

Minutes: October 21st, 1997

San Francisco State University -- Academic

Senate Meeting

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 1997

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair

Mark Phillips at 2:10 p.m.

Senate Members Present:

Aaron, Eunice; Barnes, Paul; Bartscher, Patricia;
Bernstein, Marian; Cancino, Herlinda; Chen, Yu-Charn; Cherny, Robert; Choo,
Freddie; Collier, James; Consoli, Andres; Craig, JoAnn; Duke, Jerry; Fehrman,
Ken; Gillotte, Helen; Goldsmith, Helen; Graham, Michael; Hammett, Jennifer;
Haw, Mary Ann; Hom, Marlon; Homan, Bonnie; Houlberg, Rick; Hu, Sung; Lee, Wanda;
Leitao, David; Oñate, Abdiel; Phillips, Mark; Raggio, Marcia; Rivas,
Mario; Shouse, Amy; Smith, Nina Jo; Swanson, Deborah; Terrell, Dawn; Turitz,
Mitch; Verhey, Marilyn; Wade, Patricia; Warren, Mary Ann; Warren, Penelope;
Wilkinson, Nancy; Fox-Wolfgang, Susan; Wong, Yim Yu; Woo, George; Yee, Darlene;
Zoloth-Dorfman, Laurie.

Senate Members Absent:

Pestrong, Raymond(exc.); Nicholson, Joel; Blank, Mark(exc.); Wong, Alfred; Smith,
Erna; Lyles, Lois(exc.); Tarakji, Ghassan; Eisman, Gerald; Harnly, Caroline(exc.);
Flowers, Will(exc.); Hammerstrom, Gary(exc.); La Belle, Thomas(exc.); Kelley,
James(exc.); Scoble, Don(exc.); Corrigan, Robert(exc.); Chang, Paul(exc.); Mallare,
Marie; Thomson, Lana(exc.).

Senate Interns Present:

Avant, Anna; Childers, Joseph; Leon, Sara.

Guests:

G. West, M. Kasdan, N. McDermid, G. Whitaker, H. Goldwhite, T. Saenger, B. Murphy,
N. Fendel, R. Giardina, P. Vaughn, S. Alunan, S. Shimanoff.

Announcements and Report

Members of the Academic Senate were invited to
visit the new **Electronic Class Lab** in Library 433. More information is
available via the Web at <http://www.sfsu.edu/~compsvcs/ecl/>.

Chair's Report

The minutes of the meeting of the **Statewide**
Senate Executive Committee and Campus Academic Senate Chairs were attached to

the agenda. Chair Phillips pointed out the discussion concerning the selection of the CSU Chancellor and the minimal faculty and presidential input into the selection process. Comments about the new Chancellor covered a wide range of opinions. SIP/CETI was discussed with Maynard Robinson, the CSU coordinator, and many faculty concerns were raised including intellectual property, what were we selling in terms of payoffs, concerns about control, and others. In second draft, a policy on selection of campus presidents was discussed. The members liked the current policy with one exception, the campus visit. The importance of the campus visit was discussed and the issue that there is no assurance of feedback from faculty on the campus. Merit Pay was also discussed. Phillips felt that the Merit Pay meeting on this campus was one of the more productive and valuable campus meetings.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting

of October 21, 1997

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

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting

of October 7, 1997

As there were no additions or corrections, the minutes were **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #3 - Elections

Research and Professional Development Allocation

Committee

There were three vacancies for two-year terms and one vacancy for a one-year term. Scott Patterson (BECA), Clay Dumont (Sociology), Laura Head (Black Studies) and Vinay Shrivastava (BECA) agreed to stand for election. Abdiel Oñate was nominated from the floor (M/S Cherny, Fehrman).

M/S (Houlberg, M.A. Warren)

to close nominations. The vote was taken and **Patterson, Dumont,** and **Head** were elected to two-year terms.

Shrivastava and Oñate remained as nominees for the one-year term.

M/S/P (Houlberg, Fehrman)

to close debate. The vote was taken and **Oñate** was elected.

Agenda Item #4 - Resolution on CETI

Houlberg

explained that the Executive Committee felt that it was necessary to bring this

resolution forward to go on record due to the speed with which the CETI process is proceeding. He said that the Executive Committee recognized that this may not result in changes to the process. The purpose is to go on the record, as a senate, affirming the importance of having sufficient time for adequate faculty input.

Woo

spoke against the resolution. He felt that there have not been enough details given and that he doesn't know what the plan is. While he felt that the intent of the resolution is good, he wanted more details.

Yee

felt that CETI has an impressive business plan with impressive products and services. However, she also felt that we need time to see how this proposal will fit into the strategic planning activities, specifically CUSP and Cornerstones. She issued a call for a detailed academic impact plan that will reflect the CSU and SFSU educational concerns and needs since the business plan does not address these concerns. She encouraged Senators to vote in favor of this resolution since the resolution asks for more time to study the pros and cons of this proposal.

Cherny also

spoke in favor of the resolution. He felt that we need time for faculty to voice its concerns about some of the details. If the resolution passed, he would bring it to the attention of the Statewide Academic Senate.

Hu

stated that he was for more faculty involvement, but he wondered if passing this resolution would give the wrong impression that we are endorsing the concept of CETI when we only wanted more participation. He expressed serious reservations about having a commercial entity that operates in a public university environment. CETI would dictate the hardware and software used in the CSU and he felt that that was not what should happen in a public university.

Phillips

said that the intent of the resolution is to add weight to the resolutions also coming from other campuses, to give leverage to the Statewide Academic Senate, and to go on record. He did not want to directly oppose CETI, since he felt that we don't have enough information to make a decision.

Hom

related that it is important to make our efforts known to the Statewide Academic Senate to make a faculty voice and be a part of the process.

Zoloth-Dorfman

said that one of the things that we teach our students to do is careful research, but we are not doing what we teach. One of the things that she wanted to happen was to take the CETI proposal to the California Intellectual Property Association to get another read on what the implications might be on professional scholarship. She felt that faculty leadership should be given more time to evaluate this type of proposal.

Duke

spoke in favor of the resolution and encouraged Senators to think about the implications of not passing the resolution.

Gillotte

responded to **Zoloth-Dorfman** saying that she thought it was possible to pass the resolution and still do the research. **Zoloth-Dorfman** agreed.

M/S/P (Houlberg, Gillotte)

to close debate. The vote was taken and the **resolution passed** with **one** negative vote and **one abstention**.

Cherny

asked **Woo** if he could present to the Statewide Academic Senate that the one person who was opposed to the resolution was opposed to CETI not to the idea of more discussion. **Woo** agreed.

Phillips

stated that a copy of the resolution will be sent to **Cherny** and the Statewide Academic Senate.

Agenda Item #5 - Further Discussion of Cornerstones

Report

Phillips

introduced this item and explained that this is an opportunity for feedback and to strengthen the campus response (which is a joint response from faculty and administration).

Yee

shared comments from CRAC which had discussed Cornerstones. CRAC was concerned with how the CSU system-wide strategic plan will coordinate and integrate with the campus-specific strategic plan or how Cornerstones will interact with CUSP. She said that CUSP looks at faculty recommendations in at least six areas - academic excellence, teaching and learning success, combating discrimination, creating a user friendly campus, fostering community responsibility, and internationalizing the university. While there is some overlap, some of these areas are missing from Cornerstones.

CRAC felt that the SFSU curriculum is under evolution and reconstruction and that it is timely to re-examine and retrofit the curriculum with attention to its content information. CRAC was concerned with how and when is it appropriate to be proactive, active, and reactive to issues contained in Cornerstones and CUSP. For example, one issue was how will CRAC handle curriculum proposal issues in terms of quality and accountability on a department basis, college basis or campus basis. Another concern was how will CRAC handle curriculum proposals in addressing the issues of access and lifelong education. She referenced principles 5 and 6 on page 7 of the Cornerstones document concerning distance education and technology and fee-funded versus state-funded courses. CRAC was concerned with their impact and effectiveness -- would there be different criteria, review and evaluation procedures between fee-funded and state-funded courses and programs.

Phillips

stated that one of the central tensions of the document is that Cornerstones is both political and substantive. Accountability is used widely and to him it always has a political tone. He felt that assessment does not always have a political tone since there is always a need to assess. Phillips felt that the document raises questions regarding the degree of integrity to the process that has to do with substance versus politics. One issue is centralization versus decentralization. Cornerstones has reassured campuses and fought for decentralization, but on certain critical issues it is centralized (like the allocation of money). This notion is reinforced by the Institutional Assessment process which directly and explicitly ties budget to campus performance. He felt that a lot of details have to be worked out.

Phillips introduced **Harold Goldwhite**, former Statewide Academic Senate Chair, and **Ted Saenger**, former member of the Board of Trustees. Tom Ehrlich could not be present.

Goldwhite

felt that there have been very significant changes in the current version of the Cornerstones document. The next full Cornerstones group meeting will be December 1 to discuss input from campus meetings and to talk about further changes in the final draft. The final version will go to the Trustees for their information at the January 1998 meeting. He felt that what will go to the Trustees is a statement of principles, not a set of executive orders. He believed that the Trustees will leave to discussion between the administration and campuses all the implementation and application of the principles.

Phillips

introduced Executive Director of the Urban Institute **Brian Murphy** as another resource.

Saenger

said that, in his view, Cornerstones is both an internal and external document.

As an external document, it works with people and leadership of the State of California to reaffirm a commitment to public higher education. The items on access and funding are designed to point out to the public and the leadership what the Cornerstones people feel is important going into the 21st century.

The public has a stake in the willingness to pay taxes to support higher education.

He stated his belief that funding to public higher education will have to increase percentage-wise if the CSU is to do its job.

He felt that internally the CSU has some responsibilities

in continually asking how to do our jobs better in every respect. The institution must be willing to look creatively at how to do things better to work more effectively

by using new tools, using facilities differently, and/or using the curriculum

that is offered. The student population also has changed expectations in Cornerstones

as well. All the parties have responsibilities in this process. The last several pages are the key in his opinion so that together we can meet the challenge.

While the details may be different on different campuses, he felt that the major thrusts should be the same.

Houlberg

said that when dealing with the overall issues of attitude and perception of what we do here, people are looking for blame because their lives are not better than they were before and education is easy to attack. He asked what assurance

do we have that the next chancellor will not go out and publicly insult the

faculty as the current chancellor is doing and to feed into the public that

the problem is that the lifestyles of the faculty is what's holding back change?

How can we as an organization convince the outside that we're doing a good job when we internally, particularly our high visibility people, insult other parts

of the segment internally? If the Chancellor says that the faculty is not doing

what we should be doing, how can the public support us? Where are we going to

get support and recognition for what we have already done and what we are doing

and what we are attempting to do? We ought to be looking at ourselves regularly,

but how can we do that in a climate that is as political as it is actual and

operational? How do we overcome that?

Saenger

replied that Houlberg hit on an issue that came up early in Cornerstones. The initial document, in its urgency for change, seemed to be saying you are not doing a good job. One Cornerstones member, having worked in business for a long time, said that when trying to work change in a dynamic environment improvement may only be needed in 20%, and that 80% is ok. He felt that that is an art. What is ok or even good today is likely not to be good enough tomorrow. He questioned how do we insure in our academic subjects and in the way we do other things, how do we continue to emphasize that and get the right balance? Since change is uncomfortable, one needs to have the urgency and needs to have the balance.

Murphy

echoed one particular part concerning the newest Cornerstones document. The difference in tone and specific references to the faculty in the newest document is not a political response, but is a response based on a principled view that the faculty were the central intellectual and institutional element of this complex institution. With regards to this particular issue, he felt that the document itself becomes an orientation and intervention for the new chancellor. He felt that it would be helpful that if there are further things, in the senators' judgment, that would clarify the question of the leadership of the faculty or the role of the faculty, it would be helpful to know that before the final document is written. He said to think of this as a document to help push the new chancellor.

Oñate

said that as he read the document and saw the evolution that Murphy is pointing out in the tone and direction of the document, he was very pleased to hear Saenger refer to the public relations aspect of the public funding of the university system to be able to provide the services that are expected from the university in the years to come. In the past discussions, he didn't remember anybody pointing to the need to deliberately address these concerns to the legislature or to the governor.

He referred to AB1415 (Long Term Higher Education Support Legislation) which was vetoed by the Governor on October 10. He explained that the bill would have stabilized future state funding for the CSU system and for the UC system. He read a quote from the veto message in which Governor Wilson stated, "I yield to no one in my appreciation of the value of UC and the CSU and of their importance to California." The Governor was further quoted that a better way to fund this institution was needed rather than "statutory mandated autopilot spending which imposes inflexibility on the state budgetary process". That funding has and must continue to assure quality, affordability

and accessibility.

O'ate disagreed with the Governor's position

that State funding has assured that and felt that one of the priorities of Cornerstones should be to act and influence the position of the public and the legislature in respect to funding. He wanted the guests to bring that message back into the statewide group.

Goldwhite

thanked O'ate for his support of the Cornerstones position on that matter.

He said that one wish of the Cornerstones group was to get a strong statement of the importance of maintaining a high level of public support for the CSU while making sure that the CSU adds to that support from other sectors. He spoke about the commitment of dedicating large amounts of State money to specific programs. He felt that Cornerstones will provide a very strong platform for the Chancellor and other leaders to negotiate vigorously for an increased share of the State's general fund.

Referring to the previous discussion about CETI,

Hu felt that Cornerstones addresses the importance and the impact of technology on future higher education. He questioned if Cornerstones is willing to assess the impact of quality on higher education due to the lack of diversity in terms of technology that we can use. **Murphy** stated that there had been virtually no conversations between CETI and Cornerstones. He viewed Hu's point as a good one. There are four oblique references to technology in Cornerstones and where it is introduced as a theme, there are caveats.

Goldwhite

said that there are two exclusions from Cornerstones - technology and the interaction between CSU and K-12. Cornerstones only focuses on a portion of what the CSU will be facing in the near future. He said that he heard the Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology speak about an exclusion of instruction and curriculum from the baseline infrastructure and its development. Goldwhite felt that this is a naive exclusion because it cannot be fully separately. He felt that the initial intent is to try to build the infrastructure around the State and to provide the access then to let faculty make their own choices about the use of technology in their own area and courses.

He commented that what is on the table now is an agreement to negotiate between the CSU and the CETI team to form a partnership. He hoped that the CSU Senate will have chances to influence that negotiation. He felt that it will probably be an extremely broad agreement initially and

that details about technology and instruction will not be included. The provision that the CSU will have the majority voice in the governance in that partnership is crucial, according to Goldwhite. There is a need to make sure that faculty voices are sitting in that governance group to make sure that whatever detailed agreements are worked out concerning curriculum and technology that faculty decisions will be controlling. He further felt that CETI is a tremendous opportunity to bridge the technology gap.

Barnes

said that there seems to be some vagueness as to Cornerstones taking CUSP into account while being drafted. He asked what Cornerstones could do for the role of advising for students in a way to facilitate the process for both students and faculty. **Murphy** replied that in the second and third Principles there is an explicit acknowledgment of making the institutions more student responsive, facilitating student learning plans, and the engagement of the student in the development of their own academic planning.

Swanson

felt that there is conflict between advocating access to education and being able to account for the productivity of the language learning skills that students are developing while in the university. She was concerned about a potentially strong conflict between trying to maintain access and trying to sustain a high retention rate of students who are coming in with new and evolving linguistic histories and backgrounds and the standard measure that we have always had to measure linguistic proficiency. She felt that there should be people who have a scholarly background and understanding of language development and language learning advising the people writing these documents.

Hom

was concerned that for the last 20 years, teaching in the CSU has been based on the principles in the California Master Plan for Education, but Cornerstones does not mention this Master Plan. **Murphy** said he did not perceive any contradiction in the fundamental commitments between Cornerstones and the Master plan but he invited all who identified any contradictions to articulate them.

Murphy

realized that he had misunderstood Hom's point and added that the last two master plan reviews were externally driven and were not internally welcome. He felt that Cornerstones was somewhat animated by a desire to make a preemptive move.

Hom agreed.

Woo

said that the stated reason for CETI is that we will not be able to fund the technology infrastructure through public funds, so this is the way to fund it. He wondered if money was not available to fund the technical infrastructure, he assumed money would not be available to fund any of the infrastructure, and asked if Cornerstones addresses this.

Referring to section 2C on page 5 of the Cornerstones document, **Goldwhite** said that Cornerstones includes the quality gap, the infrastructure gap, the maintenance gap, the faculty compensation gap, and other gaps. He felt that the thinking of CSU leadership, probably, was that if a way can be found to bridge one of those gaps, then public funding could be used for others.

Cherny

felt that the August draft of Cornerstones was a great improvement over the previous version. He felt that since Cornerstones can be used to educate the new chancellor, he felt that that education needs to include that we have suffered a great deal from the financial crisis. In his own department there are 25% less full-time faculty with no decrease in students or committee work. This places faculty under an enormous strain due to the increased work load. Cherny also felt that embarking on new ways of assessing our students is resource intensive and the Cornerstones group should be aware of that.

Phillips

said that his current concerns are whether or not Cornerstones deals with SIP and CETI, and institutional accountability. He felt that the integrity of Cornerstones could get compromised by events that are moving faster than Cornerstones. Cornerstones is dealing with issues of centralized versus decentralized and the relationship between assessment and accountability. But institutional assessment, SIP, and CETI appear to be on a faster track with "a more powerful locomotive."

Saenger

stated that Cornerstones is not a plan but a set of principles. He was on the technology committee, but he knows nothing about CETI, so change is happening very quickly. Cornerstones is calling for strong self-examination, closing the gap, and other things all in a decentralized mode. There are going to be initiatives and discussions that need to occur some of which will support the Cornerstones principles and some will not. He felt that this is healthy activity, but it can be scary.

Yee

referred to recommendations 5E and 6B on page 7 of the Cornerstones document.

She presented concerns from the Curriculum Review & Approval Committee and the Graduate Council about fee increases and fee differentials. She said that the Cornerstones document made a comment about matching fee increases with financial aid but that was all that was said until Appendix A, pages 18 and 19. She felt that the appendix contained very good information that could be moved forward in the document or could be cross referenced to give background information. She also questioned recommendation 6B about graduate fee differential and other fee increases piloted at at least three CSU campuses. She asked if this is in the plans or is it being done already. **Murphy** replied that the wedding of financial aid with graduate fee differential was linguistically attempted at every juncture to symbolize the policy point that they go together. He replied that the information in Appendix A is not being moved forward as far as he knew. Regarding the fee increase pilot, Murphy said that the notion is that three self-nominated campuses would mix and match by their own identification of needs and that it is an open invitation to pilot.

Phillips

thanked **Goldwhite**, **Saenger**, and **Murphy** for their helpful discussion.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Homan

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, October 21,
1997
