2008/2009 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 16, 2009

I.   **The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. and attendance was taken. Thirty-nine Senators were present.**

Ex Officio:
    Present: Lessow-Hurley,
        Meldal, Whitmore,
        Cavu-Litman, Sabalius,
        Van Selst

Administrative Representatives:
    Present: Najjar, Phillips, Sigler
    Absent: Lee

Deans:
    Present: Parrish, Merdinger, Stacks,
        Meyers

Students:
    Present: Cerda, Levy, Lichty,
        Linder
    Absent: Hypes, Palumbo

Alumni Representative:
    Absent: No representative assigned
        yet.

Emeritus Representative:
    Absent: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):
    Present: Norton
    Note: Dr. Norton representing the
    Emeritus as a voting member during
    This meeting.

General Unit Representatives:
    Present: Fujimoto
    Absent: Sivertsen, Romo

CASA Representatives:
    Present: Fee, Hendrick, Canham. Schultz-Krohn
    Absent: Kao

COB Representatives:
    Present: Campsey
    Absent: Roldan

ED Represent:
    Present: Maldonado-Colon, Rickford
    Absent: Langdon

ENG Representatives:
    Present: Gleixner, Du, Backer

H&A Representatives:
    Present: Desalvo, Brown, Mok, Butler
    Absent: Vanniarajan, Van Hoof

SCI Representatives:
    Present: McClory, Kaufman, McGee
    Absent: d'Alarcao, Hilliard

SOS Representatives:
    Present: Von Till, Lee,Heiden
    Absent: Hebert

II.   **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 15, 2008 –** Senator Stacks commented that the membership of the Program Planning Committee, as listed on page 3 of the minutes, was incomplete. The minutes were approved with 2 abstentions.

III. **Communications and Questions –**

    A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Meldal wished everyone a Happy New Year!

Chair Meldal welcomed Senators Sabalius and Schultz-Krohn back from sabbatical, and congratulated Senator d'Alarcao on the recent addition to his family.

Chair Meldal announced two upcoming forums. There will be an Intellectual Property and Entrepreneurship Forum in Engr. 285/287 this coming Friday. Next week there are two Open Access Forums and you have a flyer on your tables about it.

Chair Meldal commented that the budget still had not been passed by the state legislature in Sacramento, but they are working on it again today.

B. From the President of the University –

President Whitmore made the following announcements:

The President announced that although we are still waiting on the state budget to get passed, when it does pass it will be a budget for the rest of this year and next year. That will allow us to plan ahead.

There is some good news in the federal budget. Pell Grants will go up two years in a row, and more money will be put into the Pell Grant program. There is also a significant amount of money to increase work study programs on university campuses.

There is some bad news. The money in the original bill for infrastructure got taken out, but some of the money was moved into another section for the states, so there is still some hope we will get some funding for building projects.

The CIO Search Committee met for the first time this week, and progress is being made. In addition, the call for nominations for the search committee for the Provost has been sent out campus-wide. The deadline to get nominations to the Senate Office is noon, Wednesday, February 18, 2009. The President thanked Provost Sigler for her hard work, and commented on how much we will all miss her. The Senate gave the Provost a standing ovation.

Questions:

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked, "Is there a timeline for the Provost's search?" President Whitmore said, "Well, that is going to be very tricky. We want to make sure we have a full complement of faculty when we interview for the position. It may run into the fall."

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –
Minutes of December 15, 2008 – Senator Van Selst commented that there was an error in his remarks on page 3. The minutes should reflect that AVP Boyum, and not Executive

Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard was retiring.

Minutes of January 26, 2009 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar – The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved with the addition of two students, Nicolas Aquirre and Surina Sekhon, to the Student Fairness Committee.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

AVC McClory announced that based on the Fall 2008 FTE, the College of Education lost a Senate seat and the College of Business gained a seat for 2009-2010.

V. **Unfinished Business -** None

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

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
Senator Von Till gave an update on items pending in the C&R Committee. One pending item is the GE Taskforce Report, which will be presented to the Senate today at 3:00 p.m. Another pending item is the First Year Experience (FYE). FYE forums were just held, and C&R will be reviewing that information. The last item pending is a referral to check with AVP Mark Novak on procedures for curricular decisions regarding special session course offerings. However, since the Professional Development Center has shut down, those offerings are no longer an issue for us. The question before the Senate is whether any further action needs to be taken.

B. Organization and Government (O&G) –   No Report.

C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –
Senator James Lee reported that the first two referrals on the referral list had not yet been discussed by I&SA. I&SA is currently working on the next four referrals. The I&SA Committee is drafting guidelines for a President's Award for Student Service, and has held discussions about drafting a Sense of the Senate Resolution on impaction. I&SA has also been discussing referrals on the grade change policy, and granting individual grades to students for group projects.

D. **University Library Board (ULB) –**
Senator Desalvo gave an update on filtering at the MLK Library. Councilmember Constant may make a move for filtering at the upcoming city council meeting on February 24th or March 17th. Councilmember Constant wants filters on all the children and teen areas at all the library branches. The councilmember needs 5 votes plus his own to get this approved. Senator Desalvo encouraged Senators to attend the Open Access Forum on March 3, 2009.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –
Senator Maldonado-Colon gave an update on the three pending referrals before the PS Committee. One pending referral is a request to disband the Affirmative Action Committee.

The PS Committee wants to ensure the charge of that committee is addressed where necessary before disbanding it. Another referral to Professional Standards was made today that deals with the appointment of chairs.

VII. **Special Committee Reports –**
   A. **Accessible Technology Initiative Status:**
   AVP Mary Jo Gorney-Moreno gave a report on the status of the Accessible Technology Initiative. AVP Gorney-Moreno introduced Hilary Nixon (Coordinator of the Accessible Technology Faculty in Residence program), Harish Chakravarthy (head of the web team), and Gwen Dapper, (ADA Compliance Officer for the DRC).

   AVP Gorney-Moreno gave some background information on ATI. The Accessible Technology Initiative began in October 2006 with a coded memorandum from the Chancellor's Office. The [SJSU] President then appointed Provost Sigler as the executive sponsor of the initiative. Provost Sigler formed the ATI Taskforce. In 2007/2008 the Academic Senate passed two resolutions pertaining to Accessible Technology.

   The Chancellor's Office then requested detailed plans about how we were going to move forward on this initiative. Those plans were completed and mailed to the Chancellor's Office in June 2008. In 2008/2009, the Chancellor's Office approved our plan.

   The Accessible Technology Faculty in Residence program has been so successful, that a Student in Residence program has been added. The focus of these programs is to help faculty. A course proposal has also been "institutionalized." When a faculty member proposes a course now, they must give the course to Undergraduate Studies in a digital format, so that it is accessible to all students.

   The Accessible Technology subcommittees include, a web ATI committee, the ATI Instructional Materials Team, and a Procurement Committee. The web ATI team has developed a web faculty builder solution. There are 700 faculty using the web wizard solution who will be migrated over to the web faculty builder solution this spring. This will be an accessible solution that has more features. Another piece of the web solution is the Web Content Management 7. This is accessible for departments and administrative websites. The last piece of the web has been the Faculty in Residence for departments. Dr. Bethany Shifflett has a team of students that have been converting department websites into accessible websites. They then train someone in the department to maintain that website.

   The web builder solution also satisfied some of the needs of the Instructional Materials Committee. There are weekly classes on ATI at the Center for Faculty Development. To date, there have been over 1,885 attendances at these training sessions.

   AVP Gorney-Moreno's team has been successful in raising ATI funds with partner CSU's including Sonoma, and San Francisco State. Those efforts will bring in over $93,000 to SJSU for ATI over the next three years.

AVP Gorney-Moreno announced there is a Faculty in Residence for each college and the MLK Library, and they are coordinated by Hilary Nixon. Each Faculty in Residence has a Student in Residence. The Student in Residence's purpose is to convert materials for faculty in their college. However, these students are not getting enough work.

University policy S08-3 requires workload support in drafting accessible materials. Part of that support is the Faculty in Residence Program. The Faculty in Residence in each college is available to teach classes, or work one-on-one with faculty in their college. There is also a lab in IRC 202 where staff are available to help faculty convert documents, and that is also where the Students in Residence are. Then there is the web builder solution, and all you have to know how to do is type to produce an accessible document.

The Faculty in Residence program did a needs assessment, and developed a quick tips video. The flyer in your Senate packet talks about these materials. One of these items is a checklist that faculty requested.

Spartan Bookstore is one of our partners in this effort. When a faculty member puts in a book order, Spartan Bookstore automatically sends that information to the DRC. The DRC then starts the eight-week process of converting the materials into Braille, or whatever it needs to be converted into. They have also offered to make course readers that are accessible. Faculty can drop off their materials, and they will have them retyped into a format that is accessible.

There are some challenges, but we have until 2012 to resolve them. One challenge is how to reach 1,800 faculty, how to reach adjunct faculty that are hired at the last minute, and how to reach 5,200 employees. Spartan Shops gave ATI some funds this summer so that they could host workshops for Admin Support Coordinators. Over 64 people signed up, and there is a waiting list for the next workshop.

At the first ATI meeting in Los Angeles, 53 websites critical to student success at SJSU were identified. The ATI team immediately went to work on converting these websites to make them accessible. They should be completed in time for our Spring 2009 report to the Chancellor's Office. The ATI team has also converted and re-launched the SJSU main page.

Some other challenges include ½ million pages that still need to be converted. Also, we currently do not have a good technology solution for captioning. The ATI team has a pilot captioning project going this spring. They are taking the top 20 pieces of media used on campus and captioning them, or buying copies that are captioned. This way they can come back to the campus with an estimate for converting our 10,000 + library of videos, etc.

By May 15, 2009, all of the administrative websites must be accessible. By 2012, all faculty websites and materials must be accessible as well.

The Chancellor's Office indicated they were very pleased with our training program for web developers, and our 95% campus exposure to ATI. Each year a progress report is sent to the Chancellor's Office and they provide feedback. AVP Gorney-Moreno said, "Another thing the Chancellor's Office said about our plan is that it is inclusive, comprehensive, and we are at a

place where we can say students will have what they need and accommodations are unnecessary."

Questions:

Senator James Lee asked, "Does the College of Social Sciences not have a Student in Residence? I don't see one listed here?" Hillary Nixon commented, "Yes they do, I'm sorry we missed that the student is Ruth Gildea. She has converted over 400 powerpoint slides for the Anthropology Department. One of the challenges we have with the student assistants is that faculty aren't using them enough. The students get 20 hours a week and we don't have enough work for them." Senator Lee commented, "I don't think faculty know about them." Hillary Nixon replied, "That was one of the reasons I came today, to get your thoughts on how to reach the faculty." Senator Lee said, "Is it true that I can just send documents to the Student in Residence?" Hillary Nixon replied, "We ask that you go through the Faculty in Residence, so in Social Science that would be Stephanie Coopman. If you only have the documents in hard copy you can send them through intercampus mail."

Senator Heiden asked, "I was a little confused about the process for that in that if I give someone my green sheet for next semester, does that mean I can't change it later?" Hillary Nixon said, "If you sent the document in MS Word format, what the students would do is go through and make sure that the structure in your document was correct with appropriate headings and subheadings. Then, if you needed to change the text in that document at a later date, you could."

Senator Kaufman asked, "Of the 600 people that participated in the training sessions over the last couple of years, do you know what the breakdown of faculty to staff is?" AVP Gorney-Moreno said, "I don't have that information with me, but it was primarily faculty. One of the complaints that we have gotten is that the faculty don't go to the Faculty in Residence, they go to the department Administrative Support person." Senator Kaufman asked, "Will you visit departments if requested?" Hillary Nixon said, "Certainly we will come if you request it."

Provost Sigler thanked the ATI team for their hard work.

AVP Gorney-Moreno said, "All of these programs were funded with one-time money through June 2009. I haven't seen anything to indicate we will get additional one-time funding for next year, so get your documents in now."

B. GE Taskforce Status and Feedback:
Dr. Chuck Darrah gave a presentation on what the GE Taskforce has been doing for the last semester. The taskforce was charged by the Senate with looking at assessment in general education, because there was dissatisfaction among the faculty with the way assessment was proceeding. What the taskforce has tried to do is limit the amount of work that faculty have to do to what is absolutely essential with a focus on instruction, so that at the department level faculty feel like they are really benefitting from the assessment.

Dr. Darrah noted that Dr. William Shaw, Chair of the taskforce, could not make the presentation because he had a class, and not due to any disagreement among taskforce members about the

report. The report had representatives from different colleges, the AVP of Undergraduate Studies, and the Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee, and they all are in agreement and support the report that has been prepared.

The taskforce realized early on that they needed to have some criteria to know how to start considering assessment. The taskforce met for several weeks and came up with the criteria on the yellow handout that was distributed to Senators today.

Let's begin with a summary of the recommended changes in assessment procedures. First, assessment of GE courses would coincide with the program planning cycle. That cycle varies in different programs, but typically happens every five years. The taskforce was concerned that anything done with assessment should reduce the burden of keeping multiple calendars, and should be a consolidated process that combined program planning and GE assessment making it much easier on faculty and department chairs.

Other recommended changes include being able to assess any combination of student learning objectives in any year. What this means is that rather than assessing every student learning objective every year, a department can choose one or more to do in a particular year. That also means that departments could extend their assessment of a particular objective over two or three years if they felt it was important to do so. Nevertheless, over the program review period all of the student learning objectives would have to be assessed. Executive Order 1033 from the Chancellor's Office states that some assessment has to be done every year. Finally, assessment could be quantitative, qualitative, or mixed. The taskforce wanted to open the door to the possibility that faculty would go to academic conferences, read journals, etc. to get ideas about what to do with the course, and then assessment could be done afterwards to show what action was taken and what the result was for the students.

Another recommended change is that yearly assessment reports would be streamlined and required for every course, but they would be very brief. The report would be a very small document available online from Undergraduate Studies. These reports would be done as a continuous part of GE coordination rather than building up to certification every five years or so where it is a much bigger deal.

One of the goals of integrating assessment into the program planning process and shortening the reports is to promote conversations within departments about GE and how it articulates with the rest of the curriculum of the department. The idea is to integrate that discussion of GE in with the rest of the major.

The review process would be expanded to include an appeal process. The Board of General Studies (BOGS) would continue to make continuing certification decisions, but it would make recommendations to the Curriculum and Research Committee about decertification decisions. The taskforce wanted to promote BOGS in more of a consultative and mentoring role, and to remove the policing function. BOGS and departments would work together on assessment issues, particularly when there were disagreements, and if they couldn't be resolved that would be when it was taken to the Curriculum and Research Committee.

The first part of the initial course assessment would be a very simple statement about how the course meets the GE student learning objectives, and an assessment schedule over that five-year period of the program review, that could be modified by a simple email. The report template would be available online. It would ask the course coordinator to state what student learning objectives were being addressed that year. Next, it would ask what the assessment results were. In other words, what did the faculty learn from the assessment done that year. Last, what are the planned course modifications, if any, that reflect what was learned, or is planned for the future. All of this would be completed by a course coordinator. The final piece is a statement by the department chair that the courses are being taught consistently with each other and sections haven't drifted away from the student learning objectives. Once that statement is completed by the department chair, it is filed electronically with Undergraduate Studies and would be available to the department for their program planning review. The taskforce wanted to eliminate paperwork and create dialogue among the faculty instead of just reporting.

What the taskforce is recommending for continuing certification procedures is to add an additional section to the program planning report. It would be a section that deals with GE. It would have two pieces to it. The first would be a summary of the GE activities in general during the program cycle. It would contain a reflection on the contribution to the GE area goals and objectives, so that there would be feedback from the departments to BOGS. It would also contain the assessment schedule for the cycle.

The second piece would be the continuing certification and assessment. This would include a commentary on how each GE course in a department accomplishes the GE learning objectives that would be two pages, a sample green sheet, a summary assessment report with a holistic evaluation of the course including elements in GE that aren't captured by the student learning objectives, changes designed to improve student success on the student learning objectives that have been carried out along with any modifications that are being anticipated, and an appendix of the assessment reports that have been filed annually with Undergraduate Studies.

For continuing GE certification, BOGS would continue to review the GE component of the program planning report. The taskforce is not proposing that BOGS look at the entire program planning document. There would be a separate GE component that comes out of the Program Planning Report and is given to BOGS. BOGS would continue certification through the next program planning cycle for the individual courses if there were no concerns, and consult with the department if there were concerns. If those concerns could not be resolved, they would be referred to the Curriculum and Research Committee. At that point, there could be continuing certification or decertification, after consultation with the department, if those concerns could not be addressed.

Questions:

Senator James Lee asked, "We are not the only ones that do GE, did you look at what other universities are doing?" Dr. Darrah replied, "We did not look at other universities, because it was our understanding that BOGS was doing that as part of their work. We focused specifically on assessment at SJSU, given the concerns expressed here."

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "I was Chair of the Senate when this issue surfaced. I'd like to compliment the taskforce on its hard work. This is a very well thought out set of recommendations."

C. Draft CSU Systemwide Information Security Policy

Senator Kaufman reported on status of the draft CSU System-wide Information Security Policy. In November 2008, the Chancellor's Information Security Office sent a set of policies and standards to each of the Senate Chairs, the CIOs, and the ISOs. These documents included the CSU System-wide Information Security Policy, the Responsible Use Policy, and the System-wide Information Security Standards. These documents appear to be sent to the campuses so that the Chancellor's Office could claim we had been shown them when audited. A taskforce was convened at SJSU to look at these documents that included faculty, staff from Academic Technology, UCAT, and department information technology personnel. The general response to these documents is that they are unworkable in their current form. Some of the concerns included the fact that the documents appear to be written as if they were for corporate IT security with just the insertion of the word faculty next to staff. The documents conflate the administrative/student records type of functions that are done here with academic functions that are much more individual and faculty-based, and apply the same sets of rules to them. The Security Standards also require training each and every student, faculty, and staff member who uses a campus information resource every year. In addition, while the Responsible Use document makes some reference to Academic Freedom, it makes it clear this only applies to the classroom.

The taskforce has drafted a response that will be circulated through the other Senate Chairs at a meeting at the end of this week. The taskforce believes other Senates will have similar concerns, and hopes to present a united front to the Chancellor's Office.

Chair Meldal will send out the draft taskforce response to the Senate for review.

VIII. New Business –

A. Election of the PPI Appeals Committee

The tenure and tenure-track faculty members of the Senate voted by secret ballot and the following personnel were elected to be on the PPI Appeals Committee:

> Richard Perry, CASA
> Sharon Parsons, EDUC
> Susan Klingberg, General Unit
> T.Y. Lin, Science
> Kenneth Peter, SOCS

B. Enrollment Management Advisory Group

Chair Meldal reported that the following personnel had been selected by the President to be on the Enrollment Management Advisory Group:

> Vice Chair of the Senate, Michael Kaufman
> Chair of the Student Success Committee, Susan McClory

Faculty Member, Lynda Heiden
Faculty Member, Ping Hsu

The Senate voted and unanimously approved the nominations.

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

   A. Vice President for Student Affairs – No Report.

   B. Associated Students President –
   AS President Cavu-Litman reported that they were still accepting nominations for
   AS 55 Awards. AS has also passed a resolution on Sustainability on campus. In
   addition, AS has been working on their budget for next year, and will host the CSSA
   this weekend.
   C. Vice President for University Advancement – No Report.

   D. Statewide Academic Senator(s) –
   Senator Van Selst reported that the Executive Director position at the CSU Statewide
   Senate will not be filled at the current time due to budget constraints. Ann Peacock
   was the Executive Director and she just recently retired. Recent resolutions and
   discussions at the CSU Statewide level include Access to Excellence, support for the
   Give Students a Compass Program, Quality Assurance and Technology Mediated
   Course Offerings, protecting instruction during the budget crisis, Exit
   Interviews for faculty, support for proposed higher education tax, reduction in K-
   12 academic year, voting rights for the Academic Council on International
   Programs, and the right of faculty to have votes of no confidence, faculty support for
   energy conservation, support for faculty development for lecturers, opposing
   restrictions on educational exchange students with Cuba, and support for overturning
   Proposition 8.

   E. Provost –
   Provost Sigler reported that a new Dean of the College of Applied Sciences and the
   Arts had been hired. The Provost also announced that SJSU had been recognized in
   the President's Honor role for service learning and community engagement, which
   was announced on February 6, 2009. The Provost has also appointed a search
   committee for the AVP of Undergraduate Studies following university policy. The
   committee has already met and has a position description. Senator Stacks serves on
   that committee. The Provost also announced that all the sabbaticals that had been
   recommended were funded.

   F. Vice President for Administration and Finance – Not Present.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.