voted on the SFSU constitution and the CSU constitution to do so as soon as possible. Of particular concern is the voting on changes to the SFSU constitution. We are required to have a quorum of all voting faculty. If faculty need additional

ballots please contact the Senate office. Additionally, Senators should encourage their colleagues to vote. She reminded all Senators that balloting on campus-wide elections, college elections, and nominations for membership of the Provost search committee are also taking place.

Agenda Item #1: Approval of Agenda for Meeting of April 2, 2002

m/s/p (Oate, Consoli) to

approve the agenda

Agenda Item #2: Approval of Minutes for Meeting of March 19, 2002

m/s/p (Houlberg, Mary Anne

Warren) to approve the minutes as corrected

Agenda Item #3: Elections

Election of the Senate's representative to the Graduate Council.

Marlon

Hom was elected as the Senate's representative to the Graduate Council by acclamation.

Agenda Item #4: Draft Principles and Procedures for Temporary Suspension of Academic Programs

A small committee from the Senate Executive Committee and Academic Affairs consisting of **Pamela Vaughn, Caran Colvin, Barbara Hubler** representing the Senate, and **Gail Whitaker and Richard Giardina** representing Academic Affairs, have been working on principles and procedures for temporary suspension of academic programs. The goal of the principles and procedures is to bring some structure to an informal and previously ?unapproved? process of temporary suspension of academic programs. The principles and procedures will allow programs to have some flexibility in their curricular planning and revision without unduly disadvantaging students and other university programs. The Executive Committee feels that the attached draft would benefit greatly from comments and suggestions from the members of the Academic Senate. A copy of the draft was provided to all senators.

Chair

Pamela Vaughn

introduced the draft to the senate and indicated that its development was the result of discussion that came out of the IAC discontinuous process. The

Provost has completed extensive research on program "banking" and subsequent to that the committee was formed to develop and approve the process of program suspension. The principles and procedures agreed to by the committee and endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee are not before the Senate for debate and discussion. **Jan Gregory** asked

if it might be more useful to look at enrollment in the programs over a period of time (a few years) rather than just looking at current enrollment. **Pamela**

Vaughn, speaking for the committee, indicated that they were concerned with the students who are impacted with the decision and the time of suspension and not that concerned with the history. However, the committee is open to including consideration of changes in enrollment patterns over a period of time. **Jan Gregory** indicated that she would like to see all the points

about enrollment (past trends) to be included as part of the procedures for suspension of a program. **Rick Houlberg** suggested that consultation with students currently enrolled in the program was important and should be required in the process. He also indicated that a recommendation for suspension should start with the faculty in the program and not from administration. He also

indicated that it isn't clear what happens to the program at the end of the three-year period of suspension. Are we required to resume the program. **Pamela Vaughn** said all of these suggestions

will be included in the new draft. It is assumed that at the end of the three-year suspension the program would be revisited and the faculty would consider recommendation for resumption or discontinuance. **Robert Daniels** asked for an explanation of the difference between the suspension of a program and the discontinuance of a program? **Pamela Vaughn** pointed out that there exists a policy on the discontinuance of a

program but no policy for the suspension of a program. **Gail Whitaker**

indicated that the goal is to improve the situation so that the process is not abused. She indicated that **Mary Beth Love**, chair of Health Education, and **Roy Conboy**, chair of Theater Arts, have both used the program suspension process in the past and were present to indicate their experience. **Mary Beth Love** indicated that the department has found it very useful to be able to suspend a program while working on other curriculum items. Generally, it has been a resource issue; we just didn't have enough faculty members to work on all programs at once. The suspension has allowed us to look at other ways of offering the program such as extended learning or other options. The MA in Psychology: Concentration in Physiological Psychology has been "suspended" out of the Bulletin since 1994. That was also when the department discussed reviewing the MA as an outcome of their last program review. In the department's self study for the current program review cycle, we indicate that we have not completed the review of the MA but intend to complete it and provide recommendations in 2001-02. The department has developed a proposal--for either revision or discontinuance--regarding the MA. The department's external review is scheduled for April 29-30, 2002. **Pamela Vaughn** restated that SFSU does not have a policy on the suspension of programs. If we find suspension valuable then we should have a policy to establish procedures so that other programs on campus that may be impacted from the suspension can have an opportunity for input. Program suspension should not be left up to a phone call to the bulletin editor and then the program is gone. **Roy Conboy** indicated that the MFA in Theatre Arts: Concentration in Performance has been "suspended" since 1994.

We revisited the program during the fourth cycle of program review, and the MOU signed in May 2001 states that the College of Creative Arts and Department of Theatre Arts will "Explore possible options and opportunities to reactivate the MFA: Concentration in Performance."

We are still working on that. **Andres Consoli** commended the committee on their work and indicated that a policy on the suspension of programs should be useful. He indicated that it would be very helpful to consider the program's enrollment trends for the last few years. **Robert Cherny** suggested that the policy says that a program is being suspended is not clear, since what is being suspended is enrollment in the program. We should think of this as suspending new admissions in the program. It is important that faculty be the primary force in all curriculum discussions. **Miriam Smith** indicated that it is not clear from the draft as to who initiates the recommendation for suspension of the program. **Penelope Warren** asked Mary Beth Love if in her experience would the proposed draft assist in the suspension of programs. **Mary Beth Love** asserted that she had not looked closely at the proposed draft, but her general feeling is that an additional policy may be a burden to the process. She hopes that the new policy would just be another hoop to jump through. **Pamela Vaughn** indicated that the committee would look closely at the middle ground and seek to maintain department autonomy in program suspension. **Jan Gregory** asserted that most of the issues that senators have would be resolved prior to the program being considered for suspension. **Saul Steier** asked how would a course be continued if the program were suspended? **Rick Houlberg** pointed out that student consultation must be central to programs

suspension. He indicated that one of the reasons that suspension of IAC's program was such a controversy was that the students were not consulted prior to the decision to suspend the program. **Chair Pamela Vaughn** indicated that we had arrived at our time certain and we would extend to complete the speaker's list. Any Senators can email additional suggestion to members of the committee. Remaining on the speaker's list are **Levine** and **Duke**. **Josh Levine** asked for a clarification in the policy that it would be faculty who initiate the suspension process. He could see a problem when someone other than faculty would recommend the suspension without faculty approval. **Pamela Vaughn** indicated that the draft policy specifically states in the second sentence that no one factor can unilaterally suspend a program. **Jerry Duke** thanked the committee on a fine job. He asked how the three-year suspension time period was chosen. **Pamela Vaughn** indicated that the committee felt that three years was an appropriate length of time for a program to remain in suspension. She thanked the senators for a lively discussion and reminded all that the proposed draft is still in development and suggestions from senators or others are welcomed. A copy of the proposed principles and procedures may be found on the Senate website at: www.sfsu.edu/~senate. Comments or questions on the proposed principles and procedures may be directed to members of the committee.

Agenda Item #5: Draft

routing Sheet for First-Year Review of Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty

Caran

Colvin,

chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee introduced the proposed first year

retention routing form. She indicated that it is proposed that the new form would replace the current form. The Faculty Affairs committee has developed the proposed routing form to simplify the first-year review of tenure-track teaching faculty. The first year faculty member will no longer be required to produce a WPAF in his/her first year. The first year faculty member would receive vital information about department evaluation criteria and procedures through the use of the proposed routing form. The intention of the new form is to facilitate and assure that conversations between the first year hire and the department retention committee and the department chair take place. The form attempts to clarify the expectations of the department for the retentions and tenure of probationary faculty in their first year. The Faculty Affairs Committee has attempted to make the form as simple and self-explanatory as possible. The back of the form has a place to address these areas of retention and tenure as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Departments are encouraged to apply to this areas their own criteria for the various categories as found in the Faculty Handbook. The goal of the form is to clarify the first year experience for the new hire and make it clear to the new hire the department performance expectations.

The first year hire would still attach their curriculum vita to the form, as has been the practice in the past. This draft form has been sent to department chairs and program directors for their comments and suggestions. The proposed draft is before the Senate today for discussion, comments, and suggestions.

Rick

Houlberg

asserted that it is important to get department criteria for first year hires in writing and signed off by all levels of the review process. He indicated

that the backside of the form was too restrictive and needed to be more flexible as to the amount of space allocated to the different areas of retention as specified in the Faculty Handbook. **Scott Jerris** stated that he is strongly in favor of getting the specification and expectation for new faculty hires in writing. Additionally, he saw the form as a healthy activity for departments in getting them to write down exactly what they wanted in the performance activities of new hires. **Dean Kassiola**, as a member of FAC, elaborated on the presentation of the chair of FAC. The intention is to drop a lot of the paperwork and replace with the forum that would be more specific. He agreed with Rick Houlberg that a signature page is important. The goal is to use the first year's review to bring the candidate and department together to clarify how they are going to judge the candidate's performance. **Pamela Vaughn** indicated that the intention of the proposed new form is to get departments to be very clear about their criteria for retention review. **Mitch Turitz**, a member of FAC, supports the new form. He indicated that he would like to see the notation about the terminal years removed since this is in the first few weeks of work performance and a judgment concerning termination could not be made. He also believes that the department can change the second page as long as they address the areas of retention as covered in the collective bargaining agreement. **Midori McKeon**

strongly objected to the introduction of the new form. She felt that the criteria as established in the Faculty Handbook was flexible

enough to allow for each department and each new faculty member to express the criteria to reflect their own need and expectation. She believes that it is dangerous for a department to use a form that would limit flexibility in the process of review of faculty. The process of evaluation of new faculty must remain flexible to allow the faculty member to grow and the department to grow

as situations change. **Pamela Vaughn** indicated that the new form does not limit department flexibility. The form provides a guideline for what is expected. This new form can be very helpful for every department and new faculty. **Marlon Hom** suggested that this form is long over due. We need to give our new hires a sense of belonging here at SFSU and what is expected of them. Some departments do not have guidelines or established criteria for the review of first year hires. The departments that do have guidelines and established criteria can attach their guidelines as a replacement for the second page. **Robert Cherny** agreed with Marlon Hom and suggested that the second page is important only for those departments that do not have a department expectation. **Caran Colvin**, chair of FAC, indicated that it is the intention of the committee to make the second page as flexible as possible. The intent of the form is not to tell the departments what they should or should not do. In regard to the issue about the second or the terminal years, it was never our intention that the review occurs after two months. It could occur later. **Miriam Smith** indicated that she remains confused with the difference between campus and university non-teaching activities. **Andres Consoli** asserted that the document is much needed because it supports both the faculty member and the department in the development of expectations and criteria for the evaluation of job performance. **Tom La Belle**: A couple of comments, the document and the way it is written and the four "check all that apply" tend to shift the responsibility and the criteria to the department level. But the fact of the matter is the President makes the decision upon the advice of numerous people. I think it is important that we not bring a new faculty member here and have him or her believe that if he or she satisfies all of the criteria at the department level that it means that everything will be fine. Let me tell you how different departments are.

First: You may be all thinking that there is general agreement on how to interpret criteria. But in fact it varies widely. Just some examples: I often see that departments say that the individual teaching is above the department mean and I can imagine a department expectation would be that the individual student ratings are above the mean. But the department mean may be based upon three faculty members, or five faculty members or whatever. It may be based on certain kinds of courses and so on. Second: another is accreditation tends to influence - for example in business - accreditation influences a lot - of faculty expectations and they tend to have a particular formula of the way in which they count publications and the points system and so on, which is unique to business and that accreditation process. So in order to avoid a collusion course here and to - the collusion is setting up the department in which this basically implies - if not - if you go through it - and the last one says for example, "Department expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion agreed upon by the candidate and the department are attached to this document." It gives the impression that this is a contract and once the contract is fulfilled the individual is home free and clear. Here is a statement that if I saw in front of this "Check all that apply" I could live with for the most part the four things under check all that apply. Something like this - "I understand that the decision to promote and tenure is that of the president of the university upon the advise of faculty colleagues and administrators at department and college level, university level faculty committees as appropriate, and the office of academic affairs and the provost." To that end then you can go along - I have met with - I have met with and so on. But it tells the candidate that the department basically is a major component in this but alone does not set all of the criteria. The second page I have the same problem that Miriam had - expectation for university non-teaching activities - the further we get away

from senate policy on expectation for faculty promotion and tenure. We are setting ourselves up for revising that policy, I think, if you go this direction. One of the things, for example, I see in the personnel records is that a faculty member will come forward and say "I have been very much involved in my local church, I coached the local little league team, and so on." Sometimes that falls under community service - one of the test I use is whether or not the kind of activity in the community, or non-teaching, and I am not sure that I understand the difference between university non-teaching and community service in this listing. One of the ways that I believe that credit should be given is if the nature of the service is linked to the professional role and responsibility of the faculty member in the institution. So it should in some way be arguably an extension of the faculty member's or expertise knowledge in a field and not simply seeking credit for things that as a citizen of the United States, or a citizen of the community, or a citizen of the city, one might expect particular behavior. What I think the major point here is that I would stick as much as possible to the three categories of expectations and maybe break those out into more finite subcategories. Another one that might be problematic is personal collegial relationships. That is essentially an old black ball system. There are some signals here that you want to be careful here - not trying to pin down too closely. **Chair Pamela Vaughn** asserted that FAC can correct me but I think this list found its way here because they are all in the contract. FAC correction they are all in the senate policy. **Tom La Belle** asked: University Non-Teaching I don't believe is spelled out in the policy. **Pamela Vaughn** asserted that it is a category in the university policy. **Rick Houlberg** indicated that department and university retention criteria should be in writing. He is concerned about protecting the work and performance of the faculty member and

not protecting the criteria that the institution might develop. **Alvin**

Alvarez spoke in support of the development of the new form and indicated

the importance of clarifying the expectation we have of new faculty. He

believes it is healthy for a department to begin early to have a discussion

with the new faculty member about their mutual expectations. **Eunice Aaron**

thanked the senate for placing these items on the agenda and appreciates the

active and involved discussion of many senators. She

pointed out that the form had also been sent out to department chairs to get their

input. It is true that the president does have the final approval for tenure of

faculty; however, he does not have the time to review each individual faculty

criteria but relies on his staff for input. We must all seek to make sure that

people are treated fairly. **Jan Gregory** indicated that she strongly

supports the comments made by **Rick Houlberg**. She suggested that some of

the points of the confusion on the forum can be very easily taken care of with

a cover letter that will address the concerns of the difference interpretation

of the form and how it is applied. Lastly, there is a very long established

academic principle that it is the faculty who bear the primary responsibility

for faculty evaluations for retention, promotion, and curriculum development.

That principle is supported by this document. **Mitch Turitz** drew strong

exception to some who have indicated that the department criteria are not as

important at the higher levels of this institution. He suggested that if there

is no consultation between the higher level of the institution and the

department faculty on the criteria of evaluation for retention, tenure, and

promotion, then how are the candidates to know by what criteria they are to be

evaluated? **Chair Pamela Vaughn**

indicated that we had reached a time certain, but would extend time to complete

the speaker's list. Remaining on the speaker list are:

Cherny, Hom, and Harnly. Robert

Cherny, in response to those who have raised the issue of university policy. The policy for retention, tenure and promotion specifies that the departments draft the criteria for expectation of review. There is every opportunity for all levels of review to review the department's stated criteria and make comments. The departments draft their statements so all are clear regarding the criteria for evaluation. It does not preclude that other times and levels can vary, in which case it would be part of our discussion that there be a variation. **Marlon Hom** asserted that in the review process that the department is more important than the higher level because the departments have the expertise to create the most effective evaluation criteria. It does not undermine the higher levels of review. **Caroline Harnly** indicted that the form is not clear on who fills out the second page, whether it is the department chair, faculty committee or the faculty member. **Chair Pamela Vaughn** thanked all senators for the active and informative discussion. She reminded senators that the proposed form is a draft and will undergo many changes. The new routing sheet is proposed to replace the existing first year form. The intention of the new routing sheet is to encourage departments and first year faculty to establish mutual shared expectations for the retention process. A copy of the proposed first year routing sheet may be found on the Senate website at: www.sfsu.edu/~senate.

Comments regarding the new routing sheet can be sent to the chair of FAC **Caran Colvin** at ccolvin@sfsu.edu

Agenda

Item #6: Review of FAQs Regarding the Tentative Agreements- A discussion Item.

Chair

Pamela Vaughn

reminded Senators that a copy of the FAQs was provided with their packet of information for today's meeting. She introduced Jan Gregory who is responsible for putting the FAQs together. **Jan Gregory** indicated that the list of frequently asked questions with answers regarding the tentative agreement covers a range of issue. The document is a work in process and it is hoped that it will help explain items in the tentative agreement document. Additional questions can be addressed to Jan Gregory at jgregory@sfsu.edu.

A copy of the list of frequently asked questions may be found on the Senate website at: www.sfsu.edu/~senate. The

entire text of the new contract can be found on the CFA website: www.calfac.org. **Marlon Hom** asked since

the departments then do not make lecturer appointments how can the department play a role in their evaluation and selection? **Jan Gregory** indicated that the language of the agreement replaces any arrangement prior to the agreement. It would seem that the department would hire and evaluate lectures. **Mitch** Turitz suggested that the contract is new and that speculation on what may or may not happen upon implementation is not helpful. He recommended that we focus on real case scenarios and stay away from the ?what if? situations.

The

Senate adjourned at 3:37 PM

Respectfully

submitted,

James

Edwards

Secretary

to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive):

Tuesday, April 2, 2002
