

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes 03/04/2014

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

MINUTES

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

SEVEN HILLS CONFERENCE CENTER

NOB HILL ROOM

2:00 – 5:00 p.m.

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD: 2:00 - 2:10 p.m.

The Open Floor Period provides an informal opportunity for faculty members to raise questions or make comments directed to Senate officers or to university administrators. Please arrive promptly at 2:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

Alvarenga, Gabriela	Getz, Trevor	Pasion, Sally
Anderson, David	Ginwala, Cyrus	Pelaud, Isabelle
Azadpur, Mohammad	Hackenberg, Sara	Robertson, Bruce
Baines, Annmarie	Hammer, Mike	Rosser, Sue
Bettinger, Chris	Hanley, Lawrence	Sigmon, Mark
Buckley, Linda	Harris, Shimina	Soltani, Sonya
Boyle, Andrea	Hellman, David	Stowers, Genie
Carleton, Troi	Holzman, Barbara	Trogu, Pino
Chen, Lily	Keith-Collins, Robert	Usowicz, Thaddeus
Cholette Susan	Kilday-Hicks, Russel	Vasche, Jason
Clavier, Sophie	Levy, Eileen	Wanek, Linda
Collins, Robert	Lewis, Julia	Wilckzak, Cynthia
Cortez, Ronald	Li, Wen-Chao	Williams, Robert
Davila, Brigette	Mendolla, Paul	Wong, Les
Gamboa, Yolanda	Monteiro, Ken	Yee-Melichar Darlene
		Yoo, Grace

Absences: Alamilla Boyd, Nan (exc); Avani, Nathan (exc); Barranco, Joseph (exc); Bartscher, Patricia (exc); Chang, Sandy (abs); Doan, Therese (abs); Donohue, Patricia (exc); Ganji, Ahmad (exc); Hill, Lorna (exc); Howard, Pamela (exc);

Lau, Jenny (exc); McDougal, Serie (exc); Strong, Robert (exc); Tumbat, Gulnur (exc);

Guests: Sasha Bunge, Helen Goldsmith, Ann Hallum, Shawn Whalen

OPEN FLOOR PERIOD: 2:00 - 2:10 p.m.

The Open Floor Period provides an informal opportunity for faculty members to raise questions or make comments directed to Senate officers or to university administrators. Please arrive promptly at 2:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: 2:10 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senator Collins reminded the Academic Senate that the deadline for applications for the Distinguished Faculty Awards was soon approaching, Friday, March 14 Details on the Academic Senate Web site

AGENDA ITEM #1—Approval of the Minutes for February 18, 2014- Approved

AGENDA ITEM #2—Approval of the Agenda for March 4, 2014- Approved

AGENDA ITEM #3—Chair's Report

1. Toured future site of Faculty/Staff Club

2. Tenured/tenure-track faculty numbers are shrinking, down from 51% in 2008, to 45% in 2013. This is a CSU-wide problem, with a 4% drop in tenured faculty systemwide; 60%, and trending downward from 75% recommended by legislative resolution. CSU is unable to retain its faculty. For every 500 who leave, 400 are replaced. How sustainable is our current model of replenishing tenured cohort? "5-5-4-4" plan a good thing, but according to the CA Budget Project, even with the funding increase, funding will be below pre-recession levels.

AGENDA ITEM #4—Report: Standing Committee Chairs

1. APC- Sen. Bettinger- APC, along with CRAC as EPC, bringing 7th Cycle documents to next Senate meeting. Drafted a proposal for Posthumous Degree policy; sharing this with SAC. Working on a resolution about honorary faculty titles.

2. CRAC- Sen. Barranco absent, no committee report from CRAC.

3. FAC- Sen. Baines- bringing policy today on post tenure development and review as revisions to Post Tenure Review Policy. The committee welcomes all thoughts and feedback.

4. SIC- Sen. Carleton- gathering data and drafting faculty survey on service

5. SAC- Sen. Mendolla- first full meeting this semester since chair transition. Transportation issues- student passes for MUNI and BART. ASI reports part of weekly agenda.

AGENDA ITEM #5—Report: Anne Harris, AVP of University Development: Comprehensive Campaign

1. First Comprehensive Campaign for SF State. Currently in the process of engaging donors; hired a campaign consultant who is conducting interviews with highest-level donors. We are hoping for a good assessment at end of the month that we are ready to move forward with the comprehensive campaign, which would continue for 7 years, and raise \$150-200M.

2. We need to answer the question, "What is it that we're raising money for?" Meeting with deans and department chairs to find out what the "big ideas" are that are transformative and will have an impact. This is what the heart of the campaign is

about- our vision and passion.

3. What can we do? Please feel free to contact Ann and let her know who potential donors are and what are their interests. There are over 200,000 alums that we need to reengage with. Faculty can be a partner with Development on this, and they will help us make the ask.

4. Development doing the ask- can we train faculty to do the ask? Many of us are connected to alums already that can give smaller support.

5. Must know what we're raising the money for. Must be related to strategic plan and campaign priorities, be the right fit for the university, and within our mission.

6. Sen. Soltani- How involved are students in campaign? We will be alums someday! We need to engage students early on, like privates do the first day students step on campus. CSU's not doing that much. Change culture of working with our students and meet with them, and engage their parents as well.

AGENDA ITEM #6—Report from Jo Volkert, interim VP of Student Affairs: Enrollment Management Update—Time Certain No Later than 3:00p.m.

Postpone the motion until the time certain of 3PM.

VP Jo Volkert- will provide contextual slides and answer questions.

Enrollment leveled off to around 30,000 over the past few years. Narrowing of headcount and FTE, students carrying larger courseloads. Over last 13 years, UG and Grad numbers have grown in proportion over the past few years. Gender barely changed, 60%-40% women/men, steady and comparable to other institutions across the country. New students- transfers a little up and down; freshman new students dramatic increase since 2000, and leveling off to control number coming in.

Local vs. out of area students, looking at freshmen, degrees granted, enrollments by race and gender, freshmen needing remediation- 50% freshmen need remediation in math, English or both. There has been a slight decline in this over the last five years. Students are required to complete remediation in one year or they can't continue at SF State.

Dr. Volkert presented several slides on demographics of our students. 30% are first generation students.

Questions?

Sen. Hellman- Do we want to get bigger vs. sustainability in higher education? JV- we have made deliberate efforts to manage enrollment which is why we've leveled off to 30K range. Where do we want to be? What can we sustain? Hope SPCC will come out with data on this.

Sen. Avani- decline in graduate enrollment? Do we know why?

Sen. Soltani- SPCC discussion Friday- if we enforce higher admission standards on students outside our service area, and giving priority to 6 counties instead of 9, what will be the impact? How about first generation student enrollment? Pathways to transfer? JV- we already have a different guideline for applicants outside the 6 county area. That's what we do now. We have been using the 6 county area for the past 4-5 years. Set higher bar for people outside the area, and maintain numbers at steady state by employing this strategy. We're getting more diverse every year, which we really value. As we get more impacted majors, 8 additional for Fall 2014, there will be a whole new set of data to analyze and see impacts of those decisions. Right now, data moving in right direction regarding diversity.

Sen. Chen- What about graduate student tuition waivers? 6 CSU's already do this.

Sen. Bettinger- declining average age a crushing blow! Is getting more first-time freshmen a priority?

JV- We are open to any student who wants to apply and is qualified. Applicants are getting younger and more students are going to college, especially in the Latino population. Desire to make sure that students who want to come are able to qualify for admission and get classes they need to graduate.

Next year- CSU has increased target by 1.2%. We must adjust our numbers to achieve that target, and do our best to balance freshman transfers in both fall and spring. Some CSU's went way over that; we chose to make our target be more limited to the 1.2%.

AGENDA ITEM #7—Recommendation from the Academic Senate Executive Committee: Proposed Resolution in Honor of Linda Buckley, AVP for Academic Planning and Development, *consent item*

Submitted by Ex Comm- Sen. Stowers- Resolution approved: Commemorating the Service and Commitment to SFSU by AVP Linda Buckley.

AGENDA ITEM #8—Recommendation from the Curriculum Review & Approval Committee: Proposed Degree Title Change for the MS in Counseling from Rehabilitation Counseling to Clinical Rehabilitation - Mental Health Counseling, *consent item*

Sen. Stowers moved Agenda #8- consent item from CRAC- change name of degree- they need this for their students to qualify for dual accreditation. Motion is passed.

AGENDA ITEM #9—Recommendation from the Faculty Affairs Committee: Proposed Revisions to the Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Professional Development & Support, Post Tenure Review Policy#S00-122, 1st Reading

Sen. Baines- In order to be in compliance with CBA, FAC used opportunity to do something more meaningful and different from RTP. Left it as open as possible, privileging department opportunity. Focus on two areas- one is strengthening collegiality; two is strengthening career development for faculty. Policy is in compliance with CBA and in consultation with Faculty Affairs. Discussion?

Sen. Holzman- Lines 76-99- unclear. If each department chooses their own methodology, is there opportunity for inequity in different departments. Confused about what departmental peer review is. Lines 95-96, question about those two different areas?

Sen. Monteiro- questions about same area. One is that department chooses the process- is it standard for the department or each time someone comes up? Is there a minimum standard amount of information that each dept. will have?

Sen. Hellman- curious as to whether in consultative process our local CFA chapter has been involved?

Sen. Yee-Melichar- Lines 76-103; concerns about that section. Flexible departmental peer review, could non-tenured faculty review tenured faculty? This issue requires more thought.

Sen. Williams- highlight professional accomplishments and growth- think about language that overlaps with CBA, where we use Professional Achievement and Growth. Why does language specify "for those with teaching responsibilities". CBA requires us to have that as part of our workload, and seems too specific for this particular policy.

Sen. Sigmon- FAC did go over and discuss these issues. Ran policy by University Counsel. Leave it up to departments, something as simple as check-off form, or hosting teaching workshop, or anything faculty member wants to do. CBA language not specific about review by non-TT faculty.

Sen. Hackenberg- also member of FAC- separate line for teaching evaluations since that's in CBA. Reason that other materials followed by "can" is that we wanted departments to decide how extensive a process they want.

Sen. Robertson- appreciates emphasis on collegiality. Assumes that the dept. is collegial, what if dept. is adversarial? No consequences for not doing it in last policy, what about this one? Chance given that amount of work and lack of incentive that review might not happen.

Sen. Boyle- Lines 94-99; flexibility to bring in whatever materials people want to be reviewed. Starting at Line 95, chair or designee shall meet with tenured faculty to discuss the report. May be at variance with earlier noted flexibility. Line 97, faculty who are tenured and being reviewed can identify areas needing support. How should departments respond to this? Need additional clarification.

Sen. Avani- echo many of the same comments made by colleagues. Seemed to fit best in an ideal world!

**Now reached 3PM, time certain for agenda item #6. Motion approved to return to this item after AVP Volkert's report.

*Now return to Agenda #9-

Sen. Azadpur- should we make distinction between post-tenure pre-promotion and post-tenure, post promotion?

Sen. Wilczak- like the idea of making it supportive and collegial. Concerned that there was not any structure at all. Couldn't there be some balance? Lines 77-78- it would work great if everyone got along and could cause problems if they don't.

Sen. Trogu- Line 86- Line 101-103- would faculty welcome resources, what if they're not there? Opportunity to work toward generating resources, and university to work toward providing them. Line 16, did use word forum because it should be left to department. Implies direct interaction, distinct from the RTP format.

Sen. Lewis- you can ignore this and there are no consequences in the university. Should we be addressing this in proposed policy? Departmental review process- if there's agreement that person needs more support or resources, it's a negotiation between department, dean and university. Appreciate all the feedback.

Sen. Baines- FAC will be talking about all of the issues next week. The unique nature of being a post-tenure faculty member differs from dept. to dept. Recognize contributions of faculty member and identify areas for improvement, especially around available resources. What happens when resources are not available? Trying to give back to departments but doing something more meaningful than submitting a CV.

Sen. Collins- providing a rationale at the beginning of the policy would be good, as is giving departments the ability to be flexible. Rationale would clarify points and intentions of FAC.

Reached the end of Speaker's List-policy will return again in first reading at next Senate meeting.

AGENDA ITEM #10—Adjournment—no later than 5:00p.m.

Adjournment 4:10PM

Submitted by Eileen Levy, Secretary, Academic Senate

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, March 4,
2014
