Minutes of the meeting of February 10, 2004

Members Present: Cal Caplan, Denise Fleming, Liz Ginno, William Langan, Julia Norton (Chair), Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Jeffrey Seitz, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Donald Wort

Members Absent: Karina Garbesi

Visitors: Linda Beebe, Carl Bellone, Bob Brauer, Stanley Clark, Susan Correia, Michael Leung, Emily Stoper, Michael Strait, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda
   (M/S/P) Caplan/Ginno. Norton inserted Trustee’s visit as #6, plus 03-04 FAC 2 and 03-04 FAC 3 as #10 and #11; with the rest of the list renumbered.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings on January 13, and January 20, 2004
   (M/S) Caplan/Ugbah. Reichman—change Statewide senator’s report #C, delete that bargaining is meeting. Caplan noted on item #7 to add “and Langan.” Minutes passed as changed.
   (M/S) Caplan/Ugbah. Norton changed that she will be gone on the 12th not 9th. Minutes approved as amended.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the chair
      - CIC has asked the Senate Office to do some research on GE – re: lifelong learning vs capstone; if anyone has any institutional memory on this issue, please contact Susan Correia.
      - FAC - Norton, and Ugbah and Wort attended the meeting on January 21st. It was properly advertised that the Wang Award would be discussed; Ugbah questioned the bylaws of FAC and what would preclude that a bonefide member of FAC from participating in FAC discussions; Caplan responded that the only case would be if the member was under discussion or related to any personnel matter involving them. Ugbah reported that an FAC member was asked to only speak when spoken to. Rees asked if the chair had ruled on this; Ugbah reported that the chair remained impartial, but that this was very troubling to him (Ugbah) that the Presidential appointee was not allowed to speak. Reichman remarked that there is no provision or approved policy in place at this time which states that the Presidential appointee cannot participate fully in committee discussions or work. Wort attended the same meeting and reported that the PA was volunteering information when told that it wasn’t appropriate to provide information until asked for it. Wort stated that it needs to be clear that we cannot stifle input to the committees. Langan was concerned that this is the standing committee that is supposed to be working with policy and procedures and which is violating those policies. Rees asked if anyone on the committee spoke up; and the answer was no. Reichman remarked that many of the faculty on FAC and other committees these days do not have the institutional memory and experience in faculty governance as in the past. Seitz stated that with this, plus the previous issue, it seems that we need to remind FAC what the policies and procedures actually are. Wort recommended
that we invite the chair of FAC come in and talk with the ExCom. Langan seconded that
suggestion.
- Report on lecturers – they are still concerned about not having a voice and they have again
asked the Chair of FAC to convene the lecturer’s subcommittee, which was declined. The
Lecturer Representative, Karplus, would like ExCom to discuss having an ad-hoc lecturers
subcommittee again. It was agreed to have it on the agenda at a future meeting.
--Norton asked if it was agreeable that the letter from UCL to the Deans be posted to the
web; Rees confirmed that it was not confidential. It was agreed that keeping meetings and
information open and available would help to alleviate concerns to some extent.
-Silva has asked for feedback about evaluation of online courses; Norton responded that her
interpretation was that if the faculty are tenured that 2 classes per year be evaluated using
the same 8 questions as on regular student evaluations; is this agreeable to the committee?
Reichman responded yes and the only concern would be confidentiality via web forms. He
agreed with Norton that Strait’s office probably knew the pitfalls and technical problems
involved. Wort asked about extension classes; Norton’s position was that Extension has
created a confidential web form with slightly different questions. Extension class
evaluations go to Extension and regular class evaluations would go directly to Assessment.

B. Report of the President
-Advocacy program has been ramped up to get support for proposition 55. The needed
seismic upgrade to Warren Hall would be funded from that. Brauer reported that we got the
endorsement from ANG Newspaper Group. According to recent polls, the proposition has
been getting more than 50% support. President Rees has made him a Special Assistant to
the President. He is helping on a wide variety of issues and is available to a wide variety of
people in that position. Stoper asked about proposition 56 and Rees responded that it was
not initiated by the Trustees and has no obvious direct support for the CSU. Brauer added
that it is crucial to be passed but that ads against it are effective. Reichman asked when
might be an appropriate time to do the national search for the provost position. Rees
responded that she thinks that this the worst time in the history of the CSU to try and attract
the best people to the university.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
-Caplan reported that committee meetings are being held this week in Sacramento; he will
not be able to attend the TEKR meeting and would like a volunteer to take his place at the
meeting, if possible. Norton suggested that we ask Pat Zajac, Davenport & Servatius and if
they cannot attend, Julie volunteered. The chair will investigate possibilities.
-Ginno reported on the January 28, 2004 ASI meeting. They approved partial funding for a
CS grad student’s paper presentation; approved the $50/month stipend to Election
Committee members; approved half funding ($801.50) for the Tae Kwon Do Tournament;
approved $134 for Sigma Alpha Phi t-shirts and postage; and they are sending 4-5 students
on the Hayward Orientation Team to Long Beach. Ugbah mentioned that he hasn’t been
notified of the meetings and would the Senate Office confirm that he is on the list.

4. Appointments
-Norton reported that Pablo Arreola is now the presidential appointee to FAC.
-Norton remarked that Carl Bellone would like to be a part of the Search committee for the G.E.
Coordinator for 2004-06. Fleming and Warriner volunteered to serve on the search committee.
Norton volunteered to be an alternate, in case there was a reason one of them could not serve.

5. Nominees on the Winter 2004 University-wide Election List
The nominees for the Winter 2004 election were certified by ExCom at a brief meeting preceding the Senate meeting on February 3, 2004. The ballots have been sent.

6. Trustees visit, April 6, 2004
   An itinerary for the visit was distributed to ExCom and the chair asked for input on it. Five ExCom members were available at 10:30 to meet with the guests. Caplan suggested that ExCom discuss via email what they might want to talk with the trustees about and create a list of pertinent questions. Ideas for the campus tour were discussed, such as the Anthropology Museum, the Art Gallery, Preston’s lab, … Discussion will be continued later.

7. **03-04 CIC 8**, University Honors Program
   (M/S/P) Caplan/Wort to send to Senate. Caplan noted that in one instance it is raising the GPA requirement to enter; and in another instance it lowers the requirements to remain in the program and the inconsistency is not explained.

8. **03-04 CIC 9**, Learning Outcomes for Lower Division General Education (G.E.) Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences
   (M/S/P) Seitz/Warriner to send to Senate.

Stoper remarked that this needs to go to the Senate ASAP. We are committed to starting the new GE in the Fall, and we cannot send out a call for new proposals for new clusters until the requirements are out, and these proposals will then have to go through the CIC GE subcommittee and Senate to be approved for next year. Seitz noted that we have to have our fall schedules in by March 26th. Ugbah was concerned about the consistency of the built in assessment outcomes. Stoper asked that we do not edit the document on the Senate floor and noted that each document ought to have enough assessment and detail for each discipline area. Reichman remarked that we need to ask whether or not they fulfill the assessment requirements and he felt that they do. Stoper noted that each one of these areas covers a large number of subjects which is one reason that the assessments are broader in one area than another. Langan stated that chairs need time to figure out how to schedule the fall quarter; Stoper asked for suggestions to expediting this for chairs. Caplan agreed with Reichman and noted that the committee was charged with defining outcomes not assessment and this will allow each instructor to develop their own assessments.

When asked for suggestions on expediting the approval of courses, Reichman suggested that we grandfather in existing frosh cluster courses for one more year; Langan supported the idea and added the flexibility that we might want to also use some of the sophomore cluster classes as well. Seitz thought we should hold them to the new outcomes. It was generally agreed that a letter with the outcomes and timeline should be sent by Stoper after the Senate meeting to alert departments of the urgency.

9. **03-04 CIC 10**, Application of MLL 3240, German Film: From Metropolis to Present German Cinema, and MLL 3612, Modern Chinese Short Stories (in English), to G.E. Area C4 for all G.E. Patterns
   (M/S/P) Ugbah/Fleming to send to Senate. Reichman remarked that the catalog description is listed as 40 words maximum, but the paragraph has 59 words. This needs to be passed knowing this is to be edited.

10. **03-04 FAC 2** Amendment of the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy & Procedures
11. **03-04 FAC 3, Student Evaluation of Faculty**

Norton reported that FAC was asked to standardize the way information regarding the policy on Student Evaluation of Faculty was consolidated and reported in Senate documents. There are two places that the referral to student evaluations appears. Reichman remarked that there needs to be clarification about what “quantitative and qualitative formats” are; and, more serious, what are “college or university library records?” This information is not kept in either place. Should not the WPAAF* be used instead? Langan agreed and added that open questions and comments in the students’ handwriting don’t go into personnel action files. Clark seconded the need for clarification; suggested that the newest version of the policies and procedures clearly state that it superceded all previous versions; and consider specifying in the policy that chairs should create an index list for inclusion in their faculty WPAAF’s (stored in the Provost’s Office) which states where the qualitative comments from the Student Evaluations can be found. Langan also reported that some departments keep files on student evaluations and some give them back to the faculty to store. Ugbah remarked that any changes need to be consistent with the CBA and that FAC stated that this wording had been reviewed by the Deputy Provost. Clark reported that they must have been mistaken because he did not review this specific document. Caplan suggested that we send it back to FAC and 1) ask that they note on each document that discusses this topic which policy has superceded all others; and, 2) that they send along the next version to the provost for review. Langan also noted that the language in the background info needs to be changed to take out “in lieu of…faculty CBA.” Clark remarked that he had had a general discussion of this topic but not seen the existing document; and that things ought to be reviewed by the presidential appointee (now Pablo Arreola) versus him. Context is everything, he added. Norton asked if what we want to ask is that all student comments and the results of the ScanTron green sheets ought to be kept in the departmental offices. Caplan remarked that we need to define what the student evaluations are, how long they are kept, and where they ought to be stored. It was also remarked by someone that the last sentence should be changed. We want a review of the student comments, not a summary of them. The departments should keep the student comments and the statistical results of the ScanTrons go to the PAF. The nature of the information should be the same for every faculty member, regardless of department or rank. The policy should state where it goes, where it will be available, and where it will be saved when the process is done. The policy should also state that the reviewers not only look at the stats, but be forced to look at qualitative comments. Wort noted that it ought to specify that the records will be kept in the “departmental or the appropriate administrator’s office”, as some colleges don’t have departmental offices. Clark noted that it is not allowed to keep files on faculty members in the departments. However, departments may have course evaluations, filed in order A-Z by faculty. Ugbah remarked that the issue was that for PTR purposes this was to help make this information available to the reviewing bodies. Langan broke down the info needed as: 1) what information; 2) system of gathering and preservation (and for how long); 3) location and access by appropriate committee.

12. Adjournment

(M/S/P) Langan/Wort.

Respectfully submitted,
Liz Ginno, Secretary

---
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