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CALL TO ORDER: 2:17 p.m.

State Senator Yee invited members to several UC club events: at noon April 27 members will be served a special lunch by ?celebrity? (administration) servers, the annual ?Are you being served?? luncheon. On Thursday May 12 from 4-6, there would be a farewell celebration for the UC club and on Friday June 3, a sale from UC furniture and property would take place.
Senator Chelberg gave an update on DoIT from the Executive Committee meeting, regarding the status of email servers and infrastructure. The recent slow email response would be remedied in the short term by installation of new servers by the end of April, which should permit a marked improvement to email performance. A much larger scale upgrade would occur the next year, with the massive project in conjunction with IBM.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Colvin reminded senators about nominations for senate positions with the memos currently circulating in the colleges.

Two senate meetings remained and the upcoming agendas included the all-university committee elections, with available information on the senate website; the clinical lab sciences revision; and a set of dance BA and minor revisions. On May 10 the senate would elect new senate officers and seat the new senate. The Executive Committee sought a strong senate pool of nominations. The secretary would not return to office but both chair and vice chair sought to continue, but the chair urged senators to nominate themselves or colleagues for service in the interests of conducting a wide-ranging and fully representative election.

CHAIR’S REPORT

Chair Colvin indicated that an overview of the program discontinuance process would be posted at the senate website by the next day, and urged senators to contact her or the senate office with further information or questions.

She offered a report from the Senate chairs’ meeting from the previous week, citing the major issue as the path to graduation. This essentially was a CSU response to the issue of facilitating graduation, and she indicated that the senate would hear the SFSU’s own campus response. Compared to other campuses, ours was unique in that it included people from the enrollment management side of the house to help create new ideas. Another major issue was the GE revitalization discussion, and she mentioned the prevailing GE wars on various campuses. SFSU had not revised GE thoroughly since 1981, and she was considering a meeting with Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies Goldsmith and Susan Shimanoff, chair of GEC, to think about a review. The initial question was whether it was realistic and necessary to review the GE program.

AGENDA ITEM #1 APPROVAL of the AGENDA for April 12, 2005
Senator and CRAC chair **Nichols** moved to amend item 7, clarifying for the record that the item arrived from both CRAC and the Graduate Council.

Approved.

**AGENDA ITEM #2?APPROVAL of the MINUTES for MARCH 29, 2005**

Senator **Morishita** desired that his presence at the previous senate meeting be acknowledged for the record.

Approved as amended.

**AGENDA ITEM #3?REPORT from HELEN GOLDSMITH, ASSOCIATE DEAN OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES: PATH TO GRADUATION TASK FORCE**

**Goldschmidt** indicated that the document in purple in the senators’ packets was a supplement to her remarks. She stated that this was a report of a task force that included Chair Colvin, Senators Brett Smith, Meredith, and Abella, and represented a summary of what the committee had done in four months since its inception. Graduation rates throughout CSU were listed as compiled by Northridge, along with some interesting recommendations. A CSU task force, as well as all the campuses, were looking at this issue, and at hand was what our own campus could do about it. The goal was not necessarily to rush students through, but rather to try to establish what could be done to ease the path to graduation for students. The committee had examined some 300 students with high units, to ascertain why they were still here. Students usually were trying hard to finish, but there were reasons for taking so long. The committee looked at Fall 2004 graduation denials to see if there were patterns in place. Not surprisingly, very often students did not finish their final class. There was some consensus on advising, with four broad areas established to pursue. More data was required, and campus was putting together a pulse survey for students for Fall 2005. Bottlenecks included advising, and so the committee had spent some time thinking about how to make better. The task force recommended implementing more fully the advising policy we already have.

**Goldschmidt** indicated that the numbers of first-time freshman were at record highs. The previous fall and the coming semester saw the same number of transfers as new freshman. Eleven thousand people came the previous weekend for “sneak preview” day, and these new students likely would require a great deal of guidance. Registration and enrollment issues had to be addressed, and there was no central plan for advising.

Senator **Ulasewicz** asked for some clarification as to what time period the graduation rate, 38.5%, was for.
Volkert responded that we did not have data for our particular campus, but that system-wide students often took more than 6 years. Percentages went up with more years, but in general it was desirable to speed the process.

Goldsmith noted that the numbers were rising slowly.

Senator Yee indicated that the statewide senators had had a meeting the previous Friday on this issue, and observed that our campus was one of the first to start gathering such data to help troubleshoot the problem. Other campuses were looking to our campus for information. SFSU was unique with respect to the policy on repeating courses, and was the only one that did not allow forgivable repeatable courses. Statewide was looking at insisting on degree audits at 70 units, and possibly reducing the number of units required for the BA, perhaps with a 120 unit minimum, and perhaps reducing larger departments. There were five general areas for advising: Entry to the university, declaration of major, upper division status, pre-graduation, and whenever any difficulties were encountered.

Senator Boyle asked if there were any exemplary departments who did better than the graduation rate listed.

Goldsmith responded that no one had looked at that, which was an interesting question. Some departments certainly did better than the average, and some majors definitely had students staying much longer. This merited a closer examination.

Senator Alvarez thanked the task force for educating the senators, and expressed some shock at the data. He asked if it were possible to look at the number of advisors and the ratio of advisors to students in comparison to other campuses, and even here in the past. He deduced that campus had devoted inadequate resources for the job.

Senator Stowers asked the meaning of ?percent UR Min.? Goldsmith responded that it meant, ?Underrepresented minorities.? She also been shocked with the data, and had looked at remediation rates, which were striking. Campuses with low remediation rates were able to facilitate their students? progress much better.

Chair Colvin asked to extend discussion five minutes.

Senator Morishita asked if the data applied to regularly admitted students, and perhaps did not account for those who transferred to other institutions. There was a clear need for a standardized method of tracking, as some of these numbers were not necessarily ?failures.? Change of majors could look like problems.
Senator Bernard-Powers noted that at other comparable institutions, the rate was closer to 55 percent. She asked about the job market in our area and the role of advising for vocational counseling. There had been a cutback in advising some ten years ago.

Goldsmith agreed that future planning needed improvement.

**AGENDA ITEM #4?REPORT from HELEN GOLDSMITH, ASSOCIATE DEAN of UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES & JO VOLKERT, AVP, ENROLLMENT PLANNING & MANAGEMENT: LDTP FORUM**

Goldsmith noted that the LDTP (Lower Division Transfer Program) had begun in Fall 2004, and had accomplished some unique work. All the rules about this were derived from CSU-wide concerns beginning at the community college level. There was a desire to find a way to inform community college students so that they could come to a four-year institution as prepared as possible, and the committee had examined the most popular majors and transfer patterns. Students would be guaranteed admission if all the right things were done. Feedback was solicited from the community colleges particularly City College, the College of San Mateo, Diablo Valley College, Skyline College, the top four feeder schools to SFSU who comprised over half our transfer population. A good enthusiastic meeting with representatives from each of these institutions had occurred in February, and one of the main insights that came out of the meeting was the importance to communicate often and thoughtfully with them. Considerable apprehension existed at community colleges that they would be dictated to, not listened to.

**AGENDA ITEM #5?REPORT from GAIL WHITAKER, AVP, ACADEMIC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: INSTITUTE for the NEXT GENERATION INTERNET**

Whitaker stated that she had met with various constituencies to plan for the next generation internet. In order to do this, a Research and Service Organization (RSO) was needed. The Senate Executive Committee had suggested some ideas for projects that would be good to do.

Whitaker introduced Joaquin Alvarado who indicated the main goal of the institute was to reflect the convergence of advanced technology in laboratory and university settings. He had been working with CNIC to design tools. There were opportunities to partner with the government, community organizations and the private sector, to enhance learning environments, build public and private relationships, and help the city spread its vision. Currently the RSO would serve as a gateway for international partners, Fujitsu being one such Pacific-rim partner.
The "next generation internet" would be thousands of times faster than a regular T1 connection. Already SBC leased some lines from us. It was a great network which needed great tools; a sequel to the first internet. This would be the first time to come to the table with policies and establish strong connections with Japan and Asia.

To answer the question as to why an institute was needed, it seemed best if one unit brokered partnerships, and provided faculty and students opportunities to extend research and learning. The RSO's mission was broadly and deeply defined. It would work with the mayor's office and city, local governments to broker certain relationships. SFSU brought its own expertise, the highest level of applied technology, to extend international programs.

Four areas were of particular interest: youth media, bio-technology and bioengineering, digital media, and e-learning. The RSO would have a close relationship with Apple, the only such university to have this connection.

Digital cinema issues would work well with BECA and bring faculty into process, creating intellectual resources for the city.

As for asset management, SFSU would partner with UCSF in bio-tech, establishing requirements to meet their standards, and would participate in the bio-tech sector. By having partners there were ways to take advantage of collaboration, having classes downtown for example.

Senator Bernard-Powers asked for some basic information, some very practical questions. She asked about the youth media, now two years up and running, and asked what had changed, and what people were doing.

Alvarado responded that youth media was handled well in community, and it was desirable to align it with a college curriculum. Already in place was a working relationship, and SFSU knew what was required to study, and what would get kids into university. Digital technologies were familiar to the institute, and while we had gotten very good at buying stuff, we needed to do more to drive that technology ourselves, and allow us a voice in its design and use.

Senator Ulasewicz asked about the potential use of this technology.
Alvarado responded that technology allowed more enhanced collaboration, and could take programming out of the classroom. The technology would move away from the personal desktop, and be put on a campus server, so that the user would not need so much, which would make it more collaborative. Another piece was what we should be doing with the network, and what would make it better for the future.

Senator Yee asked about ownership, and if intellectual property rights would be an issue with partners.

Alvarado had met with Bartscher, and it was clear the campus needed workable models. Lots of questions remained and there was a great need to consider this area more fully.

President Corrigan commented that he also had some difficulties with the language of technology and that perhaps it was a generational characteristic. He spoke to where this would fit with the community, with three basic initiatives at work: Lucas films moving into the city that would need employees and technologically savvy help and that SFSU is well positioned to make that connection. South of market, there was the new campus of UCSF, but they did not have the same technological expertise that SFSU did. There were health care issues, such as Mary Beth Love’s Asthma project, where SFSU could spend less money on preventative issues and education. This initiative was a confluence of technology with projects. The system was already there, but ideas were needed. He thought this a fine way to reaffirm the campus mission of being the “City’s university.”

AGENDA ITEM #6 REPORT from OSWALDO GARCIA, CHAIR, ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE: UPDATE from the TASK FORCE on GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

Senator and chair of APRC Garcia offered the committee’s draft copy for review, now available for the first time. He indicated that the draft would also reside on the senate website shortly. He outlined the membership of the task force, reminding senators that the motivation for the task force had come from the WASC report, which had called for more attention to graduate programs at SFSU and similar sentiments expressed in the recent CUSP recommendations. He indicated that a focus on graduate programs would mean that undergraduate programs would not be fully reviewed for the sixth cycle, although there was a need to consider the balance a particular program took with respect to resources between graduate and undergraduate programs.
For the first time there would be explicit standards of quality to be used in program evaluation. Departments and programs that had outside accrediting programs might provide a supplemental report to APRC to answer university-specific questions. A central issue was what role APRC might have in the future, and that perhaps it should align itself the form of the promotion committee structure. The MOU might be replaced with a different document.

Undergrad programs would not be evaluated, and new standards were under discussion. There were university, college and program levels of standards. Administrative requirements and program requirements suggested that programs must be able to tell their story fairly. He hoped that ARPC would not adopt a cookie-cutter approach.

As for outside accreditation, departments would need to do supplemental work that was not covered by outside agency.

As for the new APRC role, it might be appropriate for APRC to write the document to be used for program change. Timelines and action items would be used to improve program. Elected members might change the way the committee operated. These were all significant changes.

The current draft of the document was now at senate website, and new standards would be the next topic of conversation. The task force sought feedback from the broader community, and at least now there was a draft document to use for discussion.

Chair Colvin announced that the senate was past time certain for the next agenda item, and would maintain the speakers list and return to this item if time allowed at the end of the meeting. Barring that, the item would return to the senate in two weeks.

**AGENDA ITEM #7?RECOMMENDATION from the CURRICULUM REVIEW & APPROVAL COMMITTEE and GRADUATE COUNCIL: PROPOSAL for a GRADUATE CERTIFICATE in GUIDE DOG MOBILITY, 1st & 2nd Readings**

Senator and CRAC chair Nichols indicated that this was a consent item after two reviews from CRAC and from the graduate council. This had been a collaborative effort between the Guide Dogs for the Blind organization and SFSU. It would be funded by the organization as long as the certificate was in existence, and would cover faculty salary costs, materials, and space on the San Rafael campus as well as provide highly qualified instructors. This arrangement would be the only one of its kind in the country.
Senator **Chelberg** supported this certificate.

Sandra Rosen, Professor in the department of Special Education, and Nick Certo, chair of that department, were present to answer any questions.

Senator **Steier** asked what made this graduate special, and what kind of formal guide work training was envisioned. Some of the courses looked like obedience training? plain and simple and he wondered what pieces involved an intellectual component.

Rosen responded that the basis of the certificate was to have a graduate level, teacher preparation course of study which was entirely comparable with graduate level education. As reasons, she gave the complexity of coursework, which was not only about how to train dogs, but how to train users how to use the animals, a fairly complex process.

Senator **Heiman** observed that the first course was a 600 level and thus would have undergraduate students, in effect a paired course. He asked whether this should be its own graduate level course.

Rosen responded that this already was a situation that existed in other programs, where the 600 was also available to undergrads, but it was a required course for several areas.

Senator **Chelberg** made a clarification that the Guide Dogs for the Blind supported the program but not the employees.

Senator **Bernstein** thought this was an exciting program but did not see any courses in psychology.

Rosen responded that this area of study was infused in the program.

Senator **Langbort** asked whether this certificate would be added to another program or a stand alone certificate.

Rosen indicated it would be a stand alone certificate.

Langbort noted that there did not seem to be anything in the courses that describe the teaching component.

Rosen responded that that was part of the teaching preparation and that the program included an internship.

Senator **Suzuki** asked about the administration requirements and why a cohort was chosen.

Rosen responded that the main issue was cost effectiveness, and the need to provide a variety of experiences for students.
Certo also observed that one issue was the number of dogs available,

Suzuki asked what type of person would make the cohort.

Certo responded that students would already have a BA and some experience, or at least interest, in people, and would have a teacher mentality.

Move to second reading.

**Abella, Steier, m/s/p**

Senator Mak noted that this seemed an innovative program and asked about how it would be assessed or accredited.

Rosen noted that the certificate would be assessed by different dog schools and an international organization. The was a strong desire to move this to a university, graduate, level, and set standards for international training,

Passed unanimously.

**AGENDA ITEM #8?RECOMMENDATION from the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

**RESOLUTION in SUPPORT of the NEW YORK TIMES PROGRAM, 1ST Reading**

**Abella, Gregory m/s**

Senator Abella indicated that the New York Times was willing to work with the campus, and had a highly proactive and educational value for the campus.

Senator Gregory observed that the resolution did not mention the obvious: that students were largely unaware of the nature of serious, reflective reporting.

Turitz questioned whether there had been any competitive bidding from any other newspapers or whether faculty members had been consulted.

Senator Daley noted that during the pilot program, her department had devoured all the newspapers available and commented that there was no newspaper comparable to the Times.
Senator Abella responded that USA Today had also been contacted but that the Times had a comprehensive package, and had shown commitment to such efforts as voter registration.

Senator Gregory seconded the comments in support for voter registration, noting as well the NYT commitment to the American Democracy program. She was unclear on how competitive bidding might take place when the product was free. The Times had taken a superior analytic treatment of the news, always printed a range of op-ed articles, and had no peer.

Senator Steier took vehement exception to the previous comments which glorified the New York Times in an excessive and misguided manner, noting that in fact the NYT basis for existence was profit and not some altruistic vision. He sought to diminish the hagiographic hyperbole a notch or two. He cited several international newspapers superior in content, style, and political sophistication to the Times but ruefully acknowledged that perhaps for SFSU the NYT was the best that could be done. He allowed that the Times edged out USA Today as a newspaper.

Senator Heiman observed that the papers were not taken by students, and that distribution was a potential issue, as well as fire safety depending on where the newspapers were stacked. Half his students had not been able to get newspapers, some of which was due their attendance at evening classes. He urged consultation with facilities authority, and large numbers of kiosks or distribution racks.

Senator Abella accepted these comments as well-taken points, and promised to explore these options. The pilot runs had helped to troubleshoot some of these issues.

Senator Chelberg noted that while the newspapers were still free, there was still a cost involved.

Senator Abella indicated that the cost was sixteen thousand dollars a semester.

Senator Gregory asked about use of the word ?suitable? word in line 41.

AGENDA ITEM #9?RECOMMENDATION from the ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE: PROPOSAL for NON-MAJORS? ACCESS to GE COURSES, 1ST Reading

Meredith, Bernstein m/s

Senator Meredith preferred to have the GEC chair comment on the proposal.
GEC chair Shimanoff stated that this policy came partially by the senate’s request, as a result of a revised enrollment policy passed in an earlier session. The proposed revision did not represent just a language change but a substantial change to policy. Previously, some GE courses had allowed majors to have priority registration. This policy change would serve to level the field for GE students.

Senator Ulasewicz had voted against the proposal. She noted that a number of committee members had commented that several departments were disproportionately affected by this change. One way of managing enrollment in the past was to limit students from non-majors.

Senator Chelberg asked how this might affect the path to graduation.

Goldsmith said it was a bit of a struggle to figure out the answer to this question. With the current web registration, students were aware immediately whether enrolling in a given class was possible.

Senator Bernstein defined the phrase ‘GE’ as general education. Departments could not have it both ways. Many courses had been brought into GE to enhance enrollment, and if a course was labeled GE, it should be open to everyone.

Senator Meredith observed that when APC discussed this, one of the most important reasons given for rejection was the significant number of students who could ‘double count’ courses both for their major and GE. If these courses were pulled out, majors would need to find classes elsewhere. APC supported this for reasons that Bernstein outlined. GE courses need to be actually available, not just theoretically available.

The agenda item would return to the senate at their next meeting in second reading.

Furman, Ulasewicz, and Abella were on the speakers’ list.

AGENDA ITEM #10?ADJOURNMENT 4:03 p.m.

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, April 12, 2005