Minutes: April 14th, 2009

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

MINUTES

TUESDAY, April 14, 2009

SEVEN HILLS CONFERENCE CENTER, NOB HILL ROOM

2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

Bartscher, Patricia        Jin, Leigh        Neely, Francis
Bugayong, Arlene          Kohn, Jim         Noble, Nancy
Burke, Adam               Landry, Lynette    Rehling, Lu
Chelberg, Gene            Lau, Jenny         Robertson, Bruce
Cheung, Yitwah            LePage, Pamela     Rosegard, Erik
Corrigan, Robert          Levy, Eileen       Rothman, Barry
Dariotis, Wei Ming        Li, Wen-Chao       Shapiro, Jerald
Davila, Brigitte
Longmore, Paul
Sherwin, Paul

Gemello, John
Luna, Debra
Shrivastava, Vinay

Goen-Salter, Sugie
Mahan, Dianne
Sinha, Dipendra

Gomes, Ricardo
McCarthy, Chris
Sveinsdottir, Asta

Gubeladze, Joseph
McCracken, Bridget
Taylor, Don

Hellman, David
Minami, Masahiko
Trautman, Ray

Holzman, Barbara
Moody, Laura
Ulasewicz, Connie

Hussain, Mahmood
Modirzadeh, Hafez
Whalen, Shawn

Jeung, Russell
Morishita, Leroy
van Dam, Mary Ann

Absences: Avani,
Nathan (exc); Boyle, Andrea (exc); Chen, Yu-Charn (exc); Chou, Fang-yu (exc);
Danner, Don (exc); DuVal,
Derethia (exc); Flatt, Sylvia (exe); Fuentes, Enrique (abs); Hellenga, Kate (exc);
Salama, Mohammad (exc); Sheldon, James (abs); Yee, Darlene (exc)

Guests:Suzanne Dmytrenko, Gail Evans, Helen
Goldsmith, Ann Hallum, Joel
Kassiola, Jim Murphy, Robert Strong, Nancy Rabolt, Dawn Terrell, Jo Volkert,
Gail Whitaker,
CALL TO ORDER: 2:15 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Whalen estimates that the April 28th Academic Senate meeting will last until 5 p.m., as there are many new items that must be introduced in first reading at that meeting so they can return in second reading at the final meeting on May 12th.

AGENDA ITEM #1? Approval of the Agenda for April 14, 2009.

Senator McCracken moved to add a new item #6, Resolution in Support of Emergency Preparedness at SF State. The motion passed.

The agenda as amended was approved.

AGENDA ITEM #2? Approval of the Minutes for March 17, 2009.

The minutes of the March 17, 2009, Academic Senate meeting were approved.

AGENDA ITEM #3? Report from Bridget McCracken, Chair, Student Affairs Committee, and Eugene Chelberg, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs: Introducing a New Campus Resource? Student Complaints and Concerns Web site

Senator McCracken, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, and Eugene Chelberg, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, reported on the establishment of a new student complaints and concerns website, http://www.sfsu.edu/~vpsa/complaints/.

Senator Rehling was thanked for her help in writing the website material.

AGENDA ITEM #4? Recommendation from the Student Affairs Committee: Proposed Revisions to the Enrollment Management Policy #F02-222, Second Reading.

Senator McCracken, on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee, moved that the Senate approve revisions to the policy on Enrollment Management, #F02-222. The motion passed.

AGENDA ITEM #5? Recommendation from the Executive Committee: Proposed Revisions to the Course Repeat Policy, #F08-248, Second Reading.

Senator Trautman, on behalf of the Executive Committee, moved that the Senate approve revisions to the policy on Course Repeat, #F08-248. The motion passed.
AGENDA ITEM #6? Recommendation from the Student Affairs Committee: Resolution in Support of Emergency Preparedness at SF State
(Proposed resolution on WHITE distributed at the meeting.)

Senator McCracken, on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee, moved that the Senate adopt a resolution in support of emergency preparedness at SF State.

Senator McCracken moved that the motion be moved to second reading. The motion passed.

The main motion, now in second reading, was approved.

AGENDA ITEM #7? Recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee: Proposed Revisions to the Written English Proficiency Policy, #S07-14, First Reading.

Senator Dariotis, on behalf of the Academic Policies Committee, moved that the Senate approve revisions to the policy on Written English Proficiency, #S07-14, specifically, revisions in the upper division section of the policy.

Discussion items and questions included the following:

- Will changing the minimum grade required in the GWAR-designated course from a C- to a C result in students not being able to take the course CR/NC?

- The 2010 timeline seems very unrealistic. Will courses be developed in a hurry, and will there be a logjam in getting the courses approved by the Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)?

- What is the role of CWEP in the implementation of this policy? What is the relationship between CWEP and the Writing Across the Curriculum / Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID) director?

- How does CWEP facilitate the development of supplemental writing courses (line 33)?

- How does the course repeat policy affect students? ability to satisfy the new GWAR-designated course requirement? Would students be allowed to repeat the course a third time?

- Since there isn?t a deadline to implement the GWAR courses, students could be confused about their graduation requirements.

- The
The speaker’s list was exhausted.

AGENDA ITEM #8?Recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee: Proposed Revisions to the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Course Criteria, #S08-14, First Reading.

Senator Dariotis, on behalf of the Academic Policies Committee, moved that the Senate approve revisions to the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Course Criteria, #S08-14.

Discussion items and questions included the following:

- The major change in the course criteria is the change in class size. Changing the enrollment limit from 20 to 25 students would be consistent with the enrollment cap in other writing classes offered at SF State.

- Maintaining the enrollment limit at 20 students may result in students being unable enroll in the required course, thereby delaying their graduation.

- The objective of the new writing policy is to help students become excellent writers. Changing the limit just for pragmatic reasons?finite resources and an uncertain state budget appropriation?is inappropriate. Instead, assessment data should be used to determine the appropriate class size. If we?re not going forward with a better writing program, why transition from the JEPET/ENG 414 program?

- The Writing Task Force (WTF) recommended that all writing classes have an enrollment limit of 20 students. However, the WTF recommended that the GWAR writing-intensive courses have limits of 25 students. Writing instruction is exceedingly intensive labor, but writing-intensive courses, unlike composition courses, typically do not focus on writing as their primary subject.

- The GWAR classes are more like writing or composition courses than writing-intensive courses, and there won?t be separate sections of the
GWAR courses for multi-lingual students. The 25-student limit is too high.

- During the initial implementation of GWAR-designated courses this semester, enrollment limits have been set at 25 students. It's disingenuous to have the policy specify the lower limit of 20 students, if the actual limit will be 25 students. Courses designed with an anticipation of a 20-student limit may be ineffective if the actual enrollment is 25 students.

- CWEP?'s authority to approve courses that exceed the enrollment maximum, as described on lines 13-15, should be better defined by including specific examples of justifiable exceptions.

- What should be done for students who do not pass a GWAR course on their first enrollment?

- The administration has previously stated that they would fund these courses at a 20-student enrollment limit. Has that commitment changed?

- Faculty Affairs remains committed to supporting whatever criteria the faculty approve for the GWAR courses.

- Last year, the Academic Senate was presented with the National Council of Teachers of English?'s recommendation of a 15-student enrollment limit, and with CWEP?'s representation that the WAC/WID coordinator supported the 20-student enrollment limit. Have those recommendations changed in the interim?

- Senators need to appreciate the expertise of our current WAC/WID specialist, who is recommending an increase in the enrollment limit to 25 students.

- A writing program that combined 25-student enrollment limits in GWAR courses with supplemental instruction could yield better results than a program that had 20-student GWAR courses but no supplemental instruction.

- The criteria do not include any statement on the enrollment prerequisites for the GWAR courses. If a placement exam or other assessment could be incorporated into the enrollment requirements, then under-prepared students could be directed to appropriate preparatory or supplemental instruction courses.

The speaker?'s list was exhausted.
AGENDA ITEM #9?Recommendation from the Student Affairs Committee: Proposed Revisions to the Religious Holidays Policy, #F00-212, First Reading.

Senator McCracken, on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee, moved that the Senate approve revisions to the policy on Religious Holidays, #F00-212.

Discussion items and questions included the following:

- Lines 24-26 should be revised to yield a better understanding.

The speaker’s list was exhausted.

AGENDA ITEM #10?Recommendation from the Educational Policies Council: Proposed Discontinuance of the Minor in Family and Consumer Sciences Program, First Reading.

Senator Shrivastava, on behalf of Educational Policies Council, moved that the Senate approve the discontinuance of the Minor in Family and Consumer Sciences program.

Discussion items and questions included the following:

- The proposal identifies the minor as “central to the SFSU mission”; as such, how could the faculty vote to discontinue the program?

- The Department of Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics has not been able to meet the enrollment demands of both majors and minors in their undergraduate programs. The department decided in 2005 to discontinue the minor program, to attenuate the demand for additional class sections; they decided it was better to deny enrollment to minors than to deny enrollment to majors.

- The current motion is simply to formally discontinue a program that was effectively eliminated by the department in 2005. The department should have requested a suspension or discontinuance in 2005.

- The reason for the discontinuance is limited resources, but the proposal identifies that there were only three students in the minor program per year in 1998-2002, and that no students have been admitted since. Thus, what resources will be saved by the discontinuance?

The speaker’s list is exhausted.
AGENDA ITEM #11?Recommendation from the Educational Policies Council: Proposed Discontinuance of the Master of Arts in Social Science: Concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies, First Reading.

Senator Shrivastava, on behalf of Educational Policies Council, moved that the Senate approve the discontinuance of the Master of Arts in Social Science: Concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies program.

Discussion items and questions included the following:

- This is another discontinuance by fiat, as the department and college imposed a moratorium on students entering the program two years ago. The College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSS) decided to not hire faculty in this area.

- The timing of this discontinuance proposal is particularly unfortunate. There will be a void in graduate studies in Social Science, as the proposed new Master of Arts in Social Science program will not be offered to students for at least several years.

- The College of Behavioral and Social Sciences has worked diligently with the currently-enrolled students, to ensure that they will be able to complete their theses. The college is unhappy that this program will be discontinued.

The speaker?s list was exhausted.

AGENDA ITEM #12?Recommendation from the Student Affairs Committee: Proposed Resolution on the Affordability of Textbooks, First Reading.

Senator McCracken, on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee, moved that the Senate adopt a resolution on the affordability of textbooks.

Discussion items and questions included the following:

- The "cradle-to-cradle" design paradigm should be incorporated into the textbook adoption process.

- The resolution should encourage faculty to develop and adopt textbooks that have Creative Commons licenses.

- No action or decision by faculty saves students more money than submitting textbook orders by the due date each semester. Three years ago, only 50%
of textbook adoptions were submitted on time; in Fall 2008, the on-time rate had increased to 67%; Rob Strong, General Manager, SFSU Bookstore, predicts an even higher adoption rate by tomorrow?s deadline for Fall 2009 courses.

- The SFSU Bookstore has been working with the J. Paul Leonard Library to implement a textbook rental program for undergraduate students. The Library?s assistance might help the Bookstore overcome significant obstacles to the rental program. Large-enrollment courses with expensive, required textbooks will be the first courses to be served by the rental program.

- Is a Senate resolution the most appropriate or effective method to bring this information to the faculty?

The speaker?s list was exhausted.

Chair Whalen declared the meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.
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