

Academic Senate Minutes

February 5, 2009
3:00 – 5:00, Commons

Abstract

Chair Report. Correspondence. Agenda amended and approved. Biology Curriculum Revision – First Reading. Special Report: Dean Leeder presentation on the Holocaust and Genocide Memorial Grove. Minutes of 12/4/08 and 12/18/08 approved. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status approved. Resolution on the CLA – First Reading. SSU Statement on Collegiality – First Reading. APC Progress Report on the Core Academic Priorities Report – Second Reading. Special Report: GE Program Review. Statewide Senator Report.

Present: Scott Miller, Susan Moulton, Tim Wandling, Deb Kindy, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Edith Mendez, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Kristen Daley, Ronald Lopez, John Sullins, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Brian Wilson, Terry Lease, Steve Cuellar, Kathy Morris, John Kornfeld, Rick Robison, Tia Watts, Nick Giest, Cora Neal, Rick Luttmann, Steve Orlick, Margaret Purser, John Wingard, James Dean, Sandra Shand, Jacqueline Holley, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Derek Pierre, Casey Jones, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Thaine Stearns, Sunil Tiwari, Karen Thompson

Absent: Steve Wilson, Wanda Boda, Maria Hess, Lillian Lee, Andy Merrifield, Whitney McClure

Proxies: Chuck Rhodes for Matthew Lopez-Phillips

Guests: Rose Bruce, Barbara Butler, Elaine Sundberg, Elaine Leeder, Christopher Dinno, Nathan Rank, Richard Whitkus

Chair Report – S. Miller

S. Miller announced the event for faculty appreciation next Wednesday in Schulz 3001. He thanked B. Butler for her work on the event. He then questioned the members of the body – “is now the time for one of you to run for Chair of the Faculty?” He shared his process of deciding to run for Chair. He noted the job has many unexpected pleasures and it is a way to get into the culture of campus in a unique way. He also noted there were other positions in the election that could use healthier candidacies.

Correspondence

S. Miller reported that he received correspondence from the Chancellor’s Office regarding our President’s three-year review. The comment period is open now. He directed questions Senators may have about the process to himself or the Senate Analyst.

Consent items:

Approval of Agenda – amendments: Statewide Senators report at 4:50; Biology Curriculum Revision moved to Business item #1; resolution regarding emeriti added as item #5 with no time certain. *Approved.*

Moved to Business item #1

Biology Curriculum Revision – First Reading - T. Stearns

T. Stearns introduced the item noting that EPC approved it unanimously and introduced R. Whitkus, Chair of the Biology Department to answer any questions. A Senator questioned the use of the designation of 495 for courses in the Biology curriculum and what standards were set for the class. He also brought up the question of 495's university wide. R. Whitkus noted that the question came up in EPC and described the use of the 495 course in the Biology revision. There was more discussion.

Time certain reached.

Special Report: Dean Leeder presentation on the Holocaust and Genocide Memorial Grove.

Dean Leeder announced the opening event, March 29th of the Holocaust and Genocide Memorial. A DVD was shown describing the purpose, design and construction of the memorial and how people can participate. Dean Leeder passed out a brochure about the memorial and answered questions.

Return to Consent Calendar

Minutes of 12/4 – Approved.

Minutes of 12/18 – revised and approved.

Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status

Charles Earl, Kinesiology; Bryant Hichwa, Physics and Astronomy and Susan McKillop, Art History were approved for Emeritus status.

Resolution on the CLA – First Reading - T. Stearns

T. Stearns introduced the resolution and gave a brief description. There was discussion about the CLA as an assessment instrument and the issues of it being mandated by the Chancellor's office. Statewide Senator C. Nelson noted she is a co-chair of a statewide task force assessing the CLA and reported on its first meeting topics. Further, it was clarified the main issue was the faculty opinion of whether the test should be embedded in freshman courses. First reading completed.

SSU Statement on Collegiality – First Reading – S. Tiwari

S. Tiwari introduced the item and gave background on its creation. The Chair clarified the statement would be a statement of the Senate and if the Senate wanted endorsement from the administration, then that would be a separate step. There was discussion. First reading completed.

APC Progress Report on the Core Academic Priorities Report – Second Reading - A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth noted that since the first reading of this document, there had been movement in the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning process to incorporate recommendations of the Long Range Academic Plan and APC's recommendations in the Progress Report of the Core Academic Priorities Report. Various committees are now working towards recommendations in the progress report such as JCAP, the GE subcommittee and the two diversity committees. A. Warmoth suggested the Senate accept the report into the record of the Senate since other documents will have more detail and could have more in-depth discussion. There was discussion.

Motion for Senate to accept the APC Progress Report on the Core Academic Priorities Report in its entirety into the record of the Senate. Second. Approved.

Special Report: GE Program Review – T. Stearns and N. Rank

T. Stearns commended the GE subcommittee for their extraordinary efforts reviewing the GE Program. N. Rank provided a PowerPoint presentation of the review process and outcomes. He also thanked the subcommittee for their hard work. He asked to have questions after the presentation. (*Thanks to N. Rank for providing his PowerPoint for inclusion in these minutes, slide content are in boxes – LHV*)

N. Rank began by reviewing the GE Subcommittee charge:

GE Subcommittee Charge

1. Develop and modify the General Education curriculum ... in accordance with ... applicable Executive Orders ...;
2. Coordinate the curriculum of G.E. courses through consultation with faculty engaged in teaching G.E. courses;
3. Develop and analyze procedures for evaluation of G.E. program ...;
4. Design policies ... with Admissions office staff concerning .. G.E. equivalencies and substitutions in the transcripts of transfer students;
5. Update and simplify G.E. catalog copy;
6. Report ... to the Educational Policies Committee.

7. Submit recommendations for proposals for significant changes in the G.E. curriculum
...to the EPC for consideration and action...

He noted that currently #3 is the part of their charge they are working on and talked about why this was happening now.

Why Now?

It's in our charge, but we haven't completed one in a long time.

Periodic review is part of CSU Executive Order 1033 (par. 6.2.5).

Many campus constituents consider a review important for planning and reform.

He said that since a program review of GE had not been done for a long time, if ever, and was such a broad project, the committee decided to narrow it down a bit into specific goals.

Goals for Review

Better understand the current curriculum.

Obtain feedback from external reviewer for how we could better implement curricular goals.

Review new GE area learning objectives and compare to other learning outcomes.

Develop action plan for reform, assessment, and improvement of the curriculum.

He talked about his interaction with the GE Affinity group statewide and how he found a good external reviewer who will visit campus in March.

External Reviewer: Gail Evans

Dean, Undergraduate Studies at SFSU

Formerly Director of General Education &
Associate Dean at SJSU



He then discussed the sources they are using to guide the review.

Executive Order 1033: "Each campus shall provide for regular periodic reviews of general education program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should include an assessment of general education student learning outcomes."

SSU Program Review Policy (2006-1)

Consultation with colleagues, SSU administrators, and with Gail Evans

He noted that some members of the GE Subcommittee have been through department program review and their experience is proving very helpful. He then provided a rough outline of the resources that have been given to the project by Academic Affairs.

He followed with a rough calendar of the program review.

Program review steps

Develop GE learning objectives in consultation with faculty teaching in GE (S08, F08).

Collect GE syllabi and enrollment data and summarize information extracted from them (intersession).

Write self study document (Intersession, Feb 09).

Gather input from students (S 09).

External review visit (Mar 09).

Complete program review write up (May 09).

He said the self-study writing had already begun and he is working with the Associated Students to gather input on how students navigate the GE curriculum. He then discussed the chapter structure of the program review.

Outline of Self Study (4 chapters)

1. Administration- program structure, course formats, advising, curricular oversight, history of change, articulations and petitions, minor changes, new courses, action plan

2. Analysis of current curriculum- distribution of FTE, overlap of GE and majors courses, instruction in GE vs. majors, role of lecturers, units typically taken in GE before graduation

He digressed to discuss the learning outcomes for GE.

A word about learning outcomes...

Embedded in our syllabi

Learning outcomes for GE areas (GEALO) (<http://ssugeproject.blogspot.com/>)

Mission, Goals and Objectives (MGO) of GE (p. 33 in our catalog)

Executive Order 1033 GE area outcomes (EOGEAO)

Four Essential Learning Outcomes from Liberal Education and American Promise (LEAP) campaign, cited in Executive Order 1033

He noted the various levels of learning outcomes in the CSU and the above slide defines the acronyms used in the GE Program Review. He said all these actually guide the GE curriculum.

He discussed how the GE curriculum is assessed currently and how they are being used in the Program Review. In the last chapter, a member has analyzed how the various outcomes relate to each other.

Outline of Self Study (4 chapters)

3. Assessment- department program review, SSU participation in standardized assessment, FYE assessment, action plan.

4. Alignment of learning objectives-

MGOs / LEAP, GEALOs / LEAP
GEALOs / MGOs, GEALOs / EOGEOAs

Action plan (enhance integration, develop process for revising GEALOs)

One of the recommendations already in the review is to develop a process by which the learning outcomes are reviewed and changed as needed.

Next steps

Complete self study document.

Prepare for visit by external reviewer.

Complete additional data gathering and complete program review by summer 09.
Submit program review to EPC.

Use action plan to guide Subcommittee as it works with GE faculty to further GE renewal and reform.

He reviewed the next steps in the program review and offered to stay for questions.

A member asked if GE review would be in SETE reviews. N. Rank said they had not considered that yet, but would welcome input on that question. The member also asked about content analysis in GE review. N. Rank said they are following much of that data at this point. A senior member of the faculty noted that this was the first GE Program Review ever and commended the subcommittee on their approach. He asked if GE has thought about what to do with the results of the review. Further, did they have suggestions for enhancing shared values between faculty and the GE program as they are complicated by resources issues? N. Rank said now was not the time to do a major course assessment because the learning objectives have just been developed, but that would be part of a subsequent review. He then described how the committee has gotten a more global sense of the curriculum and believed that would help faculty see the GE program as a common curriculum and help the campus make resource decisions based on that. A member asked about the learning objectives process and asked about the discussion process regarding what is desired in the curriculum versus what is. N. Rank said that had come out in the overview of the curriculum and learning objective analysis and a recommendation for creating a process to revise learning objectives are in the review. A member asked if assessing advising was in their review and if a town hall meeting was in planning for faculty and students on this topic. N. Rank said they will be looking into the advising survey on the Senate website and may have advising as a topic with focus groups of students. He said perhaps a town hall meeting would be more appropriate in the Fall.

The Chair noted that the Senate would have another opportunity to discuss GE during the WASC discussions. He also thanked Prof. Rank for his distinctive tenure as Chair of the GE subcommittee.

Statewide Senator Report – R. McNamara

R. McNamara reminded the body of the link on the Senate website to the Statewide Academic Senate. He reported on two resolutions passed by the Statewide Senate—one regarding exit surveys for faculty and one on protecting instruction during times of financial crisis.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström Vega