

2004/2005 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
April 29, 2005**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was taken. Thirty-seven Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Nellen, Van Selst, McNeil
Sabalius, Greathouse
Absent: Kassing

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Fee
Absent: Gonzalez, Hooper

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Sigler, Ashton, Phillips, Lee

COB Representatives:

Present: Donoho, Campsey
Absent: El-Shaieb

Deans:

Present: Breivik, Stacks
Absent: Wei, Meyers

ED Represent:

Present: Parsons, Maldonado-Colon, Lessow-Hurley

Students:

Present: Nguyen
Absent: Lam, Stillman, Gadamsetty,
Bjerkek, Kelly

ENG Representatives:

Present: Pour
Absent: Choo, Singh

Alumni Representative:

Present: Thompson

H&A Representatives:

Present: Heisch, Desalvo, Van Hooff, Hilliard
Absent: Williams, Vanniarjian

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Veregge, McClory, Kellum, Scharberg, Bros

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

SOS Representatives:

Present: Hebert, Von Till
Absent: Propas

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames, Liu

SW Representative:

Present: Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes – None

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Nellen said, “Thank you all for being here today. This meeting will enable us to complete our work for 2004/2005. Usually I prepare the year-end report in the summer, but I’m going to complete it before May 16th, so that you all can see how much work we’ve accomplished this year. A few reminders, the final policy committee meetings are on Monday, May 2, 2005, from 2-4 p.m. Our next meeting of the Senate is Monday, May 9, 2005, from 2-5 p.m. in Engineering 285/287. The final Senate meeting is Monday, May 16, 2005, from 2-4 p.m. followed by the first Senate meeting of 2005/2006 from 4-5 p.m. also in Engineering 285/287.”

Chair Nellen said, "If you haven't told the Associate Vice Chair/Chair of Committee on Committees which committee you'd like to be on next year, please do so today. Also, the Senate Office, other than where the Chair sits, is finally going to be refurnished. The office will be closed June 6-13, 2005. You may reach the Chair by phone and email during this week."

Chair Nellen said, "The changes we made to the SJSU Shared Values have been made and posted to the Strategic Planning website."

Chair Nellen said, "About a month ago we passed a resolution to make a modification to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) policy to say people presenting protocols should go through some required training. I learned today that the Graduate Studies and Research Office and Faculty Development and Support are working on both an online training module and a workshop. They hope to have this in place within the next month."

Chair Nellen said, "The Executive Committee invited two of the new trustees to visit us. Trustee Carol Chandler will be visiting us on Monday, May 9, 2005. Trustee Chandler will be at the start of our Senate meeting, and will give a few remarks followed by a question and answer session."

Chair Nellen said, "We had a very successful Faculty Service Recognition Luncheon on Wednesday, April 27, 2005. I heard very positive comments. This is an event we co-sponsor with the President's office."

Chair Nellen said, "The College of Science is sponsoring a student research day on Friday, May 6, 2005, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. in Duncan Hall. This is a great way to showcase our students work. Invitations are extended to all of you."

Chair Nellen said, "Finally, I have an announcement to make on behalf of Chancellor Reed. The Board of Trustees' Agenda came out today and there is an item where the Board of Trustees will go into closed session to discuss the appointment of the President at San José State University. Chancellor Reed was on campus a few weeks ago and met with faculty of the Executive Committee to discuss his plans regarding our President. Chancellor Reed is proposing to the Board of Trustees that the word "Interim" be removed from Interim President Kassing's title. He has given a lot of thought to this, and it will go before the Trustees on May 10, 2005. Some of the reasons that he has given include: things are going well; we need stability; our WASC accreditation process has been extended; we need to hire several Deans and AVPs; we've made great progress with our strategic planning process; and there are other presidential searches going on in the CSU, and in prioritizing them why work on one now where leadership in place is working so well. And, Interim President Kassing's absence today has nothing to do with this announcement as he didn't know that Chancellor Reed asked me to make this announcement."

Questions:

Senator Vereggé asked, "How long does the Chancellor think Interim President Kassing's

tenure should be extended?” Chair Nellen said, “The thought was that it would be extended one year. Interim President Kassing had already semi-retired when he took over as Interim President, and his wife has retired and is in Arizona.” Senator Buzanski said, “In other words, this means we cannot expect a new president in the summer of 2006 as was originally proposed?” Chair Nellen said, “That was the Chancellor’s recommendation.”

B. From the President of the University – None

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

April 25, 2005 – Senator Sabalius asked if a vote had taken place on the Student Service Award resolution. Chair Nellen said, “No, I’m waiting for a piece of data from Enrollment Services before we do an email vote. I’m hoping that resolution will come to the Senate as a first reading on May 9, 2005.”

B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None

C. Consent Calendar – None

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Donoho presented *AS 1293, Policy Recommendation, The Planning and Budget Process at SJSU (First Reading)*. Senator Donoho said, “The Resource Planning Board (RPB) was originally created in Spring of last year. The main purpose was to allow for transparency in the budget, and to determine how to deal with diminishing resources. This is really the last piece in the strategic planning process that we have adopted. The changes that you see in the policy are the result of the changes in the role of the RPB from what we’ve had in the past.”

Questions:

Senator Van Selst said, “Isn’t there some directive that requires that campuses have a Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), and shouldn’t there be something in the last resolved clause that states that the RPB will act as the BAC?” Chair Nellen said, “The question of what should be in the bylaws has been referred to the Organization and Government Committee (O&G).” Senator Veregge said, “We (O&G) were thinking that this resolution would be approved first, and then we would see what we needed to do with the bylaws. I see your point that the RPB is now taking the place of the BAC that is mentioned in the Executive Orders.” Senator Van Selst said, “Maybe some language could be put in the last resolved clause that authorizes the RPB to act in place of the BAC.” Senator Donoho said, “I would suggest that we review the language in the Executive Order before the next reading to see if it is really necessary.” Senator Norton said, “Section 2.2.4.4. of this resolution states that the RPB will serve as the BAC.”

Chair Nellen said, “We also need to add into the last Resolved clause that S93-17 is repealed, because S93-17 created the BAC. And, as Senator Norton pointed out to me before the meeting, we also need to have a 2/3rd vote to amend the bylaws.”

V. Unfinished Business - None

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items – In rotation

A. Curriculum & Research Committee –

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1282, Policy Recommendation, Revision and Reissuance of the General Education Guidelines (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1282 passed unanimously.**

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1284, Policy Recommendation, Approval of Teaching Associate Fee Waiver Program Report (Final Reading)*. Senator Lessow-Hurley said, “First, I’d like to correct a few errors. The title should read, “Revision to F01-3 and Approval of Teaching Associate Fee Waiver Program Report. And “AS” in the first line of the first Whereas clause should read, “UP.” In addition, the financial impact is “unclear.” Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to delete the 3rd Resolved clause. The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed. Senator Bros presented an amendment to add to the 3rd Resolved clause after “total FTEF;” “and that the waiver program be reviewed every other year.” Senator Bros withdrew her amendment. **The Senate voted and AS 1284 passed with 2 Nays.**

B. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1290, Policy Recommendation, Modification to Bylaws – External Relations Added to Executive Committee Duties (First Reading)*. Senator Veregge said, “We have had an External Relations Task Force for some time now. What this bylaw does is formalize the duties of this entity as duties of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. The External Relations Task Force interacts with legislators and entities outside the university.”

Questions: None

C. Budget Advisory Committee – None

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee –

Senator Thames presented *AS 1288, Policy Recommendation, Final Examination Policy (Final Reading)*. Senator Breivik made a friendly amendment to change the title to read, “Final Examination and Evaluation Policy,” and to change the last Resolved clause to read, “final examination and evaluation.” Senator Sabalius presented a motion to return the policy to the I&SA Committee for revision. The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment failed. Senator Lessow-Hurley presented an amendment to change the “Final Examination and Evaluation Policy” section to read, “In the case where an instructor decides that there is to be a final examination or evaluation it should be held at the scheduled time in every course, unless the college dean under whose curricular responsibility the course falls authorizes in writing an exception to the requirement of the final examination or evaluation being held at the scheduled time.” Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Lessow-Hurley amendment to split the amendment into two sections. One section would deal with the instructor deciding whether to hold the examination or not, and the other would state that the college dean may grant exceptions to the requirement for a final examination/evaluation. The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed. Senator Bros presented an amendment to the Van Selst amendment to the Lessow-Hurley

amendment to read, “For courses in which there is a comprehensive examination or evaluation....” The Bros amendment was not friendly. Senator Lessow-Hurley withdrew her amendment. Senator Buzanski made a motion to return the resolution to the I&SA Committee. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed.

Senator Thames presented *AS 1292, Policy Recommendation, Modification to F04-2, Changing the Schedule Adjustment Period (First Reading)*. Senator Thames said, “The reason for this policy is to change the schedule adjustment period (last day to add and last day to drop) to make it earlier in the semester by one week. Currently, there is not enough time between the last day to drop and the census date, to get all the adds in place. This is causing us to lose FTES.”

Questions:

Senator Buzanski said, “I’m confused as to the reason for the 2nd Resolved clause.” Senator Thames said, “We have quite a few students on I&SA, and one of their concerns was that students can’t always get all their money together early, and if they don’t have all their money in they can be dropped from classes.”

Senator Singh asked, “What will be the effective date of this policy?” Senator Thames said, “The Fall 2005 Schedule of Classes will be online on May 11, 2005. If we can do a final reading on this policy on May 9, 2005, I’ve been told that the change can go into effect in the Fall Schedule of Classes. We’d like to do that so that we can give students fair warning.”

Senator Von Till said, “Have you considered the impact on some programs that require the first two or three weeks of the semester for students to select from various options to add, because of insufficient enrollment? For example, in our department students must select from several senior project options. Some involve setting up an internship with a company. If the paperwork for the internship doesn’t go through, then they must select a different option. This can take several weeks, so these dates could be problematic.” Senator Thames said, “That would be the add dates that would be problematic?” Senator Von Till said, “Yes.” Senator McClory said, “Maybe the committee could talk with someone in admissions about waiving late add fees for certain courses.” Senator Thames will look into this.

Senator Van Selst said, “Did the committee consider different add dates for certain courses?” Senator Thames said, “No.”

Senator Thames presented *AS 1291, Policy Recommendation, Green Sheets (Syllabi) (First Reading)*. Senator Thames said, “We made several changes after we got feedback from different groups. Because the Green Sheet is so important, we need to be as transparent as possible to students. We wanted to put as much information as possible on the Green Sheet to assist students. And, we also looked at other universities.”

Questions:

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, “What was the biggest change?” Senator Thames said, “The

Chairs thought that the changes created more legislation and more work for faculty.”

Senator Wilson said, “What would happen if a lecturer doesn’t get into the job by the first day of class and a syllabus isn’t prepared? Would they be in breach of contract? Senator Thames said, “Exceptions can be made with the approval of the department Chair.”

Senator Hebert said, “I don’t know how many students I’m going to have for several weeks. If I have a smaller class, then I can give them more to do. Why have the syllabi due to students the first day of class? Students have several weeks to make a decision as to whether they want to take the class or not.” Senator Thames said, “We tried to make enough leeway here to say that the Green Sheets may change, and the calendar may change. The Green Sheet is not a legal contract, it is more of a professional agreement.”

Senator Sabalius said, “Has the committee considered separating the concept of the Green Sheet as a contract between faculty and their students, and the concept of syllabus in the terms of schedule or calendar? In my opinion, these are two different things.” Senator Thames said, “No, we didn’t consider breaking it up that way. What we did talk about was pulling out the parts that were universal to the university and putting them on a website, or having faculty members put them on their own website.”

Senator Heisch said, “Having the Green Sheets be due on the first day of class is something that is likely to be violated routinely, would you consider changing that?” Senator Thames said, “I will bring it back to the committee for discussion.” Senator Heisch said, “Also, did the committee discuss the possibility that this comprehensive set of rules and regulations might create the impression of wanting the university to develop cookie-cutter courses, all of them alike?” Senator Thames said, “No.” Senator Heisch said, “There is a structure implicit in what I’m reading here about learning objectives and stuff like that. There are teaching philosophies embedded in terms like that.” Senator Thames said, “We thought we were developing not a cookie-cutter Green Sheet, but a Green Sheet with some consistency. And, a Green Sheet that would be useful to Chairs in working with faculty and lecturers to give them guidelines for what we expect from them at the university.”

Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “Did the committee consider putting the standards on the syllabi? In our college we are required to put this on the syllabi for accreditation.” Senator Thames said, “On page 4, there is a section for individual departments or colleges to put college specific information.”

Senator Kellum said, “You use the word “required.” What do you mean by that?” Senator Thames said, “Most faculty go above and beyond what is required in their Green Sheets.” Senator Kellum said, “ I don’t think the Senate should write a policy that requires something if we can’t enforce it.” Senator Thames said, “This is already a policy.”

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, “My department will not let me submit an email copy of my syllabi. Would the committee consider specifying that copies could be submitted by email?” Senator Thames said, “We can talk about that. However, if you read it, we didn’t specify how the copies had to be submitted.”

Senator Von Till said, “I wonder if the committee looked at the new faculty and lecturer’s handbook. It has guidelines for Green Sheets and contains that exact language that must be in them?” Senator Thames said, “I saw some of that handbook.”

Senator Buzanski said, “My question has to do with whether the committee considered the waste of trees in requiring the repetition of certain information on every Green Sheet? Senator Thames said, “We did talk about that and put the cost in the financial impact. However, our main goal is student success.”

Senator Hebert said, “Students think of the Green Sheet as a contract. If a faculty member changes the Green Sheet midway through the semester, how will the students feel about this?” Senator Thames said, “The instructor has the right to change the Green Sheet.” Senator Nguyen said, “Students just pencil in the changes.”

Senator Sabalius said, “In some colleges the Green Sheets are a required part of the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) process. I have seen college committees and Deans comment on the quality of the Green Sheets. Have you considered the impact of the Green Sheet on the RTP and peer reviews.” Senator Thames said, “I think we need to discuss this more.”

Senator Pour said, “Some colleges require faculty to justify changes to their Green Sheets. If the Green Sheet is required to be given out the first day, what are faculty to do to avoid a problem with changes?” Senator Thames said, “The committee felt this was covered by the department Chairs being able to authorize exceptions.”

Senator Buzanski said, “Would a person have to have a whole new Green Sheet for book changes?” Senator Thames, “That would just be a modification to the existing Green Sheet.”

Senator Veregge said, “How can you enforce this policy?” Senator Thames said, “Some Chairs said you could dock pay.” Senator Sigler said, “In instances where a student complained that there was no Green Sheet, actions such as the following were taken: reprimand, suspension, demotion, and docking the faculty member’s pay. The most common complaint by students was that they did not know how grades were going to be assigned.” Senator Thames said, “That matches what the Ombudsman said to us.”

Senator Donoho said, “Would you consider adding a Resolved clause to designate Chairs to provide this policy to their newly hired faculty after their orientation.” Senator Thames, “I’ll discuss with the committee.”

Senator Van Selst said, “Would you consider checking with the Provost on what can be done if the policy isn’t followed, and what the current policy is?” Senator Thames said, “This is a bigger issue than just this policy and involves what happens to any faculty member that doesn’t follow any university policy. I don’t want my committee involved in debating that.”

Senator Hebert said, "In our contract, we have infractions. They can include penalties from a letter of reprimand to disciplinary procedures. And, if you are disciplined, the minimum penalty is one month suspension without pay up to and including termination."

E. University Library Board –

Senator Heisch said, "I need to ask the Chair whether I can present AS 1294, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Endorsing the Annual Report of the University Library Board? I also have a one-page handout on donating books to the Library." Chair Nellen said, "The report was provided to the Senate on Monday, April 25, 2005, but the resolution was not." Chair Nellen asked, "Was the resolution voted on by the University Library Board?" Senator Heisch said, "No, it is coming from the Executive Committee." Chair Nellen said, "I don't believe the Executive Committee has voted on this yet." The resolution was moved to the next meeting on May 9, 2005.

F. Professional Standards Committee –

Senator Bros said, "One thing I wanted to mention is that the results of the SOTE survey are available online if you haven't viewed them yet. Secondly, the Professional Standards Committee has been working really hard to resolve the problems people have mentioned, particularly with respect to professional development."

VII. Special Committee Reports -- None

VIII. New Business:

Senator Kellum made a motion to reorder the agenda to add a new business item under Section VI (G) of the Agenda. The motion was seconded. Senator Norton said that the resolution should fall under Section VIII, New Business. The Senate voted on the motion to reorder the agenda and it failed.

Senator Kellum presented a *Sense of the Senate Resolution from the Floor on Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)*. Senator Kellum said, "This resolution came about as the result of an email from my department Chair who absolutely abhorred everything WASC was requiring us to do. It does seem to me that we are making some decisions regarding WASC without saying so. There have been some changes to what WASC expects and wants us to do. If we do nothing but what we are told, we are making a decision that everything WASC does is okay with us. I think we should talk about this, and that is all I'm proposing."

Questions:

Senator Norton said, "In your resolved clause, how did you come to pick the Organization and Government Committee?" Senator Kellum said, "I looked at the website and the committee listings and made my best guess as to the committee it should go to." Senator Norton said, "Curriculum and Research would be more appropriate."

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "Is this a Policy Recommendation or a Sense of the Senate Resolution?" Senator Kellum said, "It is a Sense of the Senate Resolution."

Senator Campsey said, “I can see something has happened that has provoked you or your department, but I can’t tell what it is in the resolution. It would better help me to understand the resolution if I knew what it was?” Senator Kellum said, “I think what has upset us is the process of having to write learning objectives for all our courses, and the huge amount of paperwork involved. We have had to gather all kinds of statistics, and some of it seems meaningless in our department. Some of the requirements do not seem to fit our department. My department is not opposed to being held accountable, but we are opposed to the methodology.”

Senator Sabalius said, “I wonder why I find it so striking that a resolution from the Math department strikes such a strong chord with the department of Foreign Languages. Usually these two departments don’t have much in common. However, isn’t curriculum under the purview of the faculty? I see a conflict between the theory and the reality of how it plays out. Assessment tells us to reflect on what we do and to accept control. Theoretically, we should just write down what we are doing.”

Senator Buzanski said, “In respect to the outcome you would like to foresee, why is there a whereas clause that states that San José State University should decide how to use its own resources. Where is the conflict between the way in which our budget is appropriated from the legislature to the Chancellor’s office to the university? Secondly, the eleventh whereas clause appears to be a threat to WASC, and I think you should reconsider that.” Senator Kellum said, “To answer your question about resources, a serious amount of faculty work-hours have went into this, especially with regard to general education courses. Every faculty member is expected to fill out the paperwork and the burden really falls on the part-time faculty, because a lot of the tenured faculty quietly put the forms in the trash can. The part-time faculty end up doing the paperwork, and I’ve talked to them and they say it takes hours to complete. This amounts to time and effort taken away from teaching and scholarship. And, I think we need to decide for ourselves if this is an appropriate thing to do.”

Senator Donoho said, “Did you consider the cost to committee members, members of the WASC team, and members of the university by approving this resolution?” Senator Kellum said, “Given the cost of the WASC process, I felt that the relative cost of asking ourselves to look into this wouldn’t be too much. It may be that WASC is so big and so powerful, that the only answer can be that we are going to have to knuckle-under. If that is the answer fine, but let’s make it explicit and let’s be honest about it.”

Senator Veregge said, “I was just going to ask if you thought this was the only cost of being accredited by WASC?” Senator Kellum said, “No.”

Senator Von Till said, “Have you looked at some of the other universities’ processes? San José State University isn’t being singled out by WASC.” Senator Kellum said, “My Chair has talked with some of the other Math department Chairs in the CSU, and in that group we are further along than they are in the process.”

Senator Parsons said, “First of all, I would like to thank you for being brave enough to bring up this issue. Do you have any idea how faculty would feel about accreditation if it were bottom-up instead of top-down?” Senator Kellum said, “I would say in my department there is a lot of

resentment about having to write learning objectives, and the learning objectives we wrote for our general education courses most of us don't pay any real attention to. We teach to the course outline and the curriculum. Most of us don't teach to the learning outcomes. Maybe that's because the learning outcomes didn't come from us, they came from above. We wrote the learning outcomes to get the Board of General Studies (BOGS) and WASC off our back."

Debate:

Senator Norton said, "WASC is basically controlled by the universities' administrations. In other words they know what they are doing. Second, this is in response to the demands of state governments for accountability. WASC is making it easier for us to get our appropriations. WASC is not just somebody out there. WASC is part of the overarching structure of higher education."

Senator Sabalius said, "We may have no choice but to comply with WASC's requests, but this resolution allows us to articulate our concerns and objections to WASC. We should give WASC some feedback instead of just always fulfilling their requests. We should let them know what the consequences of their requests are. WASC's requests change our curriculum. They take decisions away from faculty about how to run their courses, and give these decisions to administrative institutions that don't necessarily know better what to teach in the courses."

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "I would oppose this resolution, because I think it is poorly crafted and politically unwise."

Senator Hebert proposed an amendment to add a new fourth whereas clause to read, "Whereas, outcomes assessment is an unproven methodology for accreditation of large universities." The Senate voted and the Hebert amendment failed.

Senator Norton proposed an amendment to change the resolved clause to read, "Be it Resolved: That the Executive Committee is requested to refer this resolution to an appropriate policy committee to investigate the impact of WASC on San José State University and make a recommendation to the Senate." The amendment was not friendly.

IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions: In rotation.

- A. Associated Students President – Moved to next meeting**
- B. Statewide Academic Senator(s) – Moved to next meeting**
- C. Provost – Moved to next meeting**
- D. Vice President for Administration – Moved to next meeting**
- E. Vice President for Student Affairs – Moved to next meeting**

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.