

2002/2003 Academic Senate

MINUTES
September 30, 2002

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and attendance was taken. Thirty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Brent, Nellen, Martinez
Shifflett, Peter, Van Selst

Absent: Caret

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Lee

Absent: Goodman, Kassing, Rascoe

Deans:

Present: Andrew, Breivik

Absent: Gorney-Mortab, Meyers

CASA Representatives:

Awaiting election results, no CASA members assigned yet.

COB Representatives:

Present: Donoho, Onkvisit

ED Represent:

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz, Rickford

ENG Representatives:

Present: Hambaba, Pour, Singh

H&A Representatives:

Present: Williams, Sabalius, Van Hoo

Sciences and the Arts (Gong Chen, Nancy Lu, Carolyn Glogoski) resigned in the same week. Chair Brent is happy to report that at least two people have completed nominating petitions, and we will be welcoming them

~~pages~~ The whole review process began because the current SOTE is thirteen or fourteen years old, and it was never developed from any systematic process. During the first year of this review process, the SERB looked at the old SOTE and its limitations by comparing it with similar instruments around the country. The SERB came up with about 130 to 140 possible new items for inclusion in the new SOTE. The SERB then put these items through a series of tests.

Senator Liu asked if there were additional questions on the supplemental part of the questionnaire, or what this section was to be used for? Jan Johnson said that this section is for the departments to insert their own questions that are relevant only to them. This section will not be evaluated by anyone but the department.

Senator Singh asked if by voting up or down that meant the Senate would not be able to recommend any amendments to the SOTE, and that they must vote for it or against it? Senator Katz said yes, but if Senator Singh wanted, he could vote against it. Jan Johnston said she would try and answer any questions any Senator wanted to ask about why the SERB did what they did with regard to the SOTE.

Senator Onkvisit said if the old SOTE and the new SOTE are highly correlated won't we have the same problems with the new SOTE that we had with the old SOTE? Jan Johnston said that the new SOTE taps new dimensions that were never tapped before. Specifically, there is nothing in the old instrument that dealt with helping students think, or with the relevance of what they were learning. Senator Onkvisit asked whether the SERB had

separated. Senator Katz said that his understanding from Chair Brent was that there was a certain degree of urgency in getting the SOTE approved. If there is no degree of urgency, then the Professional Standards Committee has time to include the implementation procedures with the SOTE. Senator Stacks asked about the diversity question. How would a student visualize this question, what did they think it meant. Jan Johnston said it meant a variety of things, such as diverse culturally, diverse in ability, diverse in language, etc. Senator Stacks said that the question is very open-ended. Jan Johnston agreed.

Senator Martinez said that some of the questions have vague language, e.g. question number 12. Jan Johnston said that the language was vague, because there are students from all departments being surveyed and the questions need to apply to all departments.

Senator Tsai said that she like having questions 16 and 17 on the SOTE. She asked why they wouldn't be reported back to students. Chair Brent said that it was his understanding that this was prohibited by the faculty contract. Senator Peter Lee said that you can ask for this information, but there is no provision in the faculty contract for providing information that doesn't address teaching effectiveness. Senator Katz said that the Professional Standards Committee wanted to ensure that there was as little bias and undue influence as possible. This is why they want to study questions 16 and 17. It is not clear what they want to communicate to other people making decisions at this point. Senator Katz said he does not have an answer right now as to how the Professional Standards Committee wants to recommend using the information from these two questions.

Senator Onkvisit asked how the SERB was defining teaching effectiveness. Jan Johnston said that it is the student's opinion of what teaching effectiveness is.

Senator Singh said he wanted to recommend that items 16 and 17 go to the chair, but not be counted in the evaluation.

Debate:

Senator Shifflett made a motion to change the proposal to a first reading.

Senator Peter seconded the motion.

Senator Stacks made a friendly amendment to have the proposal not only be made a first reading but also come back with the procedures for how it is to be administered.

Senator Peter requested that the Professional Standards Committee consult with Faculty Affairs with regard to the subject of contract and the number of evaluations that must be done.

Senator Nellen requested that when the proposal comes back, that it come back for a yes/no vote on the SOTE.

A vote was taken on turning this into a first reading and it passed unanimously.

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

B. Vice President for Administration – Time Certain 3:30

Susan Hansen from Housing, and Alan Freeman, the Director of Planning, Design, and

Construction gave a presentation on the Campus Village Project. Susan said that Silicon Valley is one of the most expensive housing markets to live in. Susan said that what they are trying to do on campus is create an affordable living environment of transitional housing for staff, faculty, and students. Right now we have six residence halls, one twelve story high rise, and one apartment complex. The current residences are 31-42 years old. The Housing Department did a market study in 1999. They found it would have taken \$22 million to upgrade the buildings with sprinklers to code, air conditioning, etc. Housing also does an annual survey called "The Educational Benchmarking Survey." According to this survey, the primary reason students move off campus is that they want an apartment. SJSU currently has about 1800 residence hall beds and 200 apartments. SJSU

going to be sent out to faculty and staff to get their feedback, and an email account will be setup for people to send their comments to.

Sept. 16, 2002 – No Questions

Budget Advisory Committee Minutes –

July 10, 2002 – No questions

Sept. 9, 2002 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar – The consent calendar was approved with the addition of the September 30, 2002 nominees.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

1) Vice Chair Nellen took over the meeting, and Senator Brent presented *AS 1184 – Sense of the Senate Resolution: Honoring and Celebrating the Life of Senator Roy E. Young (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1184 passed unanimously.

2) Senator Rickford presented *AS 1185, Senate Management Resolution:*

D. Curriculum and Research Committee – None

E. Organization and Government Committee – None

VII. Special Committee Reports

Senator Nellen presented *AS 1186, Sense of the Senate Resolution: Endorsing Budget Priorities for AY 2003/2004 "The Priorities Resolution" as per S02-1, 2.4 and 2.5 (Final Reading)*. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to add "and resources" to the 4th bullet. **The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed.** A motion was made to extend the meeting for five minutes. The motion passed unanimously. **The Senate then voted on AS 1186, as amended by the Shifflett amendment, and it passed unanimously.**

VIII. New Business – None

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

A. Vice President for Administration – None

B. Vice President for Student Affairs – None

C. Associated Students President – None

D. Statewide Academic Senate – None

E. Provost – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.