

2013/2014 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 21, 2013

- I. The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Heiden, Von Till,
Lessow-Hurley,
Ayala
Absent: Sabalius, Van Selst

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Hebert, Cara
Absent: Goyal

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Junn, Dukes, Nance
Absent: Qayoumi, Bibb

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey
Absent: Nellen

Deans:

Present: Kifer, Green, Stacks,
Absent: Vollendorf

EDUC Representatives

Present: Kimbarow
Absent: Swanson

Students:

Present: Gupta, Jeffrey, Hart
Gottheil, Hernandez
Absent: Miller

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Du
Absent: Gleixner

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Frazier, Bacich, Harris,
Brada-Williams, Grindstaff

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Bros-Seemann, Kress, Kaufman

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Kohn, Kauppila, Fujimoto,
Morazes

SOS Representatives:

Present: Trulio, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Wilson

- II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The Senate minutes of September 23, 2013 were approved as amended by Senator Frazier.
- III. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair Heiden made the following announcements:

tenure/tenure-track faculty. In addition, section IV, would the committee consider having the advising of students with declared majors be left to the major advisors.

Senator Hebert asked if the committee had considered in section II having faculty only advise in their major, rather than being responsible for classes across campus. Senator Frazier would be interested in other Senators' opinions about this.

Senator Brown asked the committee to clarify what the department is supposed to do in reference to the assessment requirement in section III, number 8.

Senator Peter asked in the Resolved clause, and under section II, number 1, how much of the review requirement existed previously versus what is a new requirement. Senator Frazier responded that all incoming faculty were supposed to attend an advising workshop under S89-10, but he did not remember ever doing that. Senator Peter commented that if a department had designated advisor for undergraduate studies, for example, then the requirement outlined under section II, number 1, seems reasonable. However, if every faculty member in the department must get trained this could become very costly. Senator Peter asked the committee to consider how the different patterns of advising would affect the outreach and resources for the department.

Senator Brada-Williams asked the committee to consider inserting a minimum amount of assigned time based on the amount of advising.

Senator Kaufman asked the committee to consider having Student Academic Success Services evaluated by someone outside of Student Academic Success Services.

Senator Trulio commented that she supported the requirement for assigned time, and suggested that the background in the resolution be expanded to include how everything is related.

Senator Hart expressed concern about number 2, A., "the Associate Vice President of Student Academic Success Services shall authorize advising holds," because nowhere else in the policy does it talk about why there would be a hold. It should be crystal clear why a hold is being placed. Senator Hart also asked the committee to consider whether having the Associate Vice President of Student Academic Success Services place these holds was the correct place for this authority.

Senator Bros-Seemann asked if the committee had considered the faculty workl Tc Ad9use

quality control across all advisors.

Senator Brada-Williams asked the committee to consider adding a requirement that advisors that advise more than one discipline be required to learn about the requirements of all disciplines they advise.

Senator Frazier presented **AS 1524, Policy Recommendation, Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (First Reading)**. Senator Frazier commented that this policy rescinded a policy from 1968 that was meant to ensure students received timely feedback on test scores, papers, and exams, but we now assess additional things, such as powerpoints. This policy expands the types of assignments.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked the committee to consider moving the parentheses in the first Resolved clause.

Senator Kaufman asked if the committee were aware there were other forms of materials that were not being returned to students in a timely manner. Senator Frazier replied that the committee was aware of this, and had received this referral from the Student Fairness Committee (SFC) as a result of these complaints.

Senator Du asked if the committee had looked at all the past policies to see if there was a timeline for faculty to report to students. Senator Frazier replied that he had looked through all the grade policies and none of them had any reference to a timeline for reporting this information back to students.

Senator Ng asked if the committee had considered there might be an increase in cases brought to the SFC as a result of implementing this policy. Senator Frazier responded that he did not think that there would be an increase, and this would certainly make it easier for the SFC.

Senator Kaufman asked if the committee would consider making this a final reading. Senator Frazier responded that he would, however, would like to make an amendment to the 1st Resolved clause if that occurs. After further discussion, Senator Frazier decided it was best to keep this resolution as a first reading.

Senator Backer suggested that maybe not a good idea to have the third Resolved clause. This resolved clause asks the committee with cleanup of all the older policies, and I&SA might not be able to complete this task.

Senator Bros-Seemann commented that students don't get their materials in a reasonable time, there is no language about what the recourse would be, or the impact on the faculty member. Senator Frazier commented that the SFC would become involved. Senator Bros-Seemann asked if the committee would consider making this a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Several members noted that in order to rescind a policy, you must bring a policy recommendation.

18 months away.

The library gets \$1.9 million from lottery funds but that \$1.9 million is taken back out of the library base. It is not additional money for the library. Senator Peter expressed concern about the use of lottery funding for the library base budget and asked if the Senate could be given a more detailed budget report about this in the future.

Senator Hart noted that the MLK Library is one of her favorite libraries in the whole world. Senator Hart expressed concern that sometimes she reads would be removed to make space for student activities. Chair Eggers responded that the volumes to be removed are those that haven't been touched for about 15 years. The volumes to be removed also depend on the discipline, how many copies are in circulation, and other criteria.

Dean Kifer noted that every time they clear an area in the library it becomes filled with students almost immediately. This is why they would like to open up as much space as they can for study areas.

Senator Hernandez asked how long the selection process would take, and Dean Kifer responded that it could be years depending on staffing.

Senator Von Till presented **RS 1527, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Library (Final Reading)**. The Senate voted and the resolution was approved unanimously.

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented **RS 1523, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Concerning the Need to Continue to Increase the Proportion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty at San José State University (First Reading)**. Senator Peter commented that the idea ratio is 80% tenure/tenure-track faculty to 20% lecturers but it was disturbing for the PS committee to find that San José State University had slipped to under 50% tenure/tenure-track faculty. However, the committee commended the current administration for their efforts to increase tenure/tenure-track faculty, and over the last few years we have risen above the 50% mark again. However, the committee also found that the CSU average is 62%. In addition, not long ago the legislature called upon the CSU to increase its tenure/tenure-track faculty to 75%.

In addition, the 2nd resolved clause endorses CSU Statewide Senate resolution which calls upon the system as a whole to increase the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty.

The third resolved clause asks for particular help for those campuses, such as ours, that have high cost of living areas and difficulty recruiting tenure/tenure-track faculty. Senator Peter recalled an attempt to hire a tenure/tenure-track faculty member in his

department that was offered more money to teach at DeAnza Community College than his department could afford. Regional cost of living is also an issue for us.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski expressed concern that the resolution does not take into consideration the budgetary difficulties the campus is facing.

Senator Frazier asked if it was true that the pay scale was the same for faculty across the CSU campuses. Senator Peter commented that we have a statewide senate and a statewide union. Senator Pete

additional workload. Senator Schultz-Krohne noted that the committee felt that issues of workload would be dealt with by the chair and the dean. Senator Bros-Seemann said she is concerned that a new lecturer could be required to develop an online course. Senator Schultz-Krohn asked Senator Bros-Seemann to send her concerns to Senator Gleixner.

Senator Hebert noted that “distributed instruction” shows up in only two places and then the term “hybrid online” shows up in the rest of the document, so is this an editing error. Senator Schultz-Krohn said it was not an editing error, the primary issues of concern were technology intensive hybrid online courses, but also distributed courses. Senator Hebert asked if the committee would consider clarifying where distributed education may fit in the policy.

Senator Rudy expressed concern about who owns the materials in a distributed or hybrid course and asked how SJSU can maintain the property rights to the whole delivery mechanism. Senator Rudy suggested the committee consider adding a full discussion on faculty property rights, as well as SJSU’s rights in section IV.

Senator Brown asked what was meant by “limited interaction.” Senator Schultz-Krohn commented that the committee left this sufficiently vague so that they would not be dictating to the faculty member when the materials had to be returned. Senator Brown stated that she had emailed suggestions to Senator Gleixner. Senator Brown asked how many students per faculty member is reasonable, and stated she would like a number specified. Senator Schultz-Krohn is bringing this back to the committee for consideration.

Senator Hebert asked hypothetically if he assigned a TV show for students to watch, but some students could not watch it that night and instead watched it online the next day, would this be a distributed assignment or an online assignment? Senator Hebert asked for the committee to consider redefining their terms of online instruction and distributed instruction to include interactive instruction and one-way instruction.

Senator Junn responded that the content that a faculty member creates is owned by the faculty member and this is specified in the contracts we have with Udacity.

Senator Kaufman noted that in 7 it states that personnel decisions will not be based on the mode of instruction, but this resolution is about online instruction and not RTP. Senator Kaufman asked the committee to consider coordinating with the PS Committee about incorporating this into the RTP policy.

Senator Frazier asked if a course has a cap of 25 then will the alternative class offered through this policy have the same cap? Senator Schultz-Krohn responded that the intent was to not change the caps established by other policies. Senator Frazier said there was a clause dropped from S01-10 on class size limits, and the clause was “a course shall not exceed the limits for the curricular classification of that course and shall be substantially the same as in comparable face-to-face courses.” If there has been further discussion about reinserting this clause, would the committee consider

reinserting that clause.

Senator Peter asked the committee to consult with the PS Committee to discuss issues surrounding Intellectual Property Rights.

Senator Harris presented *AS 1528, Policy Recommendation, Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading)*.

Chair Heiden announced that the meeting was running out of time, and questions would have to be limited to five minutes to get to updates.

Senator Brown asked for clarification as to the role of assessment since page 9 says that assessment is filed without Board of General Studies (BOGS), but page 10 looks like it is tied to assessment. Stephen Branz responded that this section had not been changed from the previous guidelines. Sen Backer responded that she had written that section of the previous guidelines. When program planning occurs, there is a special section of the program planning document for GE, and the GE offerings of a particular program are reviewed at that time.

Senator Branz commented that the WST is passed at a lower rate by transfer students than by our native students. However, English B is not a graduation requirement, and we cannot insist on students taking it if they come in with a full GE certification. We have a lot of inconsistencies.

Senator Peter asked what happened to the statement regarding plagiarism, the statement about distinguishing between reasoning and assertion, and learning objectives that were in the old GE guidelines, but are not in the new guidelines? Stephen Branz commented that some of the current objectives contain some of this information. Also, some of the stuff on information literacy was pulled out and moved to the 100W. This was partly driven by the Executive Order that said we were to reign in our GE programs by LEAP objectives, and they define critical thinking a little differently. One of the inconsistencies since the 2009 GE Guidelines were completed is that there is a requirement that you must assess at least one learning outcome per year, and all within the five year period.

week and 70 faculty members showed up. They are in the process of creating a website.

Questions:

Senator Kaufman asked if the Provost was aware if anything had changed in our relationship with Google to allow them to now send us ads, etc. VP Dukes will check into this.

E. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No Report.

F. Vice President of Student Affairs –

VP Nance announced that effective next week graduate admissions was pulled out from under the undergraduate and graduate admissions office. A consultant was hired that strongly recommended having a separate graduate admissions office. Graduate Admissions will be temporarily headed up by Tricia Foust.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.