

## **Minute - m11-18-03**

**Tuesday, November 18, 2003**

**Senate Members Present:**

Aaron, Eunice	Gemello, John	Meredith, David
Alvarez, Alvin	Gerson, Deborah	Morishita, Leroy
Avila, Guadalupe	Gonzales, Dan	Nichols, Amy
Bartscher, Patricia	Gregory, Jan	Palmer, Pete
Bernstein, Marian	Guerrero, Jaimes	Pong, Wenshen
Bohannon, Tara	Heiman, Bruce	Scoble, Don
Carrington, Christopher	Hom, Marlon	Smith, Brett
Chelberg, Gene	Houlberg, Rick	Smith, Miriam
Chen, Yu Charn	Irvine, Patricia	Stowers, Genie
Colvin, Caran	Jerris, Scott	Suzuki, Dean
Contreras, A. Reynaldo	Johnson-Brennan, Karen	Terrell, Dawn
Daniels, Robert	Kassiola, Joel	Ulasewicz, Connie
Edwards, James	Klironomos, Martha	Van Dam, Mary Ann
Fielden, Ned	Liou, Shy-Shenq	Williams, Robert
Fung, Robert	Mak, Brenda	Yang, Nini
Garcia, Oswaldo	McKeon, Midori	

**Senate**

Members Absent:

Batista, Natalie, Cherny, Robert (excused), Corrigan, Robert (excused),  
Otero, Aina J. (excused), Rocchio, Jean (excused), Shrivastava, Vinay, Steier,  
Saul (excused), Vaughn, Pamela (excused)

**Visitors:** David Apelt, Kati Bell,

Suzanne Dmytrenko, Maria Garrido, Richard Giardina, Ann Hallum, David Hellman,  
LaVonne Jacobsen, Deborah Masters, Brian Murphy, Sondra Perl, Charles Schuster,  
Mitch Turitz, John Van Savage, Marilyn Verhey, Edward White, Gail Whitaker,  
Georgianna Wong, Yenbo Wu, Jennifer Yeh

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair **Edwards** announced

a “wine and nuts” reception in honor of the Senate’s hard work this semester  
immediately following the assembly on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of the Administration  
building. Senators and their guests are welcome. December 2<sup>nd</sup> will  
be the last meeting of the semester, barring an emergency, in which case December  
16<sup>th</sup> is set aside. The last half hour of the December 2<sup>nd</sup>  
meeting will consist of a reception in the Seven Hills lobby honoring President  
**Corrigan’s** 15 years of service to the University, and will continue  
until 5:00 pm.

Chair **Edwards** indicated

that the Senate is still seeking names for the workload task force.

### **AGENDA ITEM #1 - APPROVAL OF**

THE AGENDA FOR **NOVEMBER**

18<sup>th</sup>, 2003

Chair **Edwards** noted that

a correction is needed for agenda items 7 and 8, whose numerical values are  
reversed on the printed agenda.

**m/s/p**

Palmer, Meredith. Agenda is approved as amended.

**AGENDA ITEM #2 - APPROVAL OF**

**MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003**

m/s/p Meredith,

Palmer

Senator

Chelberg

noted that in the section of the minutes on “changes in agenda” there is an

extra “the.” Agenda item 4 should list his title as Director, Disability Programs & Resource Center.

Minutes approved as amended.

#### AGENDA ITEM #3 -REPORT—SUZANNE

#### DMYTRENKO, SFSU REGISTRAR: STUDENT PRIVACY REGULATIONS

Suzanne **Dmytrenko** indicated

that Senators have been provided handouts, including SFSU policy on student privacy, a web tutorial on student privacy as an informative mechanism, and a postcard listing basic information regarding what kinds of student information may and may not be distributed or made public.

Senator **Meredith** asked

whether only the Registrar’s office could distribute this kind of student information or whether anyone was able to do so.

**Dmytrenko** responded that as long as a student’s record is not deemed confidential, and that confidential status is up to individual students, this is public information. These are guidelines for faculty as to what can and what cannot be released.

Senator **Williams** asked

about student names: whether class lists could not be circulated in class, whether grades could be posted, etc.

**Dmytrenko** indicated that student names are directory information, and can be circulate.

However, documents containing social security numbers, or even partial social security numbers linked to student names, and grade sheets with grades listed are items that should not be disseminated.

Senator **Ulasewicz** asked

about partial social security numbers.

**Dmytrenko** answered that this was not acceptable, and that the University was moving toward a system by which social security numbers are no longer being used for identification, but rather an unrelated University number.

Senator **Hom** asked about

one item on the information card which suggested that no discussion of a student’s academic performance may take place between faculty. He noted that such discussions are often necessary, and asked if faculty should disregard the so-called “progress

requests” between faculty.

**Dmytrenko** responded that for educational purposes, such discussions regarding students’ academic standing should naturally occur, even with the inclusion of private information. The postcard is a general guide, and not comprehensive. That is why the Student Privacy Web Tutorial is so important; which all faculty should become familiar..

Senator **Carrington** noted that since the University was dispensing with social security numbers, whether an alternative number would appear on class lists.

**Dmytrenko** noted that only printed class rosters would be missing social security numbers, and that the web class lists, available to faculty, would include the social security numbers.

**Morishita** requested that **Dmytrenko** explain the UIN to the senators.

**Dmytrenko** noted that last year’s senate had resolved to change the system of social security numbers, and that faculty, staff, and students would now be given a nine digit number. Number assignments should begin for faculty and staff in July 2004, with students later in the fall. This UIN will replace the social security number for privacy purposes.

**Williams** asked about the practice of leaving folders containing student papers for pickup, and if student papers were placed in a separate envelope was that an acceptable practice. He also expressed some anxiety about the consequences of unintended non-adherence to policy.

**Dmytrenko** said that some small penalties were possible and fines for non-adherence. For grade sheets, envelopes are appropriate, even grades written on an inside sheet of a paper would be acceptable. The caution is that students should not be able to comb through a bin for this private information. She indicated that having a staff person to monitor student access would be the best manner in which to handle the distribution of student papers.

#### AGENDA ITEM #4 - REPORT—DEBORAH

#### MASTERS, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN, & LAVONNE JACOBSEN, HEAD, COLLECTION ACCESS & MANAGEMENT SERVICES: REVIEW SERIALS OFFERINGS

Debbie **Masters** noted that after consultation with the Academic Senate Library Advisory Committee, an email regarding serial offerings had been distributed to the faculty.

**Masters** stated she wished to present an outline of the project to the senate, which is a result of presentations provided for college Deans and the Executive Committee.

**Masters** noted that there were two handouts provided to the Senators. The first handout outlined trends in scholarly publishing in higher education, and the second was a printout of the presentation slides.

**Masters** noted that SFSU library's collection is curricular driven, and is not that of a large research library. While this does not mean that research materials are not chosen, the curricular stance remains a basic principle. She urged faculty to take advantage of services like Document Delivery, which enabled access to many esoteric, and sometimes costly, journals beyond our own collection.

**Masters** stopped to provide a basic working definition of "serials." A serial is anything that is issued in parts, intended to be continued indefinitely, and is commonly referred to as "magazines, journals or periodicals" - anything for which we have a continuing obligation to acquire, is considered a serial. **Masters** stressed that we need to periodically review our materials to insure that they meet curricular needs. The goal of the project is to make sure that the library is providing the SFSU community with materials that meet these curricular needs.

**Masters** noted a slide that outlined the pattern of the library budget over the last ten years, with drastic cutbacks in the early 1990s, but with support from administration much of the purchasing power was restored in the late 1990s. Unfortunately, the cost of living augmentation which had been a factor until recently, has no longer been an option for the past couple years. This has created a large gap in the maintenance of the collection.

The rise of journal subscription prices has thus eaten more and more into the library's budget, creating an erosion of purchasing power, a situation that is not a sustainable model. The current project is an attempt to address this erosion and by cutting \$500,000 from the current \$2,600,000 budget devoted to serials, in an attempt to come back to a more balanced level of expenditure.

Librarian selectors and liaisons will be contacting departments, helping to address these journal issues. Departments may want to rank their most important journals, or look at canceling journals

with the highest inflation rates. Also, departments should consider that sometimes electronic, instead of print formats, can be more cost effective. Every department is expected to have to cancel some serials subscriptions. The project has a final deadline of April 2004, which will give the library enough time to process the changes.

In conversations with the Library Advisory Committee, the Deans and the Senate Executive Committee, a number of questions were on the order of "What are you going to do about this?"

**Masters** noted that already the CSU system is able to take advantage of consortia buying to acquire databases and other resources at deeply discounted prices. There are CSU core collections for the whole system.

**Masters** indicated that faculty might be in the "driver's seat" for initiating change. Various initiatives, among them SPARC, have launched in the University world about influencing scholarly publishing.

Some things that are being done are:

- Rethinking RTP criteria to encourage quality vs. quantity.

- Valuing electronic publication as well as print, in order to retain rights of the work to use in teaching.

- Universities can choose journals with open access to materials at no or low cost.

- When serving on journal editorial boards, chose only honorable journals.

- Collaborate on new ventures to provide alternatives to high cost journals.

- Faculty can collectively influence accreditation criteria, which traditionally create rigid and inflexible lists of mandatory journals. Perhaps the argument that access rather than ownership

is sufficient.

**Masters** stated that working together over time, it is possible to transform scholarly communication. This year the library requires your help on the serials project.

Senator **Daniels** wanted to know the names of the worst of the journal publishers.

**Masters** responded that Elsevier was the worst, and had created, partially through acquisition, a large and aggressive empire. UC, among others, was in the process of pushing back.

Senator **Williams** asked for clarification about accreditation issues. His department had fairly specific guidelines for journals.

**Masters** commented that increasingly there were criteria for learning outcomes, student information literacy and student lifelong learning. While not saying that there aren't critical journals, there may be improved ways to consider accreditation criteria.

Senator **Chelberg** wanted the other senators to be aware of AB-422 which calls for all publishers who sell educational materials to public education institutions to provide electronic formats for maximum accessibility for student use. He also proposed criteria that favored publishers who honor those ideas and use our leverage.

**Masters** agreed that market power was a valuable tool.

Senator **Heiman** asked if the library had any connection to the public library of science initiatives and what role we might play there. Referring to the point of article length and quality, he found that in his discipline, there was a real move towards shorter articles, which is beyond his control.

**Masters** was not familiar with this movement but thought that alternative publishing models might perhaps be useful, especially if peer review can be preserved. For the first part of the question, she knew that UC had spoken to the issue and that CSU library directors had been discussing it as well.

AGENDA ITEM #7—RECOMMENDATION

FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - a *consent* item - APPROVAL of the RESOLUTION ON WAYS TO ADDRESS REDUCTION IN WORK AVAILABLE FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY

State Senator **Gregory**

noted that in response to questions and comments made by senators **Vaughn** and **McKeon** changes for clarity were made to the bullet points of the resolution, but a “whereas clause” amendment never reached her electronically.

Senator **McKeon** had a question

for the Chair, as to whether it is appropriate to have procedures mentioned in resolutions. Traditionally resolutions do not usually contain information regarding procedures, and she asked if the kinds of procedures outlined in the resolution are appropriate.

Chair **Edwards** ruled that

this is appropriate, noting that the constitution explicitly addresses this.

Senator **Chelberg** noted

that in the fourth paragraph, a spelling error required correction.

**McKeon** had questions regarding some

potential difficulties with compliance and timing for the first and second bulleted items. Departments usually begin early in a semester to coordinate course schedules for the following semester, however the first bullet states that lecturers should submit work lists and an Application for Subsequent Temporary Faculty Appointment no later than one month prior to the end of classes each semester. The second bullet recommends that distribution of the form should occur during the time of class scheduling, which is at the very beginning of the preceding semester. She requested some clarification on this area.

**Gregory** adopted a suggestion in amending

this section so that scheduling would not take place before the forms were submitted. She would accept this as a friendly amendment, perhaps striking everything after the comma on line three of the first bullet point but adding the words “until budget crisis ends” to bullet point two.

Senator **Bernstein** thought

the rationale for the resolution was very clear, which is that schedules are made up quite early, and to have lecturers make declarations about courses in effect “after the fact” seems unhelpful. In fact moving it earlier would help lecturers make their case with better timing.

Senator **Meredith** observed

that his department used electronic communication almost exclusively, and wondered if this was appropriate. He also noted that he had never seen the form mentioned in the resolution.

**Gregory** supported the use of electronic

communication, but noted the understanding that both Faculty Affairs and Academic Affairs have this form, or at least a reminder that the form goes to department chairs every semester or every year, depending on lecturers' contracts.

She wondered how it was possible that Senator **Meredith** had never become acquainted with the form in question, and sought the insight of the Dean of Faculty Affairs, who was present.

Senator **Williams** reminded senators of the spirit of the resolution, which is for the institution to encourage lecturers to make sure they maintain the attention and awareness of their chairs and departments.

Senator **Heiman** made a suggestion for the third bullet, perhaps adding a phrase to the end of the bullet point "and as necessary." He commented that in his days as a lecturer at several institutions, a chair or dean had never called him during a semester break with a request to teach almost immediately. Much more common was hearing from them at the beginning or the first third of the semester, and at that stage, it makes more sense to make sure that lecturer information is available.

Chair

Edwards

suggested

this as a friendly amendment, and acknowledged that the time certain had arrived for agenda item 5, and the Senate would take up this item again when time permitted.

AGENDA ITEM #5 - REPORT—MIRIAM

SMITH, CHAIR, ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE on INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS: INTRODUCTION OF GLOBAL STARS, the database for faculty international expertise & THE COMMITTEE'S PROCESS IN COMPILING COLLEGE INVENTORIES OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Chair

Edwards

indicated that besides Miriam Smith,

Kati Bell,

Advisor, Study Abroad Programs, and Yenbo Wu,

Director of the Office of International Programs were also present to answer any questions.

Miriam **Smith** noted that

the AUCIP has a broad charge to supervise all international programs on campus,

and two of the projects the committee has undertaken have been to identify faculty and staff who have experience or expertise in international issues, and to identify all the international activities that take place on campus.

Kati **Bell** outlined some

of the history of the Global Stars database. She also noted that Global Stars is a web-based database, accessible to anyone on campus, supported by CET, and she demonstrated some of the features of the database, for example, how to search and sort by country or language. Over a hundred faculty and staff are listed so far, and they represent a wide cross-section across campus. The database would allow campus members to locate others with similar or desired experience and knowledge. She encouraged campus members to join and create records of their own to expand the database to increase its utility.

**Smith** outlined another project of

the committee, an inventory of international activity business, noting that two members of the committee were present at the meeting today, visitor John **Van Savage** from Business and Senator Oswaldo **Garcia** from the college of Science. Individuals can inform the committee about any internationally focused program or activity, and it will be collected in one place for the benefit of the campus community.

RETURN TO: AGENDA ITEM #7—RECOMMENDATION

FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - a *consent* item - APPROVAL of the RESOLUTION ON WAYS TO ADDRESS REDUCTION IN WORK AVAILABLE FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY

With no speakers on the speakers

list, the resolution was put to vote.

The resolution was unanimously approved.

AGENDA ITEM #6—RECOMMENDATION

FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - APPROVAL of the RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION WEEK 2003

Senator **Gerson**, chair

of the Student Affairs Committee commented that this resolution is similar to previous resolutions, that International Week has already begun, and she urged adoption of the resolution.

**m/s/p**

Gerson, McKeon

**McKeon** spoke to the spirit of the resolution,

and how it was in accord with this campus' philosophical stance, and urged

approval.

Yenbo **Wu** announced that

there are over 80 events scheduled this week and expressed pleasure that greater numbers of faculty, including lecturers, had become involved and put much energy into the week's activities.

**McKeon** asked for additional phrases

to be added to the final "resolved" section: after the list of people and offices who have contributed, adding "various department programs, and faculty members across the campus."

Chair **Edwards** moved the resolution to second reading.

The resolution was unanimously approved as amended.

#### AGENDA ITEM #8- REPORT—BRIAN MURPHY, DIRECTOR, SAN FRANCISCO URBAN INSTITUTE: MAKING SENSE OUT OF THE CURRENT POLITICAL TURN OF EVENTS

**Murphy** indicated he would attempt to

provide some sense of the lay of land in Sacramento. The new Governor's inaugural address was remarkably positive, and he took a stance that cast his immigrant status as a plus for the state. One example of the potential value of his experiences is that he is the first Governor in recent memory who actually attended community college. Currently many progressive forces in Sacramento rather than simply despairing the electoral outcome, are building a public awareness campaign on the consequences of the proposed executive actions. The Governor's international celebrity creates new and unusual status for the Governor in a political sense, since he is not someone who needs more fame for external recognition. He has taken a populist stance and may well not want to be known for a legacy of savaging progressive political programs like education. He may not be as beholden to the right wing as is often the case with Republican executives. But the general movement seems to be that he will be proposing ways to borrow the state's way out of the fiscal mess.

There is currently a \$12.5 billion debt, which is, essentially floated. Ten billion is from a year and a half ago, which the previous Governor had hoped to reduce with a half cent sales tax, but the debt has not decreased. Estimates for the current year's debt are for about \$8 billion now but another \$4 billion will be added due to the auto tax rollback. This adds up to a \$24.5 billion debt.

The governor is likely to offer

what is called a “burrito bond” with all the pieces wrapped up in one bond initiative. This will be a very expensive proposition for the state as it will require the state to pay a large amount of interest over an extended period of time.

If the “geo bond” goes through, it may make it very hard to pass the education bond in March and may even make it impossible for the state to carry debt at all. A geo bond means that it is paid for out of general revenues, and the bad news is that this would terminate all other options, if the Governor honors his pledges of no new taxes and rolls back the auto taxes.

Even in the hunt to find \$4 billion, we still remain in danger, because we are in the “discretionary” part of the budget. It is possible that the system may double fees. There are very few other areas from which to make cuts.

All kinds of programs cannot receive cuts without endangering federally matched dollars. A long term debt plan, coupled with a spending ceiling, is a recipe for disaster. The plans would not address such variables as population changes, demographics, and other costs, items that cannot be ignored and the result will be a very big problem. This probably would not explode in the next few years, but would emerge later. Senator **Burton** will very likely not jeopardize any social services and will let the CSU and UC systems take the first hits. Some political action is potentially useful.

**Murphy** commented on the celebrated “audit.” It looked very much not like an audit at all, but a preliminary look at budget numbers, and it seemed likely that the proposal would involve a rollback to previous budget levels.

Finally, **Murphy** observed that no one has a very good idea about the Governor’s agenda beyond the next few days. The Governor is just as worrisome to Republicans as to Democrats, and represents a potentially very independent stance. Sacramento is doing their usual taking a mixed view, trying to figure out what the new angles are, where the leverage is, etc.

State Senator **Aaron** gave thanks for the insights and wondered what was likely to happen now as far as the counties in California are concerned. She asked how they will be affected.

**Murphy** commented

that there are three complicated dynamics. The signature yesterday had a large impact on local funding, but it will not be felt immediately. It will affect poor people first, but at a local level, with no visible stateside effects. Secondly, even Republican districts are just as affected, and will have an effect on fire and police services among others, resulting in a lot of aggravated legislators. A third possibility is to make the state pay back the money, which makes for a hole, and then possibly the state would give property tax funds back to the counties. The state, however, would still have to equalize the effects of this.

Senator **Jerris** had two

questions. He observed that one cannot just issue bonds, but that someone has to buy them, and who would do that? Secondly, he wanted to know if there was any sense of what Washington might do.

**Murphy** responded that perhaps indeed

no one would buy the bonds, but they might be sold in exchange for fiscal guarantees.

**Murphy** further felt that he did not

see how any more than \$2 billion could come from federal sources.

AGENDA ITEM #9—DISCUSSION ITEM:

WRITING PROGRAM EXTERNAL REVIEW—GUESTS, EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM: DRS. SONDR

PERL, Professor of English, Lehman College, CUNY, CHARLES SCHUSTER,

Associate Dean, Humanities and Communication, and Professor of English, University

of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, & EDWARD WHITE, Adjunct Professor of English,

University of Arizona, and Professor Emeritus of English, CSU San Bernardino

Charles **Schuster** from

Wisconsin offered from the review committee

an appreciation at being able to meet with so many administrators and faculty on their visit to campus. He expressed recognition of the high commitment to teaching, learning, and writing evident in conversations across campus.

**Schuster** indicated that the review committee

would be roughing out a report, and sought to present a number of preview points.

Edward **White** commented

that he found a heartening aspect of the campus culture in the relative lack of blame about the issues involved in teaching writing. He thought the campus was definitely attempting to do the best it could with a difficult situation,

and that faculty were taking responsibility. He noted that the situation is a permanent one: students always should be writing better.

Senator **Heiman** drew the committee's attention to latest draft of strategic planning, which explicitly recognizes the need to better address student writing needs.

Sondra **Perl** stated that the committee was aware of the strategic planning and its movement, and that the committee felt that the focus is to identify where the best place on campus to put energy is, and where the resources can be put to best use.

Edward **White** noted that the committee had managed to encounter a veritable mountain of documents for the campus, including a long history of writing on campus. He noted, for example, that our own JEPET test has become a model among CSU campuses.

Senator **Bernstein** asked what the committee's thoughts were regarding GE Segment III, and what recommendations they might have about GE and Segment III in particular, and how to "catch everyone."

**Perl** found it admirable that students were writing in upper level GE courses, but questioned the efficacy of the current "ten page" requirement. She questioned the writing component in large enrollment courses, and suggested employing capstone courses or writing intensive courses within disciplines. She observed two distinctions for writing - learning to write for the discipline and learning to write in general.

Senator **Williams** expressed hope that the review committee would address the extreme disparities of student background, culture, class etc.

**Schuster** acknowledged the dedication to writing across disciplines. He expressed that we all want to do the best we can with what we have and, find ways to celebrate writing, making the need to write with high expectation and low risk a positive approach. We have to acknowledge diversity and realize there is no magic solution - nothing quick, nothing linear - and that students get better, then regress, but need to be given many opportunities.

**White** noted that he had F.E.R.P'd in the CSU and the University of Arizona, and had taught at both at the same time. He found himself looking forward to CSU campuses and their extraordinary

variety and excitement on CSU campuses, all of which feeds into writing.

**Schuster** commented that they have not seen enough student writing, and that our campus might well have “more surface error” in student writing, but likely a richer context for writing. He defined “surface air” as basic mechanics -- punctuation, split infinitives etc., but beneath the writing is often a richer background.

Senator **Gregory** asked if the committee could address the issue of increasing emphasis on writing without increasing faculty workload.

**Perl** offered some suggestions. It might make sense to make distinctions between high stakes and low stakes writing. Many students don't write well because they don't read well. One approach is to use writing to help reading, and to make writing more a practical tool for learning. It is helpful to give ownership to students for their education. Content journals and other mechanisms can further learning, along with improved ways to frame questions to make for more exciting answers to questions. If higher stakes writing is required, faculty should make sure there is time for revision. Other structures can also be helpful, and other students can help edit and proofread each others' work. She felt that less is often more, and that it often was useful to look for patterns of errors and not try to do it all.

**Schuster** that he often asked students to reflect, in writing, on their own writing, whether it worked well, whether they thought they addressed their topics and audience appropriately. Having this feedback often can be very helpful for instructors in developing strategies to improve writing skills.

Senator **Mak** asked about the effect that the internet had on writing, and how it can be used for creative writing.

**White** responded that at least one issue with the internet is as a research source, which is not a new problem. Now it is very easy to include other sources and students are not always aware of proper source citation. We need to educate, stress authority, and take more responsibility to teach properly.

**Ulasewicz** commented on a recent workshop

on rubrics for assessment, and if the committee was suggesting this route.

Also, were there suggestions for freshman and sophomores, not just upper division students?

**White** suggested not using rubrics

so much as scoring guides, but to make criteria visible. Skilled writers do not consider first drafts to be finished items. Skilled writers revise consistently.

Unskilled writers write the night before, hand it in and pray. They are not able to evaluate their own work, and need to learn how to revise. Rubrics help students devise internal criteria, which is very crucial to the process.

**Perl** wanted to address what faculty

can do to improve student writing. She suggested asking what are the most important ideas you want students to learn in the course, and then to have writing in the syllabus which support these areas. Secondly, faculty might begin to think of their courses as narratives, and ask what kind of story they are trying to tell, what is the climax, what kind of pace the course has, and then try to focus writing to match course trajectory.

Senator **Terrell** found

these to be good suggestions, but remarked that critical issues involved the notion of professional development and how we will be able to become more skilled teachers of writing.

**Perl** had two received contradictory

comments about workshops from the campus. Some questions remain as to what the value system of the campus is, and how training will proceed. All these are issues that will return to the campus, faculty and senate.

**Schuster** noted that much success in this

area is ultimately due to faculty development.

AGENDA ITEM #10—ADJOURNMENT 4:00 pm.

**Meeting Date (Archive):** Tuesday, November 18,  
2003

---