

## **Minutes: November 2nd, 1999**

SFSU Academic Senate

Minutes of November 2, 1999

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

### **Senate Members Present:**

Alvarez, Alvin; Bartscher, Patricia; Bernstein, Marian;  
Boyle, Andrea; Collier, James; Concolino, Christopher; Consoli, Andres; Corrigan,  
Robert; Craig, JoAnn; Cullers, Susan; Duke, Jerry; Edwards, James; Elia, John;  
Fehrman, Ken; Ferretti, Charlotte; Fox-Wolfgramm, Susan; Gillotte, Helen; Goldsmith,  
Helen; Graham, Michael; Gregory, Jan; Harnly, Caroline; Hom, Marlon; Hu, Sung;  
Hubler, Barbara; Jerris, Scott; Johnson, Dane; Johnson, Sharon; Kelley, James;  
La Belle, Thomas; Langbort, Carol; McKeon, Midori; Moallem, Minoo; O'ate,  
Abdiel; Raggio, Marcia; Sagisi, Jaymee; Scoble, Don; Shapiro, Jerald; Smith,  
Miriam; Swanson, Deborah; Tarakji, Ghassan; Terrell, M. Dawn; Turitz, Mitch;  
Vaughn, Pamela; Wick, Jeanne; Wolfe, Bruce; Yee, Darlene; Zoloth, Laurie.

### **Senate Members Absent:** Ganji, Vijay(exc.);

Strong, Rob(exc.); Cancino, Herlinda; Wong, Alfred(exc.); Gonzales, Angela;  
Eisman, Gerald; Avila, Guadalupe(exc.); Aaron, Eunice.

### **Guests:** J. Sim, R. DeLeon, J. Bebee, G. Whitaker,

J. Kassiola, E. Pasaporte, G. West, N. Rabolt, A. Hallum, P. Lee, H. Modirzadeh,  
A. Barnes, A. Saah, B. Smith, R. On.

### **Announcements and Report**

- Terrell announced that nominations for the Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Extended Learning are still open but need to be in soon.
- Terrell briefly mentioned the attendance of herself and several other Senators at the American Council on Education conference "Educating All of One Nation: Diversity, Equity, and Democracy: Optimizing Our Future." She also mentioned an upcoming conference that will bring together the CSU Academic Senate with CSU Academic Senate Chairs, among others.

### **Chair's Report**

- Terrell commented that the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Senate Executive Committee are valiantly working on the FMI policy. A draft policy will be a discussion item at the next Senate meeting.

### **Agenda Item #1 - Approval of the Agenda for November**

2, 1999

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

### **Agenda Item #2 - Approval of the Minutes for October**

19, 1999

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

### **Agenda Item #3 - Report from Pamela Vaughn, Chair - Programs**

for AsiloCampus 2000 Retreat

Pamela Vaughn, Chair of the Program Committee for the AsiloCampus 2000 Retreat, reported that the committee has come to a consensus on the format for the retreat: two days of workshops with a keynote speaker each day and one day of special meetings. There will be a limited focus for the workshops: meeting the challenges close to home in our changing relationships with our students and meeting the challenges in higher education more broadly. The committee is especially interested in interdisciplinary workshops--for example, bringing together advisors, staff, and faculty to discuss implementation of new advising or assessment plans. The hope is that workshops will be truly interactive and solution rather than problem oriented. Workshops on coping with our changing physical and emotional demands are also encouraged--serious workshops combined with time for play. On the morning of the third day, there will be time for special interest meetings (e.g., a chairs' meeting). This will be followed by a closing session and reception. Vaughn closed by encouraging all Senators to take the initiative in promoting these faculty development days: reach out, share ideas, and rejuvenate ourselves for the semester ahead.

### **Agenda Item #4 - Proposed Changes to the Bachelor of**

Arts Program in Political Science

**Chair Terrell** prefaced these proposed changes by explaining why the Senate was taking this up for a second time: the version passed last Senate meeting was not the version approved by the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC).

**John Elia**, speaking on behalf of CRAC Chair Alfred

Wong, introduced the proposed changes. **Richard DeLeon, Chair of Political Science**, addressed the difference between the two versions: the theory course was changed from an upper division 4 unit course to a lower division 3 unit course, which provides better articulation with equivalent courses in the community

colleges.

**Darlene Yee** asked whether there will be resources

to maintain courses dropped from the core as elective courses for non-majors.

DeLeon agreed that this is a problem in general with a shrinking faculty. He added that the Department has addressed this in terms of overall program goals; they decided this solution was the best use of resources, and PLSI 100 will be offered as a GE course at least once a year.

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

**M/S/P (Goldsmith, Oñate) to close debate.**

The vote was taken and the proposal was **approved unanimously.**

#### **Agenda Item #5 - Proposed Minor in Hospitality Management**

**Elia** introduced this consent item from CRAC. The

new minor is designed to provide undergraduates focused exposure to a particular area of business practice, Hospitality Management, rather than the broad exposure of the General Business Minor. A minor in Hospitality Management provides the non-business majors with some of the professional and technical skills needed for the hospitality industry or serves as an alternative to a double major for business majors wishing expertise in a second field.

**Abdiel Oñate** asked for further information

on the general orientation of the degree. **Janet Sim, Chair of Hospitality Management**, explained that there are 8 business minors but there has never been one in this field. There is growing interest and an increased demand for students in the industry. The program is interdisciplinary and uses existing courses.

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

**Yee** asked why Accounting 100 & 101 is not just an option rather than a substitution, and why there is a discrepancy between the 21 unit minimum for a minor and the 24 here. Sim answered that they are following the pattern of all the other business minors on both counts.

**Helen Goldsmith** asked about the phrase "prerequisites may be enforced." Sim replied that there are some classes that have strict prerequisites. Yee followed up that it's possible that the minor would be more than 24 units.

Sim explained that an advisor can help students select so that it stays at 24.

**Bruce Wolfe** asked about the conditions of taking prerequisites or not.

Sim answered that the prerequisites are specified in the bulletin but that information is here since some non-majors might have to take more than 24 units, although there are enough choices to avoid that. Goldsmith suggested some kind of notation

in the bulletin copy that says that certain courses have certain prerequisites.

**M/S/P (Ferhman, Duke) to close debate.**

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

#### **Agenda Item #6 - Proposed Bachelor of Science Degree**

in Apparel and Interior Design

**Elia** introduced this consent item from CRAC that

comes from the faculty of the Department of Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics.

Currently, the apparel and interior design subject matter is offered in two

separate concentrations under the B.A. in the Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS)

degree in the Department of Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics. Under this

proposal, the clothing/textile and interior design/housing concentrations will

be removed from the current B.A. degree in Family and Consumer Sciences and

become a degree in Apparel and Interior Design. This follows the nationwide

trend to combine apparel and interior design subject matter.

**Christopher Concolino** asked what the change from

B.A. to B.S. means. **Nancy Rabolt, Chair of Consumer and Family Studies/Dietetics,**

explained that our faculty felt that this is a professional degree with an industry

orientation, and the students prefer that it be a B.S. There is no plan to increase

the units at the moment. **Wolfe** asked what distinguishes a B.A. from a

B.S. Rabolt replied that she understands it to be based on number of units and

whether the degree is more liberal arts or more professional.

**Yee** asked about consultation with the College of

Arts and Industry and removing the two concentrations from the B.A. in Family

and Consumer Science. Rabolt replied that there has been extensive consultation

at all levels; she explained that the concentrations would just go from one

degree to the other. The main difference is in the core with a change from a

family orientation to an industry orientation.

**Laurie Zoloth** asked about rationale for the new trend.

Rabolt explained that she looked through the directory of the international

textile/apparel association and found 15 or more colleges that are combining

these concepts. There are a lot of similarities for these fields, and it is

both industry-oriented and pedagogically driven.

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

**Goldsmith** raised a concern about the B.A. versus

B.S., suggesting that sounding better does not seem good enough justification.

**Midori McKeon** asked if we could be provided with

a table that listed all the required and elective courses in order to take a

look at the changes more concretely. **Gail Whitaker, Associate Vice President**

for Academic Program Development, explained where we are in the process:

this is a master plan projection; the actual courses and units come later in

the implementation plan. **Wolfe** commented that it sounds like the cart

is being put before the horse, and he would like to see a student pulse survey

on this, whether students really are interested in taking more units to get

this degree. Rabolt responded that they did an extensive survey, and the response

was overwhelmingly positive. We did not ask them about increasing units because

there is no plan for that.

**Andres Consoli** asked about the timeline, specifically,

with plans for Fall 2001, what will happen to students who come in Fall 2000?

Rabolt replied that students will have the option to do the requirements of

the old or new program. She added that the only differences are to the core

classes.

**Marlon Hom** reiterated that this is a master plan

projection, so we should be looking at the principles behind the proposal in

such a way that we know that we will have a second chance to look at specific

proposals. He added that from the point of view of Asian American Studies, this

department is making excellent revisions based on our urban university mission,

guaranteeing students employment in a larger sphere.

**M/S/P (Edwards, Fehrman) to close debate.**

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

#### **Agenda Item #7 - Proposed Revisions to the Bachelor of**

Arts Degree in Dance

**Elia** introduced the revisions to the content of the

undergraduate core in the B.A. in Dance. Specific changes include removing Dance

306, Dance 431, and Dance 399, and adding the option of one of two courses,

Theatre Arts 315 or Dance 262, to the core courses.

**Sung Hu** wanted to make sure that we are voting for

establishment of the new core program and not on the elimination of concentrations.

**Jerry Duke, Chair of Dance**, explained that this is true; if this is approved,

we will have four concentrations. EPC will be looking at discontinuance. Duke

explained further that this revision came about through a number of factors:

program review, reduction in one full-time faculty, difficulty of scheduling

for three different concentrations, and a student survey.

**M/S/P (Edwards, Fehrman) to second reading.**

**McKeon** asked Duke about replacing the full-time faculty

member and cutting the curriculum. Duke added that we are not dropping any classes in this process. We lost one full-time faculty member due to resignation but have not asked for a replacement; the part-time faculty seem to be working out better.

**M/S/P (Edwards, Kelley) to close debate.**

The vote was taken and the proposal was **approved unanimously**.

#### **Agenda Item #8 - Proposed Minor in World Music and Dance**

**Elia** introduced the following consent item from CRAC:

changes to the minor program in the College of Creative Arts currently entitled "Minor in Non-Western/Cross-Cultural Musical Arts." The proposed new minor in World Music and Dance provides educational resources for those students interested in global perspectives of music and dance for varying careers as well as personal enrichment.

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

**Wolfe** asked if the electives will be expanded as time goes on. Duke replied that the future of this will be to expand, but we are trying to get it on the books now to work with the things available to it.

**Hom** asked for clarification on the change of title from "non-western/cross-cultural" to "world." Duke answered that they did not want to use "non-western." **James Edwards** added that this was a CRAC concern as well and that it was explained that this term identifies a body of study that is interdisciplinary and includes all dance throughout the world.

**Goldsmith** asked why the 1 unit Gamelan Ensemble was required. Edwards answered that it is in there because it is a form of music instruction that anyone can pick up and understand-- beginning rhythm and beginning spirituality of world music. **Zoloth** added that world music does not speak to any one world but is a specific title of a sub-discipline of music referring to interdisciplinary fusion of musical styles with applications in other disciplines. It is not a geographical identifier but identifies the interdisciplinary nature of the fusion--the kind of music that deliberately takes elements from different cultures and puts them together in interdisciplinary performance.

**Terrell** recapped the questions for **Patricia Lee**, Chair of Music: the name change and MUS 387. Patricia Lee replied that the non-western/cross-cultural minor is moribund. She added that a new faculty member arrived who is very interested in this area and developed something with dance that would be attractive to students and would provide a broader sense of artistic involvement in other cultures. Lee also commented that the gamelan is one instrument

or ensemble that does not require prior study; the experience of playing as an ensemble is very important, and the gamelan can also involve dance.

Goldsmith asked if neither music nor dance majors can minor in this. Duke said that dance majors would be able to major in dance and minor in world music and dance, but Lee stated that music students would not be able to minor in this.

**JoAnn Craig** asked why "world" rather than "global" or "cross-cultural." Lee answered that it seems to be something that people understand that is simple and suggests something other than looking just at western music.

**M/S/P (Edwards, Fehrman) to close debate.**

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

**Agenda Item #9 - Proposed Revisions to A.S. Policy #F93-133**

Procedures for Faculty Participation in the Academic Program Review Process

**The Chair of the Academic Program Review Committee, Jerry**

Duke, introduced this consent item from the committee: the old policy was not being followed; this revision more accurately reflects what actually goes on in the committee.

**M/S/P (Fehrman, Wolfe) to second reading.**

**McKeon** asked about crossing out 1 faculty member from each school under review. Duke answered that, one, we look at up to four different colleges in a given semester, and, two, there is no real advantage to college representation. **Miriam Smith** added that could represent a conflict of interest to have someone on the committee reviewing their own program.

**Helen Gillotte** spoke from the perspective of having sat on the committee for five years, stating that she was able to give a lot of input when her department was up for review, but she was not assigned that review to write up. She did raise a concern about crossing out school representation, asking if this had been crossed out because they cannot get representatives. Duke replied that it was not the reason, reiterating that school representation really would not benefit the program, for the same questions would be raised one way or another. Gillotte added that persons from the school are also there for manpower and assistance. Duke replied that we are not reducing manpower.

**Jeanne Wick** asked about assuring that the College has opportunity to respond. Duke responded that this is part of the process, and that the APRC report is only one part of the whole process that is sent up to Academic Affairs.

**Jaymee Sagisi** asked if the new committee would have students on it, suggesting that they should. Duke responded that there are not students on the committee, and there were not in the previous policy. **Marcia Raggio** commented that the self-report that colleges and departments do includes extensive student input, as does the work of the external reviewers. **Deborah Swanson** reiterated that there is a whole section that is nothing but student concerns. **Wolfe** commented that surveying is distinct from having a student at the level where the decision is made. This is not a specific faculty issue that should exclude students in the decision-making process. Duke replied that APRC is not a decision-making committee but an evaluative committee, but he is open to, albeit cautious about, a student representative on the committee. **Whitaker** commented on the issue of special members from colleges under review. We are completing the fourth cycle of review and beginning the fifth cycle. This issue harks back to the third cycle of review where we did departments and then colleges as a whole, which we do not do any more. Having a person on APRC from a program under review is neither an advantage or disadvantage. Designating persons from programs under review might cause logistical problems, and it is not quite under the context for which it was originally designated.

**Edwards** returned to student representation on the committee, suggesting it would provide a refreshing, enjoyable point of view. Swanson seconded support for student representation: having a student to look out for student interests makes sense for this committee. Raggio commented that she is unsure what it would add. **Hom** added that all Senate meetings including committee meetings are supposed to be open. When there is a program review from a particular department, it just has to be announced. Sagisi commented further that students not being from the department is not any different than the faculty members on the committee. Swanson responded to Raggio's comment, echoing Sagisi that we evaluate programs about which we know little, so students would not be to any greater disadvantage than we are, and would be especially helpful on items having to do with their academic life, like access to courses and advising.

**M/S/P (Sagisi, Edwards) move to amend the motion to add**

a student to the Academic Program Review Committee.

Sagisi commented that having a student sitting on the committee is a different and important commitment than just having meetings open. Edwards commented that this is a hard-working committee, and we should welcome a student there; it is a wonderful opportunity to invite students into the decision-making

or report-writing or memo-engagement that we go through. **Jan Gregory** encouraged us all to support this, given how we so often mourn the absence of students on standing committees. Duke reiterated that he has no problem with a student being on the committee but suggested having one oversee the work for a semester before deciding since it may be a problem to find one who will attend regularly. **Fehrman** supported the fact that students should be on all committees, but wondered who will appoint and how we will make them come. Miriam Smith agreed with Duke that we should open it up for a student on an experimental basis before amending the policy.

Hom suggested caution in terms of the ideal versus reality since APRC is a working committee: can the student afford to spend that amount of time and share the responsibility and same charge as the rest of the faculty members. Swanson reminded us that what we have before us is a policy not reality--what we would like in principle to be true in terms of membership and the way things work. She added that it is her understanding that when you create a policy like this and a student does not show up that would not change what is in the policy, which recognizes the valuable role a student should play in the work of the committee. She concluded by suggesting we put forward that we want a student be a part of the membership, at least making it part of the official charge.

As there was a time certain for the following agenda item, debate on this item was temporarily suspended. This item will be returned to at the next Senate meeting.

#### **Agenda Item #10 - Proposed Revisions to A.S. Policy #S89-160**

University Policy on Temporary Faculty

**Marlon Hom, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee,**

introduced this consent item from the committee, with the following rationale: it brings the language of the policy into compliance with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and it responds, where appropriate, to the recommendations of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Lecturers, as well as to the comments from Senators when this was brought up as a discussion item. This policy can be very controversial with its legal implications, but FAC and the Senate Executive Committee have worked on this in good faith to establish a policy that protects temporary faculty welfare and reduces chaos in the appointment and reappointment process.

**Gregory** suggested that this not be sent to second reading today so that people know what they are voting for and also because she has a couple of non-substantive changes. She also asked that Hom pinpoint those parts that are part of the CBA and not subject to change. Hom responded

that most of that is in italics; he added that there is still a window of opportunity for language changes because the President can change this after it has been dealt with by the Senate.

Gregory asked if we can agree that phrases like "appointments being made on the basis of (program) needs and service to the university" are editorial. Hom was open to this. **Marian Bernstein** suggested that there are quite a number of problems and that these should be dealt with now: for example, compare "the faculty on leave or to fill a temporary curricular need" with "to fill a basic curricular need."

**O'Leary** praised the committee for the hard work on this delicate topic but wondered more broadly how we feel about the notion of basic curricular needs being filled by lecturers. Hom commented that there are programs that don't have enough resources to hire full-time, tenure-track faculty, which leads to the reality of temporary faculty teaching basic curricular needs for the program. Gregory spoke from the perspective of Chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Lecturers, first clarifying that she did not think there were lots of problems in this policy, but adding that the broader questions are important. Looking specifically at the two lines in the second paragraph, she commented that they reflect something with which the committee struggled for two years, which has to do with the ways in which temporary faculty serve the university in fact. There are many "temporary" faculty who have been here longer than most people consider "temporary"; there are a number hired to replace those on leave. The committee's concern was to make the university a more user-friendly place for both groups, but the attempt was not to perpetuate exploitation. She reiterated her suggestion that we return in second reading when we are less rushed.

**Kelley** supported Jan's basic position but asked why we are doing this, suggesting that with so much from the CBA, we'll just have to change with a new one. It might be better to pick out of the policy those things that are not related to the CBA and vote on those. Hom replied that this is precisely the crossroads of shared governance. It's true that this policy will be changed with a new CBA, and he hopes that the Senate will keep pace with what's going on and that our interests will be recognized.

**Gerald West** asked about the meaning of service. Hom responded that teaching one semester per year is counted as one year of service. West asked further about the definition of "service," wondering if it only means teaching in a department or working for the university in another service. Hom pointed to p. 3, lines 1-2, explaining that if it is non-instructional, externally-funded,

the appointment will end as the project ends. The concept here is general-fund funded position rather than special fund. Assigned-time is another difficult issue in terms of lecturers and entitlement.

**Terrell** summarized: it appears that there still are a number of questions even though this was brought up for discussion at the previous meeting. This item is in first reading and will return at the next Senate meeting.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Dane Johnson

Secretary to the Faculty

**Meeting Date (Archive):** Tuesday, November 2,  
1999

---