

Minute - m10-10-00

SFSU Academic Senate Minutes

October 10, 2000

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair

Vaughn at 2:10 p.m.

Senate Members Present:

Avila, Guadalupe; Bartscher, Patricia; Bernstein, Marian; Blomberg, Judith; Boyle, Andrea; Cancino, Herlinda; Cherny, Robert; Colvin, Caran; Concolino, Christopher; Consoli, Andres; Contreras, Rey; Corrigan, Robert; Cullers, Susan; Duke, Jerry; Edwards, James; Elia, John; Ferretti, Charlotte; Garcia, Oswaldo; Garcia, Velia; Goldsmith, Helen; Gregory, Jan; Harnly, Caroline; Hu, Sung; Hubler, Barbara; Jerris, Scott; Johnson, Dane; Johnson, Sharon; La Belle, Thomas; Langbort, Carol; Loomis, Barbara; McKeon, Midori; Nichols, Amy; Pasaporte, Erin; Raggio, Marcia; Sagisi, Jaymee; Sayeed, Lutfus; Scoble, Don; Shrivastava, Vinay; Smith, Miriam; Strong, Rob; Turitz, Mitch; Vaughn, Pamela; Warren, Mary Anne; Warren, Penelope; Wong, Alfred; Yip, Yewmun.

Senate Members Absent: Flowers, Will(exc.);

Alvarez, Alvin(exc.); Chan, Jeffery; de Vries, Brian(exc.); Gillotte, Helen(exc.); Aaron, Eunice(exc.); Kelley, James(exc.); Collier, James(exc.).

Guests: G. Whitaker, R. Giardina, J.

Combs, S. Ferer-Balthazar, E. McQuown, J. Kassiola.

Announcements and Report

- John Elia announced the conference on Sex Education, including the keynote address by the inimitable Dr. Ruth.
- Sara Ferer-Baltazar announced a fund-raising event for La Raza students who will be traveling to Cuba with medical and educational supplies.

Chair's Report

- Vaughn provided a brief summary of the recent day-long meeting among CSU Campus Senate Chairs and the Statewide Academic Senate Executive Committee, highlighting the major concerns that kept surfacing. On FMI, some campuses have asked for published evaluation criteria as employed by deans and presidents; some campuses have asked that current FMI distribution be made equally among faculty, including lecturers. There was a good discussion on benefits with Vice Chancellor Jackie McClain. With regard to recruitment

and retention of faculty and workload/housing problems, there are no immediate solutions, but the CSU is looking into both. The CSU Deans of Education and the CSU-National Board for Professional Teaching Standards planning group have endorsed a NBPTS Network for the CSU, supporting the increase of National Board certified teachers and the incentive programs attached thereto. Senate chairs also raised and discussed a number of concerns with year round operation / summer semester, including the ability of the system to fund the summer semester as envisioned and the lack of contract and policy language governing summer teaching. It is hoped that many of the ongoing concerns will be addressed by a new study of system-wide shared governance being undertaken by Vince Buck and Jim Highsmith.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for October

10, 2000

The agenda was **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for September

26, 2000

The minutes were **approved as amended** after a single spelling error was detected and fixed on page two by Chair Vaughn.

Agenda Item #3 - Report from Vice President La

Belle

Vice President La Belle reported on two broad issues vital to the hiring process of tenure-track faculty: confidentiality and discrimination. He prefaced these remarks by commenting that we have learned some things from recent court cases and that it is difficult to control behavior of faculty with 57 on-going search processes.

La Belle ran through some variables underneath confidentiality and discrimination. The search committee itself is the only one that has access to the materials related to any one candidate.

They should not breach this confidentiality; they should not share opinions about candidates with anyone else in the department. He added that if a hiring committee becomes aware of any negative information like alcoholism, it should be treated with extreme caution. Information of that sort should be used only if it is confirmed by other reliable references and only if it relates to job qualification and performance. Should a problem emerge, consult with the Dean of Faculty Affairs or Provost La Belle directly.

La Belle listed some of the things that you can ask about: formal educational background, teaching experience, appropriateness of

their training to the curricular needs of the department, evidence of research, evidence of interest in the professional community, interest in teaching in a large urban university, ability to advise students and work with a diverse student population.

La Belle then listed some of the things that you cannot ask about: a person's birthplace or the birthplace of their relatives, race, ethnic origin, religious denomination, age (even indirect or euphemistically), citizenship, gender, sexual orientation, marital status, health status, whether a candidate's partner is willing to relocate, or political views. He summarized by saying that you cannot ask anything that is not job related.

La Belle re-emphasized the importance of confidentiality and that there are restrictions on what is asked. He added that you should not talk about workload, tenure, or salary. These questions should be left to the chair or the dean. Even a draft report is subject to scrutiny and search committee members can be held liable.

La Belle went on to elaborate for campus visits: treat them fairly in terms of exposure to the search committee; solicit reactions from colleagues but that should go directly to the committee. He added that analysis of strengths and weaknesses should be emphasized rather than ranking them. La Belle reiterated the seriousness of this business in light of two court cases where colleagues have been held liable and where we have not fared well. La Belle concluded by saying that we must hold our search committee colleagues to acceptable standards of confidentiality and equal treatment. He will make a video of the salient points; department chairs and deans will be held accountable for what transpires in search committees.

Robert Cherny raised a concern about some of the things mentioned that we cannot talk about. He described the History department process where screening interviews happen at a national conference that may not have the chair involved. Specifically, what do we do if the person asks about our teaching load? La Belle replied that one must accommodate to the situation. Some common understanding among dean, chair, and hiring committees is the key with the issue about treating candidates equally. It is important that more than one individual be present. The underlying message is one of great care and due process.

Sung Hu asked about confidentiality of the candidates' resume, which is often distributed more widely when meeting with faculty members outside of the hiring committee during a campus visit. La Belle

replied by emphasizing equal treatment for all candidates. He suggested that a standard format for the resume might be better than just accepting each candidates' resume.

Vaughn added that professional organizations also often have lists of ethical and non-ethical questions.

Agenda Item #4 - Proposed Resolution on the 120-unit

Baccalaureate Degree

Vaughn introduced the proposed resolution on the 120-unit Baccalaureate Degree, which comes to the Senate as a consent item from the Senate Executive Committee. This resolution reinforces on a campus-wide level the information from the Provost: that it is now possible for students to graduate with 120 units provided that they meet all of the requirements for their major and all university requirements. She contrasted this with the language in the bulletin with its 124 unit minimum for a BA. This resolution would reinforce information already provided by the Provost. She emphasized that this does not mandate any program to make any changes.

M/S/P (P. Warren, Jan Gregory) to approve the resolution for first reading.

Oswaldo Garcia spoke from the perspective of a program that has more than 120 units wondering if they need to worry. Vaughn replied that the purpose of this resolution is not to mandate any program decisions. The purpose is to allow students who have accumulated 120 units and met all requirements to graduate effective January 2001. It is her understanding that exceptions may be sought and granted for high unit programs and that this will occur during the regular program review cycle unless the program decides to accelerate the process. **Cherny** added that that understanding is the understanding of the Statewide Senate. Departments that have major degree programs that cannot fit into 120 units are not expected to take any action immediately. There are very few programs that will be affected this way. If it is appropriate for a particular BS degree to be of a particular size, that does not change. **Gail Whitaker** confirmed what Vaughn and Cherny had said and reiterated that the change is to say to students that if you have met the long list of requirements and you have 120 units, you may graduate. We also knew that students would have questions about this. In order to raise the consciousness of students and faculty, we have alerted the programs where students would have to accumulate more than 120 units to graduate and asked them to take a look at their program, and if they can reduce that would be a good thing. If for very good reasons they think

that is not the case, we are just asking that they justify this. There have been responses on both sides.

Jan Gregory commented that she trusts that when we speak to students and departments we are also retaining our emphasis on the privilege and the value of a broad undergraduate education.

Vinay Shrivastava asked who is going to reduce the number of units. Vaughn replied that the number has been reduced; it is state code that the minimum units to graduate has been reduced from 124 to 120. La Belle added that the mean number of credits completed by graduates of CSU is about 144 units. This is not going to affect a lot of students because you would have to get through without taking any extra courses. It does have strong implications for progress to degree. The downside is the elective, and this takes one away from students.

M/S/P (Duke, Hu) to second reading.

M/S/P (P. Warren, Shrivastava) to close debate.

The vote was taken and the **resolution was approved.**

Agenda Item #5 - Proposed Resolution on Proposition

38

Vaughn introduced this resolution opposing Proposition 38, the Constitutional Amendment Initiative entitled "School Voucher. State-funded Private and Religious Education. Public School Funding." The SFSU Senate is falling in line behind the CSU Board of Trustees, the California State Student Association, and the Statewide Academic Senate in opposing Proposition 38.

M/S/P (Cherny, Gregory) to approve the resolution for first reading.

Eloise McQuown spoke in support of the Senate taking a position opposing Proposition 38. In this case it could have devastating effects on higher education. If Proposition 38 passes, the funding requirements of Proposition 98 will stand, and the billions of dollars going for Proposition 38 will be taken from the general fund, which will then come out of support for the CSU and other public universities. If Proposition 38 passes, it will bankrupt the state of California. She offered a brochure with further information.

President Corrigan also spoke in favor of the resolution opposing Proposition 38. He recounted speaking about higher education at the Rotary Club, where all the questions were about vouchers and seemed slanted

toward support. He urged us to go out and talk to the public about the dangers of Proposition 38.

M/S/P (Cherny, Gregory) to second reading.

Miriam Smith asked if anyone knows the proponents' view on Proposition 38. Corrigan responded that the basic position is that public schools are not doing well by our youth, and they are suggesting that poor people need the voucher system. But we know that this will undermine the public school system in addition to the financial burdens. There are some good folks in favor of this because they have seen schools deteriorate.

Gregory asked about the impact on CSU and UC of admissions if this passed, wondering if we would be required to take the percentage from voucher schools as from public schools.

McQuown added that sometimes voucher proponents use accountability, but there are no accountability features in this proposition.

Vaughn also mentioned the potential loss of federal funds in hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

M/S/P (Gregory, Bernstein) to call the question.

The vote was taken and the **resolution was approved.**

Agenda Item #6 - CFA Voter Registration Drive

- Report from Eloise McQuown

Eloise McQuown reported that the CFA Voter Registration Drive registered over 1300 students on this campus with the participation of almost 90 faculty and staff in this effort. She added that the next step is to make sure that students get out and vote. Voter registration was non-partisan, but CFA has taken stands on propositions and endorsed candidates for the legislature.

Vaughn thanked McQuown and Jan Gregory on behalf of the Senate and the entire campus for their work on the voter registration drive over several years. Resounding applause followed.

Gregory added that there is nothing quite as moving as registering a student and having them tell you that it is the first time they are voting.

Agenda Item #7 - Voter Registration - Report from

Marsha Adler

Marsha Adler was invited to provide an update on other voter registration activities on campus, but she was unable to do so at this meeting.

Agenda Item #8 - Report from Richard Giardina

Director of Academic Planning and Assessment Richard

Giardina provided an overview of the Draft Self-Study report prepared for the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and colleges (WASC).

He provided some background to this draft report and upcoming visit, first mentioning the history of CUSP, our mid 90s strategic planning process. President Corrigan negotiated with WASC to have a special type of self-study where we would review the extent to which we have accomplished our goals as stipulated in the strategic plan. WASC agreed with the caveat that in doing so, we must also demonstrate an assessment of student-learning. That had already begun, so that was not a problem for us.

Giardina then went over the process of producing the Self-Study. There were a number of committees that have been working over the past two years to put together the three volume self-study document. Volume I focuses on how we have met the objectives of the strategic plan. Volume II focuses on other important areas of the university that were not focal points of the strategic plan. Volume III focuses on assessment activities in general education, in the various majors, and of student attitudes. Volumes I and II are done. Volume III is in process and will be completed soon. Giardina then passed around a honor roll of the hundreds of people involved in the self study process. He added that there is web-site for all volumes. All college offices and other places have hard copies.

Giardina then summarized where we are now in the process: this document is a draft document out for comment, which he encourages.

There may be a chapter or area of particular interest. There is about a month for comment. He added that the impetus is WASC and accreditation, but it is important to recognize that what we have here is a reflection of where we are as an institution at this point in our existence and where we think we are going.

Penelope Warren thanked Giardina for his leadership in this process. She also asked for more information on how the visit of the WASC team will be structured. Giardina replied that he cannot give a good answer to that right now; the team chair will be on campus in February, and he will determine the structure. Giardina did lay out some notions of how it might happen: there are experts in the various areas of our strategic plan; they will probably divide themselves according to the six thematic foci of the plan; they will want to meet with members of the planning committees; they will meet with a

wide range of other groups like deans and senate leaders; there are also mandatory open sessions for any and all faculty, staff, and students.

Vaughn thanked Giardina; a round of applause followed.

Agenda Item #9 - Report from Associate Vice President

Gail Whitaker

Gail Whitaker, Associate Vice President for Academic

Program Development, provided an update on Summer Semester 2001. She first went into some background, going over the prior planning process for Summer 2000 and the conversion of summer session activities from a self-support basis to a state support basis--a general fund summer semester. She summarized Summer 2000 as success on every level anticipated with 67 courses generating 253 semester FTES with 640 students. The numbers overall were higher than they had been on self-support.

Whitaker went on to outline the current planning for total conversion of summer session from self-support to state support. As a base we will offer the same courses that we have offered, but they will be offered through general fund support, with matriculated students generating FTES, which in turn will generate FTEF. Open University will be set up like fall/spring with non-matriculated students able to take those courses, generating money through their fees. This will generate a comparable amount to that provided back from CEL to the departments in the past. The third funding issue is infrastructure: with summer as the lead session for 2001-2002 that will be included in the normal budget-building process.

Whitaker then addressed the scale of this plan. If we convert everything we have been doing, it will generate between 1700 to 2200 FTES on a semester basis. She thinks we can build from there, taking a look at the past and then asking departments to negotiate up or down from that. One carrot is that long-term participation in summer means the possibility for more tenure track hires. She mentioned that they have developed a summer session Q&A, which has a lot of answers for the detailed questions you might have. This is available at the Senate office; deans and chairs also have it.

Vaughn asked when the summer curriculum needs to be ready for scheduling. Whitaker replied that schedule building is taking place now for the spring. As soon as that is in place, they'll begin with the

summer, roughly the month of November. **Jerry Duke** wondered about research or prognostications of the effect on fall FTE. Whitaker answered that they think it will be minimal based on teaching what we have been doing in the past, focusing on remedial courses, and front-loading general education basic subjects. She added that the average course load in fall/spring has been very stable.

Cherny asked for elaboration on two things

mentioned to which he responds positively: operating expense and tenure track hires. Some departments generate a large portion of their operating expense from summer money. The funding formula would not produce that number of dollars if applied simply to general fund allocation. Does comparable support mean that no department will have less operating expense money than they currently do?

He then elaborated on his second concern: if enrollment generated in summer can be justified to hire tenure-track faculty, which he supports, that also

means that the university will have to expand office and work and studio space.

He raised a third concern about implications for government processes, wondering, for example, if this would mean that department committees meet in the summer or that we will be in session but government processes will only go on during the normal academic year.

Whitaker first addressed operating expense, going

into the summer formula in some detail and comparing it to open university in fall/spring. Looking at past history and considering the changes in the general formula, the overall pool is comparable, but things would not balance out from program to program or even from college to college. We cannot have exact payback on a course by course basis. She reiterated that the ballpark looks good but

that an exact formula for allocation has not been set; the goal is equity. Whitaker then addressed tenure-track hiring and space to house them. The goal is to regularize the summer session, making it the lead session of the college year. Summer FTES will contribute to annual FTES so that will become part of the annual target.

Next summer there will be a stride halfway there, negotiating a target based on what has been done in the past but moving toward a permanent commitment to that target and permanent commitment to that FTEF, a lot of which can be converted into tenure track hires. Cherny followed up wondering where to put the new faculty.

Whitaker admitted that she did not know the answer, though many of them will be replacing faculty who are leaving. On governance, Whitaker replied that they are waiting for the contract extension and the new contract, which will include parameters for how faculty are hired. Currently one course is .20 or 3 WTUs, but where the other stuff come from is negotiated. If we just do a conversion,

there is not that much new, but if we grow the summer session, we have to answer those questions. Faculty do need to talk about this, but we need to wait on the contract to see the options.

Caroline Harnly wondered if there would be

a change in the strange mixture of overlapping summer sessions. Whitaker replied that we are trying to keep it as simple as possible: a 10 week session beginning June 11, ending August 19, within which there will be two five week sessions as well as the 10 week session. There is the possibility of three or eight week session as long as they build the course start date close to the above start dates with end dates are more flexible. We are trying to go to more standardized time blocks so that students find it easier to schedule at least two courses in each five-week session.

Scott Jerris asked a question specific to

summer session for accounting where they normally schedule intermediate accounting 1 in the first six weeks and intermediate accounting 2 in the next six weeks.

Whitaker commented that the two five week sessions make it possible to do more or less the same thing with lots of discretion for the department.

Lutfus Sayeed remarked upon problems in Business

Computer Information Systems where faculty remuneration is not enough during the summer, wondering about a possible change in incentive. Whitaker replied that the pay will be on the same basis as on an annual basis. There also will not be a situation where you have to take a reduced salary because of low enrollment.

Gregory remarked dryly that the new summer

session may be the perfect opportunity to put into practice "distance governance."

She then put out the hope that support systems like tutorial assistance have been factored in. She then asked a follow up question from the Q&A, where the answer was that it will depend on collective bargaining. Given Humboldt's campus negotiation, Gregory wondered whether a) we have initiated such a process, and b) considering the expeditiousness of CSU/CFA negotiating, what are we going to do since faculty will have zero idea about how summer teaching has to do with RTP, entitlement and many other issues. Whitaker first summarized the Humboldt situation, a situation that will not be generalized. She explained that SFSU has not unilaterally attempted to set ourselves out in that way; we are waiting for a more general approach. If nothing happens, there is always a default, which will probably be very close to the current agreement. This past summer we were able to have people paid on the annual salary basis.

Midori McKeon asked for clarification on whether

each department would be given a new FTE target that would add on to their previous one. Whitaker explained that we are talking about the part of the target that has been for summer already, and that will be the baseline. Deans and department chairs can grow or retreat from that. For 2001, the FTES generated by summer participation will be added to the annual FTES. Vaughn asked for clarification about whether this was college or department FTES. Whitaker reiterate that the new FTES is at the college level.

Carol Langbort asked about the fee structure.

Whitaker answered that it will be the same as it is in the fall/spring, the CSU fee plus the local fee. The local fee was reduced for summer 2000.

Shrivastava asked if there is a limit to how many courses a faculty can teach or departments can offer. Whitaker replied that there is no limit to the latter; the limit on the former is the standard one.

John Elia asked if, given the 10 week session, will there be the same ceiling on units. Whitaker answered that there are guidelines as part of Title V for purposes of petitioning for an overload: a full load is 7 units maximum for a five week session or 14 units for the entire summer.

The Senate was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane Johnson

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, October 10,
2000
