

Executive Committee
2/26/04
3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Catherine Nelson, Noel Byrne, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Melanie Dreisbach, Rick Luttmann, Robert McNamara, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme, Eduardo Ochoa, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Ruben Armiñana, Phil McGough

Guest: Steve Wilson

Agenda – approved

Minutes – Minutes of 2/12/04 emailed today. Delayed due to seven grade appeals filed. *Minutes unable to be approved.*

Correspondence – Invitation to Budget Summit in Long Beach on March 10th. The President, the President of Associated Students and the Chair of the Senate from all the campus get together and talk about the budget. The Trustees selection committee for the President of San Jose State met yesterday to consider candidate qualifications and determine which candidates to advance to the next level of consideration. Our colleague Bill Crowley's brother will be temporary President for awhile longer.

Chair-Elect report

M. Dreisbach said in terms of our electronic elections at last count we were at 40% earlier today which is further along than the same point in time a year ago. It appears that the bugs have been cleared up for the PC and it's working quite well. So the election closes at midnight Thursday. We will know the outcome of the elections in the morning. The other main thing for us in Structure and Functions is that because there are so many grade appeals, we had to actually had to draw an emergency panel to supplement the original panel. So we have eight faculty members serving on the panel for the entire year, but we had no grade appeals in the fall. We've drawn a subsequent one and certainly come to realized that when you get multiple grade appeals the policy does not work. It becomes crazy to try to meet all the timelines. We are working with the schedules from faculty members to try to find common blocks of three hours to hear and deliberate on each of these juries. So we're very busy and she appreciate the body's indulgence that Laurel, if it weren't for Laurel she didn't think this could quite happen. But it means she can't be doing the minutes and everything else, but it is a real team effort, but she's definitely a team member here and she needed her on this and she begged the body's indulgence to let her use her.

R. McNamara said he knew there were some glitches, but he cannot believe we are constantly having to extend an election because a few people could not figure out. E. McDonald said it's a software, operating system issue. M. Dreisbach said it didn't affect all systems or computers. Structure and Functions meet on this and she felt strongly that if it were just poor voter turnout we could not extend. R. McNamara said he was glad to he brought it up because that was his impression, that oh, I got a little impasse and I gave up and didn't vote. E. McDonald said we just don't have

the IT support. If we all had up to date computers will all the latest software, it wouldn't be an issue. B. Lahme said some of the problems she had was it usually uses capitalized letters, but it wouldn't use capitalized letters as her log in name. And on R. Luttmann's computer the password would disappear, so there were big problems. R. McNamara said it was good to hear this because he'd never had a problem. S. Wilson asked when the results of the election would be announced. M. Dreisbach said it will go out in an email tomorrow.

Vice President of Administration and Finance report

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he wanted to let the body know about a new systemwide task force that's been created that he's been appointed to. It has to do with billing students who have take excess units beyond the amount needed for graduation. It is the desire of the Trustees and the Governor to bill students the full cost of that instruction above 10% beyond their graduation requirements. The Governor had hoped to implement this with the coming up year of '04-'05, but it's not possible. So they created this task force of several Provosts, several Presidents, some members of the Statewide Academic Senate, he understands, a couple of CFOs to study this question and since he has a seat on it, he's like to open himself to the Senate in some kind of a way if there's input to this task force. It might be through the Student Affairs committee. He was not sure what's the appropriate Senate committee or group that he should keep informed. He certainly plans to talk to the ESAS people and our accounts payable/receivable people and CMS people and so forth. But there are potential academic policy issues and he's not really qualified on those and he'd like to have some kind of brain trust about these issues so he can communicate the feelings of at least our faculty. C. Nelson said at a minimum Student Affairs, and Academic Planning might be interested as well. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he opened himself. The first meeting is this coming Monday. He had no idea what the agenda would be but he's happy to share it.

R. Luttmann said he was glad L. Furukawa-Schlereth solicited our input on this because he's very concerned about it. It sounds like there is a feeling up there in the upper echelons that there's a bunch of freeloaders or something and he thought one must be very careful to find out if that's what's really going on. It's very difficult to imagine that. Most students are very anxious to get out and take what they need to get out. And those who are taking a lot of extra units, it's usually for some very good reason such as they transferred in from out of state or even from somewhere else in state, but there were problems with a lot of stuff they couldn't use or they might have changed their major and have a lot of wasted units. There are all kinds of reasons that are perfectly legitimate. Besides that we're in the business of selling education, not specifically degrees. It seems to him that if someone wants to stay here and get an education for whatever reason they are as much entitled to it as anybody else. E. Stanny asked about the definition of graduation requirements. Is it a unit requirement or . . . someone could have a double major and they might need more units. Are we talking 120 or we talking the number of units you need given your major. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he thought it was the latter. E. Stanny said so if she decided she wanted to be a joint chemistry/business major and so she needs 140 units or something. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he didn't know. It hadn't been defined yet. C. Nelson said that the impetus for this as it was explained at the

Chair's meeting was that is that it's supposed to be about access. So one of the ways of opening up access is get students out the door, theoretically sitting around taking too many units, not focusing on the major, changing the major five times, as R. Luttmann said, indulgently getting educated and the average number of units for native students, that is student who start here and finish here in the CSU, is 141 and the average number for transfer students is 142. And that was part of the revision in the transfer policy, for the 45/15 thing she was talking about at the Senate last time and this is part of the same package. That's the background. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he will report next time about how this meeting goes. The reason he's on it is to figure out how can technically implement it from a financial point of view, not an academic policy perspective, but he would like to be able to talk intelligently about the academic policy issues. E. McDonald said it would be nice to build into the policy, if this is really the way we're headed, an appeals process, so that students who have perfectly good reasons for excess units don't get penalized. That's pretty harsh. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said these kinds of things will be very helpful.

EPC report

E. McDonald reported a couple of things EPC is dealing with. She mentioned last meeting that EPC is attempting to create a university wide task force to develop a program review protocol to replace what had existed before WASC came to visit and to build on what we did for the interim program reviews that almost all the departments have gone through now. In our last meeting we decided it was important to have representation from all the Schools including the Library and Extended Ed and representation from all the committees that might be interested including APC, EPC, FSAC and SAC. It sounds like it's going to be kind of a large task force now, but we're in the process of soliciting nominations from the Schools so all the Schools reps on EPC should have been going back to the Schools at this point to talk to the Chairs to try to get nominations. We'd like Schools to nominate people rather than picking people from Schools, if possible. If you'd like to find out what going on in your School about that, what we really want to do is have a group that is very representative of all the interests involved. She wanted to have something in place by the end of this year, but her committee told her that was extremely unreasonable and unrealistic, so she thinks what we're going to do is have a draft in place by the end of the year and then go through the approval process next Fall. The second issue is that the GE committee and the APC GE task force have created a background for discussions of this GE path proposal to the Schools. She didn't have enough to pass around to everyone. It takes the six points that were called the blueprint for change and focuses on those six points and then asking each School curriculum committee to...well, it's unclear what's being asked. What's here told her that each School should maybe come up with their idea of what the path would look like, and comment on the existing path. Also come up with what the implications are of implementing this, what the financial implications are, what the implications are for undeclared students, for all the different constituencies that would be affected by GE change. That's also in the Schools right now and she's trying to get a committee in Science and Technology particularly to deal with the special issues Science and Technology majors have. Finally, she had some questions for this committee. She's heard through the grapevine about policy changes, or maybe they are not policy changes, it's unclear, coming down the pipeline dealing

with some of these new issues about getting students out, restricting numbers of units, those sorts of things and the latest one she just heard about was that the grade WU is no longer going to be replaceable. B. Lahme said she could update on that. E. McDonald said great, now her question is how do we communicate to faculty about these changes, where is the forum for discussion of these changes. There was an issue at the beginning of the year about limiting students, she didn't know where that had gone, about limiting students to 19 units and not letting them go beyond 19 units a semester. Where are these issues and where do we discuss them?

SAC report

B. Lahme said the Student Affairs committee has been working on advising issues a lot and we put a document together and invited Provost Ochoa and presented to him what we've been doing, the constraints we've identified, one of those that E. McDonald just mentioned is one of our concerns and some suggestions of how to implement some changes. And so communication was one of our big concerns and one of the suggestions was to identify somebody to be in charge of communication of these issues. The WU, that came up at a faculty lunch, Janet Swing from ESAS and Lisa Noto, Registrar and they both had conflicting information on this WU, so Lisa Noto said soon it will not be able to replace a zero that results from a WU anymore by repeating the class. So there was kind of an uproar. There were some emails going back and forth including Margo Axsom. At the end she called the Registrar and asked what is going on with this now and the current status is that this policy is not changing anytime soon. So there is no plan of changing how the WU is treated. And then she asked if they change it, who would make this change and she talked to Shawn Peterson, the Assistant Registrar who said it would come through the Provost's office. So there is no plan to change that, but this was one of the big things. There are these issues – students were reserved to 16 units a semester and then one day it changed to 19 and there was really insufficient communication to people advising at the time that that was the case. Another one – students can withdraw now just by doing it at the computer, previously they needed a signature from the instructor. Also right now faculty don't really have access in PeopleSoft to see which students have withdrawn, so there is no record. You have to go to your AC. She did that yesterday and it's a lengthy process to get a list of students who have withdrawn from a class. R. McNamara said the class rosters are pretty up to date. B. Lahme said the drops are on there, but she didn't think the W's were. So if you drop before the drop date, it's there, but the W's, if you have access to a grade roster it would be on your grade roster already, but she tried to get a grade roster and it's not up yet. She couldn't figure out a way to do except go through the AC and she watched her do it and it was mysterious. That was one big issue. The other big issue was training for faculty. In the Advising policy right now it says that there should be training for people involved in advising. There is no such training program, but it would be beneficial to have something like that. Then the Academic Advising subcommittee put out a survey to departments and Deans asking them how advising is done in their departments and Schools and so there is some disconnect between how the Advising policy says it should be done and it actually is done, so we are going to talk to the Deans about that to have them talk to the Chairs about that and identify, well, first of all make them aware of what's there and then also get some feedback on if there is something unrealistic that the policy is asking for, but

what should be changed or what kind of support they would need to be able implement it.

R. Luttmann said he was glad to hear that the matter of the WU has been shelved for the time being and that the Registrars office will bring it through the Provost's office. If it was going to be brought up again, he trusted that E. Ochoa would bring it to the Executive Committee to consider. E. Ochoa said he would run it by the appropriate committee. R. Luttmann said it really should be brought to the Executive Committee to decide what to do with it. But the other matter you mentioned evidently has been implemented which is that students can withdraw without our signature or without even notifying us. He didn't know how that happened. He didn't recall that we ever had any discussion about this or even notification and he was upset about that. First, as a matter of principle we should at least have been notified, if not had a chance to discuss it, but also he didn't like it. Because he didn't like having students disappear and he doesn't know whether they are simply being irresponsible or if they've actually legitimately withdrawn. In some cases, he might be able to assist them or help them or change their minds if they come to him about wanting to withdraw. So he wondered if E. Ochoa knew anything about it. E. Ochoa said that it's the general trend in higher ed as we move to automated systems to provide students with this option. That's been his experience on several campuses that the W grade comes at a cost to the student. It remains on their record. It's much better for them to drop it earlier. So when they do that they do pay a price, but they are adults and if they want to leave a class, they should have the ability to do that and he thinks that is the drift of the way things have been going. He thinks it's something that should at least have been discussed and we should have gotten input on it rather than making a purely . . . he thinks there is a tendency in general, particularly with PeopleSoft implementation, people are so caught up in the mechanics and logistics of getting it up and running that sometimes they may lose sight of the forest for the trees in terms of realizing that this is not just a technical decision, this procedure has some sort of impact on the teaching and learning experience and we ought to run it by the faculty and see what their perspective is. R. Luttmann said at the very least could we request then that since this has been implemented that we be notified when students withdraw? E. Ochoa said he would take that comment and transmit it. He didn't know what that entails technically, but he would look into it. R. McNamara said it seems on the withdrawal that is should not be too complicated to have to be able to have that reflected in a class roster after the official drop period. That might be the easiest way to do it. If a student doesn't show up for two weeks we can just pull up our class roster and if we see a W we know what happened. He asked if U has changed or is that part of WU. B. Lahme said it used to be U and now it is WU. The U doesn't exist anymore. R. McNamara said his other comment is just on advising in general. He went to one of those trainings few weeks ago. It has changed quite a bit and he had mentioned at the training that he was surprised that there weren't more training sessions or something and apparently they have been advertised, but it might be a communication thing again, but it seems clearly faculty need to be up to date on that issue because it is there, it's not that cumbersome, but students are going to be coming in for advising and we need to be prepared and we need to know how to read the advising report and all of that, and it has changed. He recommended that the faculty get up to speed on this quickly. He was bit surprised. B. Lahme asked if he was talking about the PeopleSoft advising. R. McNamara said

yes. B. Lahme said the training has been going on and has not been that greatly advertised. Two departments have done it so far. So the Math department has done it and one other one, and they were the only ones to take advantage of that, so she thinks it is a communication issue. It's not required.

R. Coleman-Senghor said he wanted to share with R. Luttmann the observation that this is not just a matter of a student leaving or being an adult and leaving. It means that when he assigns students to group projects, that in fact, there is an expectation that students are going to be working in groups and when a student doesn't appear and students come to him and say so and so is not coming and he looks at the record and sees that they are still in the class, that presents a problem. He would like to be notified of what that student's standing is. The other thing is that the distinction between the WU and the U, in our catalog and grading policy, the important thing is that the policy leads the technology, not the technology leading the policy. There's a distinction between a WU as he understands it. It is an authorized withdrawal that the student has. The U is the designation for a student who has not submitted all of their work and technically you cannot give a student an F because you have not evaluated all of their work, so you have to have a distinction between those two and that has been a point of litigation. He would like to have some clarification on that which comes back to the issue of the relationship between setting up standards and who establishes that and how do we go about the business of doing that. Because this is a clear mechanism that he would like to keep in place. He would like to be able to make the distinction between a student who has taken the course and failed and a student who has disappeared for whatever reason. M. Dreisbach said she did represent the body at the Associated Students Board meeting on Monday and advising is key concern of theirs and they are actually working on a resolution to bring to the Senate on this and decided to hold off on that because they were alerted that the Provost and Student Affairs and the Deans were going to be working on this. She also cannot attend the next two. R. McNamara said a U does turn into an F if they have not dealt with it within a year. N. Byrne said it happens immediately.

From EPC: Changes to the Major in Psychology

E. McDonald said as far as she understands it what Psychology is trying to do is simply streamline their advising. A. Warmoth has written a nice justification on a memorandum that is in your packets and essentially what they are proposing is to eliminate their supporting units but leave the total number of units and basic requirements for the major unchanged. The supporting units means those units taken in other departments, but apparently all their majors were taking their supporting units in Psychology, they had a lot of options. She thinks this just makes it electives they can take. It's more broad for their major and it doesn't have much of an effect other than that. They used to have optional advisory plans where they gave students, depending on their interests, different plans of courses they could take. They've eliminated that and substituted a list of interest areas that represent the expertise of the faculty, so she thinks students are expected to chose their major courses and their supporting courses in connection with whatever their emphasis is of interest. The other thing they did was to add a recommended research methods menu. They have so many students that they are advising, the impact on the department on advising alone is really serious so she thinks this will make their

lives easier. Now it was just that little phrase in there “it is our intention to cross-list research courses with other departments” that attracted the notice of one of our members in EPC who had a real issue with cross-listing courses. It was unclear to her what the problem was. It had something to do with who would control the content of those courses that were cross listed down the road. Which is why it didn’t pass unanimously in EPC. So this cannot go forward as a consent item. But the issue, she thinks, has been resolved to that members satisfaction due to a series of emails that passed back and forth. She didn’t think those email needed to be included in the Senate packet anymore. But A. Warmoth’s paragraph about the question of policies relating to cross listing courses, the proposal requires no change in existing policies for cross-listed courses. The Psychology Department is not trying to do anything different than has ever been done before with cross-listed courses. Other than that there were no major issues raised in EPC.

R. McNamara said on the question of the cross-listing of courses, was it specific to the Psychology department or in general? E. McDonald said in general about cross-listing courses in the university. R. McNamara said he could see that as an issue and could see that the full Senate may want to talk about it because if someone is getting credit and they’re taking a course in any other department, but also getting Political Science credit for it, you want to know in that department is that course appropriate for getting that kind of credit. E. McDonald said her understanding is that the two departments get together and decided to cross-list them together. R. McNamara said is that always happening though. E. McDonald said it is her understanding that it can’t happen unless the two departments agree. R. Coleman-Senghor said all cross-listed courses are supposed to be referred to the curriculum committee of those departments. R. Luttmann said what are we going to say about cross-listing? He sees that Mary Halavais did ask for her email to be included in the cover memo, but it seems to him that if the cross-listing matter is not at issue then it’s counterproductive. E. McDonald concurred that adding the email would confuse the matter. She could briefly state that’s what the issue was and that its been resolved.
No objection to the item on the Senate agenda as business item.

APC report

R. Coleman-Senghor said we have been working in task groups and one of the task groups is the General Education task group. What you have before you is a proposal that was supposed to come to APC prior to being disseminated because APC was supposed to look at it. And it did look at the document today and made some revisions, and those revisions will be forwarded to EPC. The concern in the committee was one, that we should in addition to what’s here on the paper, we should ask the question, at least have an on-going discussion of the question, exactly, specifically what is wrong right now with our GE and that’s specific to the departments. What works within their GE, what doesn’t work within their GE, what would they like to specifically see changed. There’s a different sort of feel within the committee as to whether or not (unintelligible). Some of us believed that it had been part of an on-going discussion for the past two and half years, others felt that is perhaps had not gone on and could we produce the time for a discussion that would allow us to make a commitment to any curriculum programs coming out. The other issue was the one of the support, both fiscal and resource, for GE. The mass of the

committee basically is in agreement that this proposal should be handled no differently than any other proposal that's come before us in terms of our recommendations with respect to our planning document. We have made recommendations based on whether or not a program, is curricularly sound and fits in with our mission and that it is responsive to the impact issues, both in terms of fiscal resources and personnel resources. This proposal that we have is really a way to get people to think about the proposal for a rich discussion rather than people throwing up barriers to the proposal that is before them. It's been part of our process that while APC may ask that question, it is EPC's role to make sure that that assessment takes place. We're expecting that to occur at EPC. The other thing that we briefly looked at was this issue of transferability. The Chair of the Senate asked all the Chairs of the committees to respond to the transfer proposal. There are a number of concerns reflected in our response to it. One, is the autonomy of our university for the programs we want to offer. The question of what will this mean for majors, are we asking for standardization, whether standardization can sustain itself in all disciplines the same way. That discussion was not completed. The third discussion we had was concerning Residential Life and the Residential Life task group has been doing some really good work trying to get at how we can assess what is going on in the residents and begin to think about the way the residents can be or should be recognized as part of our curricular offerings. We do right now have a FIG program. The FIG program is a response by the people in Residence to bring about cohering the first year experience for the students. They actually have discussion groups and they live in FIG dorms. There's a clear sense that the curriculum is trying to find a way into the dorms and we need to continue thinking about how the curriculum can come into the dorms. How the curriculum can be tied to Residential Life and what we need to do to make sure that tie is a strong one and an effective one for student's education.

From EPC: Early Childhood Education Certificate

E. McDonald said she's always so impressed with the School of Education because she is always so thoroughly confused by all the different demands placed on all of these different programs that change it seems on a yearly basis. Essentially, Johanna Filp and Patricia Nourot have laid it out pretty well in the first two paragraphs that say that the State did away with what used to be called the Multiple Subject Credential with an emphasis in Early Childhood Education. Then the State recommended that universities create their own certificate programs that would pretty much do the same thing, so that's what this proposal does. They can't offer the Multiple Subject Credential with that emphasis so instead the students will get their Multiple Subject Credential and then take extra classes to get their certificate of emphasis in Early Childhood Education. The reason why having a certificate is important is that the State is moving towards having more universal pre-school programs for all children. They are going to set up these programs so that all children have the opportunity to go to pre-school and they need teachers to run these pre-schools and having this certificate of emphasis in Early Childhood Education will be important in getting jobs like that. There are no new courses that they are offering. They have about 20 students currently in the program that's now being done away with that would be interested in getting the certificate. She thinks the rest of the proposal lays out exactly what they will say the Early Childhood

Certificate is - these three courses that are already currently being offered by the School. And then students already get their Multiple Subject Credential before that. It has been unanimous all the way along. *Approved to go forward to the Senate as a consent item.*

R. Coleman-Senghor added to his report. He said that in reviewing the make up of the committee he came across the fact that a number of faculty members that are At -Large members are really assigned to leave office at the same time and so he asked the body to charge Structure and Functions to come up with some way of staggering those memberships so that we can have an effective turnover without losing a large number of people all at one time. E. McDonald said EPC is having the same problem at the end of the year. It's amazing how much turnover we are going to have at the end of this year. Four out of nine of our voting members will get turned over at the end of this year. P. McGough said in an ideal world three of the nine would be at their three year term, so you seem to be on track. E. McDonald said that was a good point, but it still seems overwhelming. It seems that if we had all four new members next year we'd have a committee with an extreme amount of inexperience. B. Lahme said they had the same problem in the Student Affairs committee last semester, but she thinks what introduces the problem is if somebody leaves and you get a replacement, but that replacement doesn't sit out the term. They just serve until the end of the year. M. Dreisbach said replacements can go to the end of the term. SAC happened to have a situation where the term was nearing the end. C. Nelson asked that **Structure and Functions check on the membership and make sure we have an accurate accounting of where everybody is in their term, whose term is going to be up, etc and then look at the by-laws to see if staggering would be an effective way of helping prevent so much turnover at any one time.** E. McDonald said one more thing in EPC that exacerbated it. Tom Cooke retired, Tom Ormand went on sabbatical replacement and she thinks is trying not to come back. *Approved to refer to Structure and Functions.*

FSAC report

E. Stanny said FASC reviewed the Intellectual Property policy and Tony Apolloni and E. Warren were going to make a few little changes. There's one little change that we added about works for hire. It will be obvious when you see the policy. So that's finished for our committee and we're revisiting the Course Outline policy and we had Paul Draper come in and we're going to add a little blurb about GE. She's not sure what to do about the Diversity statement, but she did send an email to Rose Bruce who had not gotten back to her. Does the Campus Climate committee want to look at this or have someone attend FSAC? E. Ochoa said ok. We also looked at the transfer policy that C. Nelson sent to us. She will write up her comments and send them to C. Nelson. C. Nelson said the reason they are mentioning this is that the Statewide Senate emailed all the Chairs and said please have your campuses look at this and provide feedback because the Statewide Senate is going to be looking at this the week of March 8th. E. Stanny said we worked from the amended version of the Course Outline policy we got from SAC, so they also looked at it.

Provost report

E. Ochoa announced that we're going to have the WASC team visiting us on the 24th. They will be here Tuesday night as well as Thursday morning. On budget, he guessed that the last tidbit of news is that we have enough information now in terms of cuts that could be made out of non-instructional areas in Academic Affairs to collapse the two scenarios into one. So we're releasing the planning scenario version one. It reflects the slight increase in the total cut that was distributed today at PBAC, then that's more than offset by additional cuts we identified in other areas, so the net effect to the Schools is that the cut has gone down a bit. There's a possibility of additional cuts we might be able to make, but this at least gives us some information to work with and the Schools now don't have to plan with two sets of numbers. The Schools continue to report. He met today with T.K. Clarke and got a report on Business. He's gotten Social Science and Education already, so we're getting close to having all the information together to put the picture together.

R. Luttmann said regarding the WASC visit, he understands their coming back for an interim visit because of concerns that they had last time they were here. Could he say a little bit more about what those are and how we're planning to address them? E. Ochoa said there were three areas that were mentioned in the letter from WASC after the last accreditation visit that they were going to be interested in seeing our progress midway through the accreditation period. One was in the area of planning. They wanted to see more of an effort at systematic planning and the other one was assessment and the third one was diversity. We should have released to you a copy of the report that has gone to the team, the Senate should have it. C. Nelson said we had only received the draft in December and not the final copy. E. Ochoa said he would tell E. Sundberg to send it to the Senate. It's been shipped off to WASC. We had a conference call about it with the team and with the WASC liaison person in the WASC office and talked about the upcoming visit. There weren't any real questions about the report itself, so that seems ok. It was mostly about the logistics of the visit and how to structure the meetings and so forth. We feel that we have made progress on all three areas, but of course more remains to be done.

M. Dreisbach said related to accreditation E. Ochoa had mentioned in a report in a previous Executive committee a possibility of moving some post baccalaureate programs into self-support or Extended Ed. Recently, she'd been hearing from faculty, not even in her own School, but faculty concerned about moving their programs, hearing that they could be in trouble with accreditation if their programs are not viewed as central to the mission of the school and with institutional support. She didn't know if that was something in his conversations about the possibility of moving the post baccalaureate programs if accreditation of those programs is an issue by their accreditation bodies. E. Ochoa said certainly in Business, this is not an issue at all. In fact, the Business Deans of the CSU have sent a letter to David Spence from all of them urging them to be allowed to move their graduate programs into self-support mode across the board and they wanted actually to take over the program. M. Dreisbach said she was referring to Counseling or programs that are not more business oriented, but more traditional credentialing and certificate kinds

of things. E. Ochoa said we certainly wouldn't do it if it threatened accreditation. The option of going self-support is actually an option to be explored to see if a program can be strengthened that way rather than weakened. M. Dreisbach said she was just mentioning that as factor to definitely keep in mind as we think and talk about particular programs to move over. She also said asked about E. Ochoa talking to three Schools about their planning schedules, so then has there been approval to actually mount a schedule in some areas of the university? E. Ochoa said we've given ourselves until about mid April to actually come up with schedules. That's been the deadline that's been identified. We have that deadline in mind. We can anticipate that we won't necessarily have resolved all the issues regarding how to handle the cuts by that time, but we will mount a schedule at a minimum that allows us to meet our enrollment targets and beyond that we'll incorporate as much as possible the constraints we have been able to work out on the funding side. So a schedule as it first goes on may not precisely be the one we're able to mount when it goes live, when it actually starts in September if further revisions have been mandated by the budget situations. And, of course, that's true in a big way if the budget we get is different than the one we've been planning for. M. Dreisbach said so now the schedules we're now getting rooms for and have the responsibility of putting together by Monday is just another planning or . . . ? E. Ochoa said it's a first pass at it. You'll have a chance to revise them.

C. Nelson asked about the WASC visit. She didn't know how the visit was structured, what is the faculty role in these visits in terms of Senate committees, APC and EPC or Chairs of APC and EPC, Campus Climate, whatever. Could E. Ochoa explain that to the body? E. Ochoa said we just had our conversation yesterday with the WASC committee and ran by them the list of groups that we thought might be appropriate for them to meet with and they gave us back some of their ideas and so at this point it would be appropriate to run those by this body or by the Chair, Chair-Elect - maybe in the informal Exec committee sessions we can discuss it. E. Sundberg will have a first draft of a schedule any time now. But it does include all the key committees that you would expect. C. Nelson confirmed that the major part of this would be Wednesday, March 24th. E. Ochoa said yes. R. Luttmann said E. Ochoa mentioned that assessment was one of the things WASC was interested in. Could he say a little more about what their concerns were and what is being planned to tell them about how we're addressing them? E. Ochoa said WASC is part of a general movement or consensus that's been developing among accrediting agencies for some time about the need for what they call continuous improvement, which is the notion that you need to assess the effectiveness of your programs against some pre-defined objectives. In the beginning you have to identify what the objectives of your academic programs are and you need to assess to see how well those objectives are being met. The results of that assessment should feed back into curriculum revision and improvement and you get an continuous cycle of improvement. So they want to see to what extent we've closed the loop. That's basically where most of these accrediting agencies are now. Most schools have done something about developing assessment instruments, they have some sort of program review in process, but the question is once you get the results from assessment what do you do with it. How does that feed into the routine process of curriculum improvement. So that's what they are going to be looking for, what progress we've made on that. We've got some narrative about that in the report we

sent them that gathers up everything we've done in last five years and one of the things we are going to include would be meeting with three departments that might be representative of different stages of progress in terms of the process – one that's would be very far along, one that's about half way and one that's just getting started. We'll share those with the body when he gets them from E. Sundberg. We have tentatively identified some departments and they may come up with others. R. Luttmann asked if E. Ochoa thought we could make a response that WASC will be satisfied with? E. Ochoa said he thought so. One of the nice things about this perspective of continuous improvement is that it's always a process, so as long as you're in the process and you're moving and you've got some momentum, it's not so critical that you be at a particular milestone or one point. But clearly we should be further along than the last time they looked at us and he thinks we are.

R. McNamara said he was going to ask that also, but more specifically in diversity. E. Ochoa said that is probably our weakest area. We have some things we've done that can be put on paper. It's nothing he would shout on the rooftops. It's something to work on. E. McDonald asked if the Campus Climate committee would be meeting with WASC. E. Ochoa said he was not sure. Probably so. It seemed to him that it would be, given the three areas. R. Coleman-Senghor said the report was posted to APC and APC has been looking at it and making comments on it. He wanted to change the topic. He was struck by an exchange between E. Ochoa and R. Luttmann and T. Wandling around the question of SFR. In that discussion he said E. Ochoa came to an expression that T. Wandling initiates with the idea that someplace in the background is the idea of hot spots. That there will be a way of identifying the hot spots and he took the hot spots to mean places where this intersection between resource, FTE and FTEF comes into collision. What also struck him about that was what kind of criteria would he use to determine that it is a hot spot. Obviously, we are going to have to deal with a lot of freshman, but we also have the problem of dealing with the major and then with reduced staff within any given program especially for a program like English which has a large ratio of part-timers. If you don't have that, then you have other departments that are going to have to pick up that difference in some way because that's what you've been pointing out which will mean that the SFR will rise in those departments. And then there's the question in the rising in those departments whether the SFR rises to such an extent and severely compromises the quality of the education. Now some departments have external guidelines to deal with that, for instance, Business has a formula set out by its professional association. E. Ochoa said there are some formulas, although in Business they are not the deciding factor. They don't come into play in the range that we're operating in. R. Coleman-Senghor said his central question is that if we have external organizations that take a look at programs and say you can come into us and be part of our association and receive our accreditation if you stay within the ballpark of these criteria. Now if that is something which is external to us, but is a guideline, the same thing is happening in Art History, Education has that also. So given those externals how do we decided about what the criteria are to us internally. E. Ochoa said he address that by describing the hot spots in a different way. We have a distribution of SFRs across departments around a mean value. We think we will get in the aggregate of 25.3. Mostly, but not entirely because we started out with in fact a dispersion of SFRs already across departments. For example, it's not clear whether a department that started out with a very low SFR, but is going to be

doubling its SFR as a result of the initial look at the resources, that may be in more trouble than a department that's was already at the right tail all along and isn't going to change very much. So we've factored both things in, first the absolute size of the SFR of that department relative to the mean, but also how dramatic of an issue the change would be and that's where the FTEF issue comes in. So those are the two things we are going to look at. The third would be the extent that it becomes a constraining factor would be accreditation issues. In Business, he doesn't think that comes in to play because the SFRs that are being set as upper bounds by ACSB are quite a bit higher than what we have in the CSU. R. Coleman-Senghor said he thought is was between 38 and 40 to 1 and his point in that is that there will be departments that will exceed that. So his concern is how we can use even that guideline as perhaps a model for our own thinking about what is the upward level for quality education. E. Ochoa said the first purpose of identifying these hot spots is to see to what extent we can reallocate faculty resources or FTES targets to bring that more in line. So we'll make those adjustments and see if there are any remaining intractable problems and then those become the subject of scrutiny and we'll be looking for someway of supporting those if we see that they are in fact problematic. But the first effort is to minimize the impact on quality and then after doing that if there's some that are still at unacceptably high levels, then we'll have to deal with that problem then. R. Coleman-Senghor said he looked at room utilization and was struck by the remark that was made by Dr. Crabbe in saying to us that we, in the CSU were around 98% utilization, but that there are formulas when you have 65% per room, he's puzzled a little bit and finally figured out what that was all about. It means that the reduction in utilization is tied to pedagogical issues. For instance, while we have a space which holds 200 when the band meets in it we don't have full utilization, you can't put 200 bodies in the room. So his concern is has there been a discussion of that particular aspect of how pedagogy is going to impact our approach to full utilization. E. Ochoa said that is something that is being handled at the School level. We're not looking at it at our level. We are relying on the Deans and the Schools and departments to deal with those issues, to identify problem areas with that. He would say that in his mind a more important reason for the so-called full utilization being, in fact, less than full has to do with the inevitable dispersion of times that classes are given and the fact that it's very hard to get a body of students wedged into the little boxes and time slots that are come up with 100%. So if you wanted to actually give them 100% access you've got to build in some over capacity. Unless you're in a situation with great excess demand. Then, of course, you can fill every class 100%, every room, every hour. If you actually try to get 100% of your student body in class, to do it you have to make enough sections open that you will never fill them all. There will always be a little bit of space. The system recognizes that. Under a normal situation, a balance between supply and demand of enrollment, you're going to have some spare physical space.

Visit from Bob Cherny and Kathy Kaiser – C. Nelson

C. Nelson said as you know next week Bob Cherny, Chair of the Statewide Senate and Kathy Kaiser, Faculty Trustee will be visiting campus. They are going to arrive around 10:00 and it is presumed they will stay until at 5:00 through the Senate meeting. She sent a copy of the email giving a very broad statement of what we had come up with so far – lunch with the Provost from 12-1:30, if you have not RSVP'd

yet to Laurel about your menu choice, please do so. She understands salmon is pretty popular and it may even be politically correct. We also are thinking about a campus tour and time for an open meeting with faculty and we haven't decided which to do when yet. She wanted to know if there is anything else the body thought we should be doing with these people while they are here besides having lunch with us specifically, an open meeting with the faculty and a campus tour. There was discussion of specifics of the campus tour. P. McGough offered some information on the visitors. He said that Bob Cherny came to Sonoma State about 5 years ago and made a presentation at the Senate. The Statewide Senate has four standing committees, two of them are like ours, Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs, the other two are Fiscal and Governmental Affairs and one that focuses on K-12 and relationships with the university. Bob was chair of Academic Affairs, was the lead author, although Susan McKillop took a big part, in probably the major undertaking of the Statewide Senate in the last 10 years - The CSU in the Twenty-First Century - showing the continual erosion of student-faculty ration and resources. He made a presentation based on that to our Senate. He's leaving the Statewide Senate. He's gotten this prestigious Fulbright Chair and will be spending next Spring as the John Adams Chair of American History at a university in Holland. Kathy Kaiser, who is in the Sociology department at Chico State has spent a lot of time and energy in the Statewide Senate on GE education. R. Armiñana said Kathy is particularly interested in energy conservation, green building, those kinds of issues. She might be very interested in what happened with Salazar and is going to happen with the Rec Center and in the Environmental Technology Center. One of the questions she always asks about proposed buildings is about how green is this building and how much energy does it use, etc. There was further discussion about how to incorporate these suggestions in to the day. It was decided to do the tour in the morning and the open faculty meeting in the afternoon.

Senate agenda

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes - 1/29/04; 2/19/04 emailed

Early Childhood Education Certificate

Special Report: Green Music Center Curriculum report – E. Ochoa, J. Langley, F. Ross in Warren Auditorium T.C. 3:00

Special Guests: Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser and Statewide Senate Chair Bob Cherny in the Commons T. C. 3:45

BUSINESS

1. Joint Doctoral Program in Education – Second Reading – attachment - B. Vieth T. C. 4:30
2. Resolutions regarding Lecturers: T.C. 4:55
 - a. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – Second Reading –M. Dreisbach - attachment

- b. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators –First Reading - - M. Dreisbach - attachment
- 3. Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in SSU Academic Senate and Administration - Second Reading - P. Phillips - attachment
- 4. Draft Vision and Mission statement from AASPC – Second Reading - C. Nelson – attachment
- 5. Grants and Contracts Policy – Second Reading – E. Stanny – **Please bring attachment from 2/19 agenda.**
- 6. From EPC: Changes to the Psychology major – First Reading – E. McDonald - attachment

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom