

Minute - m10-22-02

of October 22, 2002

Chair Robert Cherny called the

Academic Senate to order at 2:15 p.m.

Senate Members Present:

Aaron,	Corrigan,	Kassiola, Joel	Smith,
Eunice	Robert A.	Klironomos, Martha	Miriam
Avila,	Daniels, Robert	Luft, Sandra	Steier, Saul
Guadalupe	Edwards, James	McKeon, Midori	Stowers, Genie
Bartscher, Patricia	Fung, Robert	Meredith, David	Strong, Rob
Bernstein, Marian	Garcia, Oswaldo	Morishita, Leroy	Su, Yuli
Bernard-Powers, Jane	Garcia, Velia	Nichols, Amy	Terrell, Dawn
Blando, John	Gemello, John	Noble, Nancy	Turitz, Mitch
Blomberg, Judith	Gill, Sam	Pong, Wenshen	Vaughn, Pamela
Carrington, Christopher	Gregory, Jan	Raggio, Marcia	Warren, Penelope
Chen, Yu-Charn	Houlberg, Rick	Short, Larry	Whalen, Maureen
Cherny, Robert	Jerris, Scott	Smith, Brett	Williams, Robert
Colvin, Caran	Johnson-Brennan, Karen		Wolfe, Bruce
Consoli, Andres			Yang, Nini

Senate Members Absent: Newt-Scott,

Ronda (abs), Weinstraub, Aram (abs), Gerson, Deborah (exc), Gill, Sam (exc),
Gonzales,

Dan (exc), Fielden,

Ned (exc), Collier, James (exc),

Guests: Marilyn Verhey, Jim Orenberg, Lily Berry, Ron
Compesi,

Jaih McReynolds,

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senator Mitch Turitz announced that ballots for the CalPERS Board Elections Office were mailed to each eligible member's home address beginning October 10, 2002.

EligibleState

members not receiving a ballot by November

12, 2002, should contact the CalPERS Board Elections Office at

www.calpers.ca.gov **Or** (800) 794-2297.

Senator Rick Houlberg reminded all faculty and staff

to sign up for the University Asilomar Retreat and that they are still accepting applications for "talent of any kind"

to participate in the "Cabaret Night" at the retreat. Contact Rick at houlberg@sfsu.edu.

CHAIR'S REPORT

The senate chair did not give a report in order for the senate

to have more time for debate.

AGENDA ITEM #1 - APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FOR October 22, 2002

m/s/p (Houlberg, Terrell)

to approve the agenda, passed unanimously

AGENDA ITEM #2 - Approval of the

Minutes for October 8, 2002

m/s/p

(Houlberg, Gregory) to accept the minutes as amended, passed unanimously

AGENDA ITEM #3 -Elections

The senate elected Singkin Yu, Counseling and

Psychological services to fill out the three-year term (2001-2003) on the

Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Advisory Board.

m/s/p (Turitz, Colvin) to close nomination, elected by

acclamation.

AGENDA

ITEM #4 -Report from Professor Ronal Compesi, Chair of the University Promotions

Committee for 2001-2002

Ron Compesi, chair of the 2001-2002

University Promotion Committee reported on a very successful year for UPC and acknowledged the well-organized and impressive quality of the candidates' work as supported by their Working Personnel Action

files. He announced that 34 faculty had been promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate and that 19 of 21 were promoted from Associate to Professor.

He stressed the importance of department committee's role in establishing and certifying the candidates' qualifications for promotion. Compesi indicated some concern that in some cases department

committees were not formulated the students teaching evaluations in context with their expectation for the job performance of the candidate. He asserted

that department promotion committees need to do more than just report the student teacher evaluations. He pointed to the two areas of joint appointments

and credit for campus and community service as problems areas that both Faculty

Affairs and the Senate Faculty Affairs committee need to review. Senator Jan Gregory expressed her appreciation for the through job and

hard work that the committee is required to make. She was also pleased to

hear that the Working Personnel Action files are looking better. She asked

Compesi to comment on the overall evaluation of the service category. Compesi

pointed out that in his review of all the files he found that a not significant

evaluation for service areas was more common for department level reviews.

Senator Bruce Wolfe asked the extent to which students opinions are used

in promotion considerations. Compesi indicated that the minimum

level of acceptance for promotion is a significant rating in teaching effectiveness.

Wolfe asked what was the meaning of a rating of significant?

Compesi indicated that in order to be promoted to the rank

of professor an individual is evaluated in three categories of promotion.

These three categories must be rated by all levels of the review as to not

significant, significant, and superior. In the category of Teaching Effectiveness

the candidate must receive a rating of significant to be promoted to the rank

of professor. The criteria that are evaluated under Teaching Effectiveness

are: the student evaluation scores, peer reviews, syllabi, and letters of

evaluation. Wolfe asked if evaluation letters that are requested by

the departments are reviewed for promotion? Compesi indicated that if they are

included in the file the committee reviews them. Senator Yu-Charn Chen indicated that nothing is perfect but suggested more

time be devoted to more objective measures for evaluations. Senator Marcia Raggio commented on the problems of putting together a file

when the candidate is both being reviewed for tenure and promotion at the

same time. The two areas of review require a different number of criteria for tenure than is required for promotion. Compesi indicated that Faculty Affairs had conducted a number of meetings for candidates to explain the different between the two sets of criteria. He indicated that it would be helpful if some process could be used to trim down the volume of materials that are submitted.

Senator Maureen Whalen

asked if UPC was looking at the issue that some faculty that were hired at the assistant professor level were actually at the rank of professor before they were hired. Compesi

indicated that UPC had asked Faculty Affairs to look at the problem. Senator Caran Colvin, chair of FAC, responded to many of the comments made

by the senators and encouraged departments to consult with Faculty Affairs when they have problems or issues concerning the hiring and promotion process.

Senator Pamela Vaughn asked if the criteria for evaluation are clear enough

for UPC to make a judgment. Compesi indicated that it is sometimes

difficult to weight different criteria for the department since there are

60-70 departments on campus. It is important that department committees articulate

their expectation of candidate in their evaluations. Senator Turitz, in answer to Senator

Wolfe, regarding student input that

students' evaluations are the only materials that can be put into a person

Working Personal Action file anonymously. Student letters must be signed.

He also indicated that CFA holds regular information meeting on tenure and

promotion. A general invitation is sent out to all faculty who are interested

to attend one or more of these meeting. CFA highly recommends these meeting

since they explain the RTP process and does make the process a little smoother

for the candidates. The problem that CFA has experienced is getting people

to the meetings. Senator Sandra

Luft asked about the reference to

objective criteria, and warned against any effort to reduce qualitative evaluations

to quantitative. Senator Consoli

indicated that it might be helpful to video tape the information meetings

so that those who could not attend because of teaching requirements could

still take advantage of the meeting. Senator

Houlberg recommended against video

taping of the meetings would present a chilling effect on candidates and not

allow them to speak freely about issues surrounding retention, tenure, and

promotion. He recommended more meetings scheduled at different times. Senator Raggio asked about attendance at these meetings? Compesi

indicated that last year's attendance was pretty good. Dean Marilyn Verhey indicated that the office of Faculty Affairs is working

with the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching to improve the RTP process.

She indicated that Senator and VP John Gemello along with Lilly Berry, chair of this years UPC are in collaboration to schedule meetings and

working on the elucidation of the two sets of criteria between retention/tenure

and promotion process. Senator

Bernard-Powers asked about the problem

of the changing nature of department RTP committees and the need to educate

new committees each year. She was concerned that one meeting was not enough.

Compesi

indicted that one of the problems is that the reporting deadline for RTP process

come up very early in the fall semester just after the departments hold their

election for their RTP committees. He recommended that a spring semester information

meeting might be helpful. He also noted that some departments meet as a committee

of the whole rather than electing a smaller RTP committee. Lilly Berry, 2002-2003, chair of the UP recommends that both the department committee

and the candidate thoroughly understand the retention/tenure and promotion

policy. Senator Consoli asked how many departments in this year's cycle had spelled out criteria.

Compesi indicted that it is important for departments to spell

out any special criteria that they have for their candidate prior to the start

of the evaluation process. In answer to the senator question he felt that

the information was not available. Senator Wen Shen Pong asked if research

and professional development was given more weight by UPC than the service

areas. Compesi indicated that UPC follows university policy in the

evaluation of the candidate WPAF for promotion. He indicated that often candidates

that put a lot of effort into research have little time for service. Dean

Marilyn Verhey indicated that community service is an important area

in the retention/tenure and promotion evaluation. Her office invites department

to set up workshops to address the problems of the evaluation process. Senate

Chair Robert Cherny indicated that

the statewide academic senate has asked campus senate chair to collect information

how department and the university evaluate community service in the retention/tenure,

and promotion cycle. He has requested the information from department chairs

and encourages all to send the requested information to him as soon as possible.

AGENDA ITEM #5 —report from Professor James Orenberg, Chair

of the Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Session 2002

James Orenberg announced that a random survey of 3,457 of the 8,300 students enrolled in summer session 2002 indicated that 65% were in favor of the current configuration of sessions. He announced that, due to campus building repairs that have restricted the number of classrooms available during the 2003 summer; the committee recommended that the 2003 summer session calendar remain the same as the 2002. Senator Wolfe asked how the survey was distributed and how many students were involved? Orenberg indicated that 3457-survey instrument was distributed to a random sample of classes. The total number of students enrolled in summer 2002 was 8300. Senator Robert Williams asked the committee to look at the funding for summer session and to seek to learn if the funding was being drawn from other areas of instruction. Orenberg indicated that this is a question for the VP John Gemello. Senator and VP John Gemello indicated that summer funding is based upon FTE target requested from colleges. Other funding to department can come from Open University money that is shared with the colleges. Senator Williams indicated that it was his understanding that summer funding was some how tied in with new hires and asked the committee to monitor how summer sessions funds are being spent. Senator Genie Stowers asked for clarification of summer funding for department programs. Gemello indicated that colleges get the money and how they distribute that money to their departments is up to them. However, in the past the total amount of summer money that came into the university was less than what was needed to support summer programs. In the past we have used general fund money to maintain college programs. Senator Christopher Carrington asked if the summer session was moving toward being equivalent in size and scope with the fall and spring semester? Additionally, is the committee looking at mechanism to determine if students learning during the summer are the same as the regular semester? Orenberg indicated the committee is open to different measure of assessment of the summer session program. Senator Rick Houlberg asserted that the standard student evaluation that is used in the summer session classes is a good indicator of student learning. Senator Karen Johnson Brennan thanked the committee for their hard work and their flexibility in support of the summer nursing programs request for a flexible 10-week course. Senator Dean Kassiola acknowledged the committee and APC for the important work they are doing for the university. He is hopeful that once the building problems on campus are taken care of and more lecture classrooms become available, an additional 10 week summer session would be available.

AGENDA ITEM #6 - Recommendation

from the Academic Policies Committee: Calendar for Summer 2003, 2nd

reading

Senator **Midori McKeon**,

chair of the Academic Policies introduced, in second reading, the Calendar for Summer 2003. She indicated that the Academic Policies Committee unanimously presents for deliberation the Summer 2003 academic calendar. A copy of the calendar was provided to all members of the Senate. McKeon emphasized that the proposed summer 2003 calendar is identical to the calendar that we had for summer 2002. She outlined strong support from students enrolled in the summer 2002 session.

m/s/p (Terrell,
Steier) passed unanimously

AGENDA ITEM #7 - Recommendation

from the Executive Committee: Resolution on Pretax parking Payroll Deduction,
1st reading.

Senate Chair Robert Cherny introduced the resolution and indicated that the resolution was identical to one passed by the statewide academic senate.

ms (Houlberg,
Daniels) to open for discussion

Senator Houlberg indicated that he supported the resolution and urged other senators to vote. Senator Daniels indicated that as a result of recent tax law changes CSU employees, except faculty, have been able to move their parking fee to a non-taxable category. He saw no reason for not implementing the resolution. Senator Dean Kassiola asked if the resolution would include administration? Senator Corrigan indicated that his parking fees were in a non-tax category. Senator Morishita indicated that administrators have been paying parking fees in a non-taxable category since 2001. Senator Turitz indicated that CFA at its fall assembly did approve a resolution similar to the one before the senate

m/s/p (Houlberg,

Terrell) to 2nd reading, passed unanimously

Voting on the resolution, passed unanimously

AGENDA ITEM #12 - Adjournment 3:30 PM

m/s/p (Carrington, Nichols)

to adjourn

Respectfully submitted,

James Edwards

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, October 22,
2002
