

## **Minutes: May 13th, 1997**

### **Minutes of the May 13, 1997 Academic Senate Meeting**

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

**Senate Members Present:** Eunice Aaron, Paul Barnes, Patricia Bartscher, Gerrie Baughman, Sally Berlowitz, Marian Bernstein, Janet Buchholz, Yu-Charn Chen, Robert Cherny, Jerry Duke, Gerald Eisman, Ken Fehrman, Helen Gillotte, Helen Goldsmith, Peter Haikalis, Ann Hallum, Jennifer Hammett, Caroline Harnly, Mary Ann Haw, Marlon Hom, Bonnie Homan, Rick Houlberg, Todd Imahori, Herb Kaplan, James Kelley, Thomas La Belle, Wanda Lee, Lois Lyles, Hollis Matson, Eugene Michaels, Joel Nicholson, Abdiel O'ate, Raymond Pestrong, Mark Phillips, Elisabeth Prinz, Mario Rivas, Roberto Rivera, Don Scoble, Peggy Smith, Dawn Terrell, Lana Thomson, Thaddeus Usowicz, Marilyn Verhey, Mary Ann Warren, Penelope Warren, Nancy Wilkinson, Alfred Wong, Yim Yu Wong, Darlene Yee.

**Senate Members Absent:** Patricia Wade, Sanjoy Banerjee, Kenneth Walsh, Rosa Casarez-Levison(exc.), David Hemphill(exc.), Dane Johnson(exc.), Newman Fisher(exc.), Will Flowers(exc.), Gary Hammerstrom(exc.), Robert Corrigan(exc.), Lee Sprague, James Collier(exc.).

### **Senate Interns Present:**

**Guests:** G. Whitaker, G. West, S. Higgins, W. Hopkins, F. McLaughlin, S. Perry, A. Wallace, D. Schafer, E. Seibel, J. Messina, M. Kasdan, V. Thompson, A. Kuhn, P. Baj, R. McClaine.

### **Announcements and Report**

#### **Chair's Report**

- Please submit **Standing Committee Preference sheets** as standing committees will be formed this week and committee chairs elected at the next meeting on May 20.
- Those senators who will be serving on the Senate next year were reminded to complete and return the **Summer Address Questionnaire**.
- The **Senate meeting schedule** for Spring and Fall 1997/98 was attached to the agenda.
- A memo was also attached to the agenda concerning the **CSU Academic Senate Merit Pay Task Force**. Specific thoughts about alternative merit pay systems can be communicated to the task force via e-mail at [majordomo@lists.sdsu.edu](mailto:majordomo@lists.sdsu.edu). The campus response to Cornerstones is due May 20.

#### **Agenda Item #1 -Approval of Agenda for Meeting of May 13, 1997**

**M/S/P (Matson, P. Warren)** to amend the agenda, inserting *Agenda Item #3a - Resolution Condemning Pan Afrikan Student Union Representatives' Interference with Free Speech* as a consent item from the Executive Committee and change Agenda Item #3 to #3b. The vote was taken and the agenda was **approved as amended**.

#### **Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meetings of April 29, 1997**

As there were no objections, the minutes were **approved as printed**.

#### **Agenda Item #3a -- Resolution Condemning Pan Afrikan Student Union Representatives' Interference with Free Speech**

**Houlberg** introduced this item stating that on May 8, 1997, many of the copies of the *Golden Gater* were confiscated and destroyed. Several members of the Pan Afrikan Student Union (PASU) admitted responsibility. This resolution is in response to that action. Houlberg said that as faculty, the Executive Committee felt that the campus community should be representative of the most open discussion that is possible amongst all the diverse voices on campus. **M.A. Warren** asked about the content of the *Golden Gater* article in question. Houlberg responded that it was reported that the *Golden Gater* was unfavorable in its editorial stance and coverage of PASU. It was reported that individuals confronted the editors of the student newspaper and gave the editors a list of what they thought they might do in reaction to the negative editorial and coverage.

**Lee** asked how it was known that the students who destroyed the papers represented PASU. **Houlberg** replied that it was reported that several members of PASU admitted responsibility to the editors of the *Golden Gater*. Aaron stated that the Executive Committee felt that such outrageous conduct has to be immediately called outrageous and that the resolution should be brought forward for the Senate's attention and approval.

**M/S/P (Matson, M.A. Warren)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the **resolution passed** with 2 nays and 1 abstention.

### **Agenda Item #3b - Report from Vice President La Belle**

**La Belle** reported on post-tenure review and challenges to tenure across the country. Cornerstones calls for a strategy for faculty renewal within the CSU. The CSU claims that by the year 2010, half of the current faculty will retire. More than one half of the tenure/tenure-track faculty at SFSU are over 50 years old, so SFSU can expect considerable turnover. Cornerstones calls on a savings of dollars based on replacing those retiring faculty with lower paid newer faculty with those dollars being re-invested into a comprehensive faculty renewal plan. Cornerstones identifies general skills and specific skills that it is felt faculty will need to keep up with technology and knowledge-based changes. He felt that SFSU will need to form a base-line to know what is being invested in.

In the press, there is a lot of pressure on tenure across the country. La Belle felt that some of the reasons for this pressure on tenure is shrinking and down-sizing of budgets; more flexibility in coping with changing curriculum; demographics which resulted in a large population of long-term permanent faculty with a resulting cadre of often less-than-satisfied tenure-track faculty and part-time lecturers who seek tenure track positions; and public skepticism of higher education. He also felt that all of this links to productivity and accountability which Cornerstones addresses.

A common way to address this issue is to look at post-tenure review. A recent paper from the American Association of Higher Education identified several options for post-tenure review including an annual or periodic review of all tenured faculty; a comprehensive review of selected tenured faculty based on unsatisfactory performance; and formative review of all tenured faculty for professional development and support of long term career goals. The policy that is in place calls for post-tenure review at least every 5 years by peer review to include teaching evaluations and other criteria to be used by the department. Some of the questions that La Belle felt have been raised in relationship to post-tenure review include whether or not post-tenure review is taken seriously? Is it a useful process? Is it viewed as punitive or developmental as a way to create a support system to enable faculty to move to the next higher level of their achievement? He felt that SFSU needs an assessment tool to demonstrate our commitment to accountability and to find out how to invest in ourselves over the next few years. He saw these

issues as challenges for FAC, the Senate and his office over the next year.

He also expressed appreciation for the Senate's welcome and collegiality during this, his first year at SFSU.

#### **Agenda Item #4 - Report from APRC Chair Jerry Duke**

**Duke** reported that APRC has had a very productive year.

The committee members represented a broad range of campus community disciplines. He thanked all the committee members (Banerjee, Gillotte, Verhey, Wilkinson, Wong, Oñate, Woo, Nasser-Tavakolian), James Bebee, Faculty Coordinator for Program Review, and Associate VP for Academic Programs Gail Whitaker for their assistance and support this year.

Preliminary meetings have been held with Health and Human Services, Science & Engineering, Technical and Professional Writing, Women Studies, Journalism, NEXA, and Labor Studies. External reviewers have visited our campus for Design and Industry, the Inter-Arts Center, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Dance. APRC has completed reports for Foreign Languages, Asian American Studies, the Inter-Arts Center, Design & Industry, and Recreation & Leisure Studies.

#### **Agenda Item #5 - Proposal for a Certificate in Entrepreneurial Leadership in Health Care**

**CRAC Chair Ann Hallum** reintroduced this item and introduced Nursing Chair Shannon Perry as a resource. Hallum said that the program addresses the needs of academically prepared registered nurses who seek health-care-specific training in budgeting and fiscal planning to adapt to changes in managed care. This program utilizes existing courses from the M.S. curriculum but is offered through Open University. No additional faculty or resources are necessary.

**Matson** asked if the current administration management emphasis is simply being revised. **Perry** replied that currently there is an Entrepreneurial Leadership in Health Care track or emphasis in the graduate program. The certificate program is open to nurses in the community and will not be part of the graduate program. The certificate program uses existing graduate courses, so Perry felt that this is a good use of resources. Matson then asked if there is any potential danger if individuals leave with a certificate that the community may believe that person now has a M.S.N. with that concentration? Perry replied that those with an M.S. will have a diploma from SFSU stating they have a M.S.N. and the Certificate Program graduates will have a certificate from Extended Education. However, Perry said that the School of Nursing cannot control how people perceive the certificates.

**Oñate** requested clarification about how entrepreneurial risk-taking and profit-making relates to community based nursing services. Perry's reply was affirmative. She said that one of the reasons that this is being offered has to do with down-sizing and restructuring of health care which resulted in the loss of jobs for many middle and upper level nurse managers. In one case, a maternity nurse opened a Bed and Breakfast to provide hotel services and needed nursing care for new mothers who must leave the hospital after 24 hours.

**M/S/P (Michaels, Gillotte)** to move to second reading. Gillotte wondered how long the Masters in Entrepreneurial Leadership had been around. **Perry** replied that there has been an emphasis in Administration and Management since 1984. Gillotte said that since that emphasis has been around that long, she felt that we did not need to worry about the emphasis. She asked about the implementation date of Spring 1997. Perry replied that they wanted to implement the certificate by that date, but it was not possible.

M/S/P (Homan, Gillotte) to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed unanimously**.

### **Agenda Item #6 - Proposal for a Consortium MBA Degree for Managing Technology and Innovation**

**CRAC Chair Ann Hallum** introduced this item and introduced Joe Messina, Finance Department Chair, as a resource. She said that this 27-month program is very innovative in its use of distance education to provide an intensive business program to working managers at off-shore corporations. The program has further incorporated ethical concepts throughout the corporation.

**Eisman** mentioned that this looked like an exciting venture in distance education and that two-way video conferencing appeared to be the primary form of distance education but there are other forms of electronic material that would need to be provided. He asked who owned the material for the course and whether the faculty will own their own course material. **Messina** replied that while the issues have not been formally resolved, they will conform to CSU procedures for Pay for Hire Out Rules. He felt that the content would reside with the faculty but the tapes would not belong to the faculty. Faculty could bring their own medium into the presentation.

**Cherny** asked if students will be admitted as regular students or will they be admitted through Extension and where will those students receive their degrees. **Messina** replied that SJSU will be managing the records and bookkeeping and that the Consortium program will be managed by the SJSU MBA program since they have an identical program delivered on-site in Silicon Valley. The Consortium plans to have the names of all five schools on the degree. Cherny further asked about the statement in Section H that students must meet admission criteria similar to regular MBA students in the Consortium members' programs. He felt that it indicated that the program exists outside of any campus. He questioned if there are provisions for CSU degrees that exist outside of any campus. Messina responded that the SJSU program is delivered through the Open University forum and the degree is done through special sessions. The idea of having the names of all five campuses on the diploma is still being discussed between the Deans and the Chancellor's Office.

**Michaels** asked about the anticipated enrollment, tuition costs for students, and how the faculty are to be reimbursed, if the Consortium courses will be part of the regular teaching load or will other provisions be made. **Messina** responded that enrollment is a minimum of 25 students together with an approximate maximum of 50-60 for the lock-step program. The cost of the program is tentatively \$25,000 per student, but that is negotiable as the marketing process continues and it is determined what the market will bear. The faculty will be reimbursed as an overload so it will probably be equivalent to what they make for a course on their own campus or a little more. He said that the program will be self supporting.

**Haikalis** questioned the library resources. Students will have remote access to over 60 electronic databases and since some of those databases are bibliographic in nature, how will the students have access to the articles? Have provisions been made for student consultation with Library faculty? And if there is a provision for library consultation, is there overload payment for library faculty? **Messina** responded that the Consortium does not intend to use the resources of any campus. If the Library thought that this was costing the Library money, the Library would be reimbursed by the Consortium. He said that there is no formal provision for students to consult Library staff. Haikalis then asked how the Consortium proposed for the students to get the Library resources that are needed to do their work. Messina replied

that the students could access the Library at any of the five campuses. For business employees who come to school full time, supplemental packages of articles and other materials will be provided to the students. The databases are statistical and financial, not bibliographical. He felt that the additional demands on the Library would probably not be as intensive as some other disciplines, however, Messina said that he understood that the students could request documents to be faxed to them if they did need additional documents.

**M/S/P (Kelley, Smith)** to move to second reading. **Cherny** asked whether the admissions process will go through Extended Education on all the campuses. **Messina** responded that SJSU processes admissions and will use the same admission standards as for their regular MBA students. Since the standards for the five campuses are similar, but not exactly the same, basically the Consortium will use the highest standards. Extended Education is used to get the money back into the system and to process some documents. Cherny also asked if the degree will be issued by SJSU or the Consortium. Messina responded that the issue is still being debated. Cherny then asked about the last sentence in Section M on page 4 questioning who the "Consortium partner under our direct supervision" is, who will arrange for access to English-language resources. Messina replied that the firm that is sponsoring the candidate for the MBA program is the partner. Since the Consortium is delivering the program to companies in the Pacific Rim if there is a problem, the firm's on-site liaison/coordinator will have to make the arrangements.

**M/S/P (Aaron, Gillotte)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the **item passed** (26-9-5)

#### **Agenda Item #7 - New Concentration in Athletic Training**

**CRAC Chair Ann Hallum** introduced this item and introduced Susan Higgins as a resource. She said that the Department of Kinesiology proposes a fourth concentration within their current B.S. The concentration will prepare the students to provide on-field and follow-up care to athletes in high schools, colleges, on professional sports teams, and in clinics. Unique to the program are the 9 units offered through distance learning to additional campuses at Chico and Humboldt State. This would allow additional resources and sharing of faculty that could not be provided individually.

**M/S/P (Kelley, Smith)** to move to second reading. **Cherny** asked whether the resource implications were WTUs or FTEFs and whether by approving the curriculum the Senate would be approving changes in resource allocation. **Higgins** replied that it is WTUs and that the program is already really in place and is essentially already funded.

**M/S/P (Michaels, Gillotte)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed unanimously**.

#### **Agenda Item #8 - Revision to Academic Senate Policy #F96-194 -- Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSI)**

**Phillips** stated that this item was introduced at the last meeting and is still in first reading. He stated that there is an amendment on the floor, moved by Kelley and seconded by Michaels, to change the word 'shall' back to the original word 'may' in the second paragraph of section IV on page 2. As there were no speakers on the Speaker's List, the vote was taken on the amendment and the Kelley **amendment passed**.

**M/S/P (Aaron, Gillotte)** to move to second reading.

**M/S (Usowicz, Cherny)** to amend Section III on page 2 to change from 'three years' back to 'five years'. **Usowicz** stated that he hasn't heard any convincing arguments to support

reducing the number of years. He felt that different faculty members have different styles of achieving and contributing and sometimes these particular contributions are not apparent for a few years, so some faculty may need the longer time period to demonstrate their performance. **Cherny** felt that after the contract is re-negotiated, there may be a new process for merit pay, so he felt that the rules should not be changed mid-process.

**M/S/P (Terrell, Gillotte)** to close debate on the amendment. The vote was taken and the Usowicz amendment passed (25-17-0).

**M/S (Cherny, Wilkinson)** to amend the second paragraph of Section II on page 1 by replacing all of the deleted language concerning demonstrating teaching performance. **Cherny** felt that the awards should be encouraged based on teaching excellence and to remove this language is contradictory. He felt that this kind of information should be encouraged, since it can clearly demonstrate teaching performance.

**Lee** spoke against the amendment as a member of FAC. She felt that it was really unclear to applicants what to include and the administration of the process was cumbersome. **Imahori** spoke for the amendment. He felt that a good idea should not be killed for poor implementation. He felt that the statement "no other materials may be submitted" was part of the problem since applicants then included everything possible within the guidelines. He was concerned for lecturers, whose primary assignment is teaching, that lecturers are not evaluated on how many classes they teach and what they accomplish. If someone is doing research and service, quantity and where they are published is evaluated, but teaching quality is evaluated by how, not quantity. He felt that if teaching quality is being evaluated, then student comments must be included.

**Gillotte** asked what information an applicant should include to evaluate teaching effectiveness if that language is excluded. **Phillips** replied that you do the best concise representation of norms and averages in summary. Gillotte then asked to have the statement re-written to state that the applicants provide a statistical summary of this data. She felt that the policy should state some idea of how to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

**M/S/P (Houlberg, Smith)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the Cherny amendment was defeated (15-22,-3).

**Chen** questioned the review procedures in Section V on page 2 that has five copies of the application going to the Department Chair when the Department Chair does not have a role or function in the review process. He suggested that in Section VI on page 3 that the second sentence be re-written to read, "These reports will accompany the committee's and the Chair's recommendations."

**Phillips** replied that the surveys that have been done and the feedback from the campus has been split almost 50/50 as to whether the Chair should be heavily involved in the process. The committee that revised the procedure felt that this divisive issue should not be included in this version of the policy. He felt that when there is a new collective bargaining agreement, this issue may be revisited.

**M/S (Pestrong, Lee)** to amend the second paragraph of Section II on page 1 to replace the sentence "This may include work done at other institutions." with "This shall only include work done subsequent to employment at SFSU." Pestrong felt that this would provide a level playing ground for the PSSI competition. If someone comes from another institution where they may have had lighter teaching loads and/or more equipment and support, they would be competing under different circumstances. Lee felt that the PSSI should reward the work of people who do the work while they are employed at SFSU, since the money for the PSSIs comes out of the SFSU budget. **West** stated that he felt

excluding work done at other institutions would be contrary to the collective bargaining agreement and to the Academic Senate policy since faculty who receive prior academic credit can use that for the RTP process. He felt that prior academic credit should also apply to PSSIs.

**Haikalis** spoke in support of the amendment because he felt that when people are hired, their previous performance is considered when their salary step and rank are established. He agreed with Lee that since the money for PSSIs is coming out of the SFSU pool of resources, the awards should only consider work done while employed at SFSU. **Imahori** spoke against the amendment saying that it could have a negative effect on recruiting and hiring.

**M/S/P (Michaels, Gillotte)** to close debate. The vote was taken on the Pestrong amendment and it was defeated (16-26-2).

**Michaels** proposed an amendment to remove the word 'other' from the last sentence on page 1. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

**M/S/P (Kelley, Smith)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed**.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Homan  
Secretary to the Faculty

**Meeting Date (Archive):** Tuesday, May 13,  
1997

---