Minutes of the Meeting of January 15, 2002

Members Present: Kevin Callahan, Sue Opp, Norma Rees, Henry Reichman, Don Sawyer, Eric Soares, Emily Stoper, Susan Sunderland, Don Wort

Members Absent: Dee Andrews, Sally Murphy

Guests: Carol Becker, Armando Gonzales, Jim Kelly, Linda Kinrade, Frank Martino, Dick Metz, Sonjia Redmond, Jodi Servatius, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Stoper/Caplan) to revise the agenda to include the appointment of a Winter Quarter replacement for Terry Jones (Sociology and Social Services) on the Academic Senate and a Winter Quarter replacement for Hadi Behzad (Management & Finance) on CIC as 4.a, and to include an announcement by Hank Reichman following the report of the Statewide Senators, as 3.d

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 8, 2002

M/S/P (Caplan/Stoper) to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 8, 2002 with the following corrections: 2, page 1, line 11, strike "to" and insert "too", 3, page 2, under report of the Statewide Senators, line 2, insert the word "Subject" following "Multiple", 8, page 2, line 2, following the word "votes" insert the words "and the reasoning behind the recommendation."  6, page 5, line 2, replace the period with a question mark.

3. Reports:

A. Report of the Chair

Wort indicated he had received information about the CSU budget from Bob Buckley, Chair of the Sacramento Academic Senate. Buckley reported that the Governor’s proposal for the CSU includes an increase of approximately 4.5%. In the communication Buckley identified a number of areas of reductions that when subtracted from the 4.5% increase, would actually provide a net increase of .8% to the system.

On February 20th our campus will participate in Legislative Day in Sacramento. It was noted that this is an important time in the budget cycle, particularly this year, for all levels of the CSU to be active and engaged with the state legislature.

The Chair invited Jodi Servatius, Interim Vice President, University Advancement to speak to the Committee.

Servatius indicated her delight in being back on the campus and expressed her thanks for the
warmth and sense of community the campus has extended to her. Her primary goal for the next 6-8 months is to insure that University Advancement does not lose momentum or stall before the new leadership arrives on campus. Her initial assessment is that the unit has some very good people who have the energy necessary to be successful. However, she was disappointed in the disjunction between the faculty and University Advancement. She noted that the Faculty Liaison Committee has not met in some time. Further, she indicated that University Scholarships were not working as effectively as they could or should. She indicated her intention to reconnect the faculty with her office regarding student scholarships.

B. Report of the President

Vice Chancellor Louis Caldera will be on campus, Thursday, January 17th touring areas of the University, including University Advancement. He will attend a reception for the History Department in the afternoon where the faculty will have an opportunity to visit with him. Vice-Chancellor Caldera is new to the system and his function in part relates to the BOT goals for fund-raising and to communications. Most of his work deals with external funding groups and he does not have much to do with faculty issues. However, the CSU Staff in Washington D.C. reports to him and faculty might want to indicate to him that CSUH is indeed a place where exciting research is taking place and there is a need for federal funding to support our important research.

On January 24, 2002 we will have the Grand Opening of our Oakland Center. The Oakland Chamber of Commerce is hosting the event which will draw a large number of people from all areas of Oakland. Rees encouraged the faculty to participate.

Callahan asked about the consequences of the proposed budget for this year. Rees indicated that the numbers on the amount that the system will take back at the end of the year have changed from 1% to 1.4% ($1.1 million) of the base budget (non-energy money). There appear to be no consequences as of now. Rees indicated she has left much of this in the hands of the Vice-Presidents. We have to watch our spending carefully, and if money is available at the end of the year we need to use it profitability for the University.

Rees noted our highest priority is to provide classes for our students.

Caplan asked about the CSUH enrollment picture. Rees indicated that at this point FTES is up 3.5% from Winter Quarter last year. FTES figures showed we were up 3% last Fall from the previous year’s census.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Caplan reported that the Senate will be having a plenary session next week, January 23-25. The major issues that will be discussed include the apportionment of the membership of the Senate and faculty work space.

D. Announcements. Reichman announced that there will be a reception sponsored by President Rees honoring Professors Andrews and Weiss (History) for their respective research awards on Thursday afternoon, 4-6 p.m., at the University Club. He also announced that tonight, at Cody Bookstore in Berkeley, Jake Fuchs will be reading from his latest book Death of a Professor.
4.a. Winter Quarter replacement for Terry Jones (Sociology and Social Services) on the Academic Senate

M/S/P (Stoper/Reichman) to appoint Carl Stempel (Sociology and Social Services).

Winter Quarter replacement for Hadi Behzad (Management and Finance) on CIC

M/S/P (Soares/Opp) to appoint Joy Badhury (Management & Finance)

4.b 01-02 CIC 13, Application of ES 3820, Race Matters, to Area C4 and the Cultural Groups/Women Requirement for the 1996/98 and 1998/02 G.E. patterns

M/S (Soares/Callahan) to place on the Senate agenda.

A number of committee members voiced their dismay and concern related to the number of grammatical and punctuation errors in the documentation of the course proposal. Additionally, several members indicated they were unclear or did not understand the nature of several course activities described in the course proposal.

- Caplan pointed out that a number of committees had reviewed these documents. It was his assumption that there was a standardized form which requires the reviewing bodies to sign-off and indicates that other departments have been consulted. This proposal appears to be lacking these elements. He recommended that a standard form be used when existing courses apply for G.E. credit.

- Caplan also pointed out that several of the proposals are requesting consideration for the 1998/03 pattern. The only pattern approved by the faculty runs through 2002. Opp stated that any proposal that came through the GE Subcommittee was considered for only the existing pattern which extends to 2002. She felt that the 1998/03 pattern is confusing and all proposals should be changed to indicate that they are being approved for the 1998/02 pattern.

Kelly indicated that the request should be for only the existing pattern.

Caplan moved, based upon the discussion, to refer the item back to CIC. The motion died for lack of a second.

Stoper pointed out that the consideration before the committee is whether the course meets the GE requirements. Reichman agreed with Caplan that items should not go before the Senate without the proper documentation. It was his belief the course met the GE criteria requirements.

M/S (Reichman/Stoper) to place on the Senate agenda with the requirement that the full documentation for the course be made available to the Senate. This was considered to be a friendly amendment.

Caplan reiterated his concern that proposals should not move forward without being complete. In general, XCOM should not be so sensitive to the time issues and the standing committee should not be moving items forward if they are not in proper form. Several members noted that the course was being proposed for Spring, 2002.
The motion as amended, passed.

5. 01-02 CIC 14, Reintroduction of Directed Group Study (DGS) Courses

M/S (Sunderland/Soares) to place on the Senate agenda.

Sunderland asked why we are considering reinstating the DGS course process. Reichman suggested it was a short cut to introducing a course. He questioned how this would work without a policy and how this process might work in relation to GE approval. He indicated he was not sure what was being voted on.

- Associate Dean Kinrade indicated that a form was missing that related to this item. It was her understanding that the DGS certification of a class does not include GE. The DGS was a means by which a faculty could experiment with a class. The class could not be offered more than three times and if the course was to be recommended for continuation, it would have to go through the regular review procedures. One reason for offering DGS classes relates to a problem with the Degree Works program. This would allow a course to be taught without becoming part of the department’s official inventory of classes.

- Stoper's view was that it would be a bad idea to reinstate this system. She reviewed the history of the DGS system and pointed out a number of its shortcomings. One of the major issues was that the courses were presented for hasty review and approval by the department chair and dean at the last minute and then offered three times, at which point they could not be meaningfully reviewed by the faculty. The process did not provide adequate time for consultation and there were a number of instances where there was duplication of courses by different departments. She noted we now have outcomes assessment and department program planning and wondered how the DGS course would fit into either process.

- Reichman, acknowledging Kinrade's comment regarding the problem with high course inventories by departments, suggested as an alternative that CIC should look into the possibility of developing course numbers for special topic courses that already have GE approval. He pointed out that if the course does not meet GE requirements or major requirements they typically do poorly in enrollment.

M/S/P (Caplan/Callahan) to refer back to CIC with a charge for reconsideration and the development of a detailed policy for DGS courses. The committee will be provided with an excerpt of today’s EXCOM minutes.

6. 01-02 CIC 16, Learning outcomes for Lower Division GE in Science

M/S (Callahan/Opp) to place on the Senate agenda.

Kinrade reviewed briefly the history of the development of the Lower Division GE Outcomes in Science. She explained the unique situation of approving student outcomes without specific assessment tools which will be coming forward at a later date. More importantly she stressed that this was a starting document, and was hopeful that there might be a mechanism or process where the learning outcomes could be accepted with the understanding that the assessment tools will follow.

- Reichman asked about the ALSS Learning Outcomes for Social Science and Humanities. It was his understanding that they were completed by the School and sent forward. He wondered why they were not included. Opp stated that last spring the ALSS Council of Chairs had pulled the
learning outcomes back from the GE Subcommittee.
- Discussion followed as to why all the learning outcomes had not come forward at the same time. Due to delays by various review bodies, it was decided to move the Science Learning Outcomes forward now.
- Caplan pointed out the learning outcomes represent the school ideas; they are not necessarily prescriptive criteria to which courses or clusters are measured. All these can be modified through the various departments and schools. However, because of the lack of these criteria or student outcomes it has caused problems for other schools when presenting course proposals.
- Stoper questioned how the learning outcomes and assessment process are related.
- Reichman suggested that clarity on the content of these course learning outcomes should provide a way to assess student learning.
- Opp agreed that the information on student outcomes and course criteria needs to be disseminated and there appears to be a need to get more schools involved. These Science Learning Outcomes are a beginning.
- Kelly suggested these criteria are not intended to be used for assessment only; they are also criteria by which to judge which courses meet Lower Division GE requirements. It was CIC view that this was, as Kinrade acknowledged, the best we can expect from the School of Science now. It will at least begin the process.
- Caplan, responding to Kelly's point that these will provide criteria by which courses are judged, suggested that if a course fulfills these outcomes and criteria then the course is appropriate for GE inclusion. If that is the case, they need to be more specific.
- Kinrade reminded the Committee that the Senate instructed the schools of ALSS and Science to do just what Caplan has asked for, and a part of it is the learning outcomes. Whether these outcomes are broad or tight they are the School's best effort to this point.
- Callahan wondered if it is appropriate to send these Science Learning Outcomes on to the Senate since the action requested is to "satisfy the request from the Academic Senate to develop outcomes for all Areas of the GE Program."

**M/S (Stoper /Reichman) to refer back to CIC.**

Kinrade suggested that in delaying sending this to the Senate, EXCOM might consider reviewing the charge or developing a different charge.

Callahan and Soares spoke in favor of moving the item forward to the Senate.
- Stoper viewed the Learning Outcomes as too vague and incomplete. It was her position that they were hard to judge and not specific enough.
- Reichman pointed out that we are asking that these outcomes do two things: they are used in assessment of student learning, and as criteria for review of courses. These are not quite the same thing. We might want to call for separate documents on assessment and subject matter criteria.

**M (Soares) to end the debate on the motion to refer to CIC. The motion passed.**

It was suggested that the motion to refer to CIC include the charge to:

1) Refer to CIC with the charge to determine how the outcomes will be used in the GE review process
2) Refer to CIC with the charge to work with the School Science to make the goals more specific.
M/S/P (Caplan/Opp) to divide the motion to refer to CIC into two parts.

Part 1 of the motion to refer to CIC passed.

Part 2 of the motion to refer to CIC failed.

7. 01-02 CIC 17, Application of ANTH 3400, Social Anthropology, and ANTH 3430, Ethnicity and nationalism, to G.E. Area D4 for the 1998/03 G.E. Pattern

M/S (Stoper/Callahan) to place on the Senate agenda.

Opp pointed out that the designation for the G.E. Pattern should be 1998/02.
- Caplan indicated that this is not a new course and there should be a specific form for G.E. approval other than what is presented.

M/S/P (Caplan/Soares) to refer back to CIC for the proper documentation.

8. 01-02 CIC 18, Designation of Unique Course Numbers for Cluster Courses in the Natural Sciences Areas B and D

M/S (Callahan/Sunderland) to place on the Senate agenda.

Due to the fact that the three courses are basically the same with slight variations, it was suggested it might be helpful to include a statement that the other two courses were not available for credit because they would be a duplication.
- Opp asked how that policy might affect academic renewal, and the response was that it was not clear.

The motion passed.

9. Report from the Subcommittee on Implementation of the Academic Standards Report - Held over to the next meeting.

10. Discussion of CAPR's charge with regard to budget and resource issues - Held over to the next meeting.

11. Adjournment

M/S/P (Sunderland/Callahan) to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald Sawyer, Secretary