

**ACADEMIC SENATE SPECIAL MEETING**  
**Tuesday, April 29, 2008**  
**John Spoor Broome Library rm. 1360**  
**Minutes**

**Attendance**

Virgil Adams, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Julia Balén, Terry Ballman, A.J. Biesczad, Geoffrey Buhl, Catherine Burriss, Tracylee Clarke, Stephen Clark, Christopher Cogan, Manuel Correia, Irina D. Costache, Beatrice de Oca, Amy Denton, Jesse Elliott, Therese Eyermann, Scott Frisch, Blake Gillespie, Andrea Grove, Phil Hampton, Debi Hoffmann, Tiina Itkonen, Karen Jensen, Joan Karp, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, Liz King, Kristen LaBonte, Daniel Lee, Kathryn Leonard, Alex McNeill, Trudy Milburn, Brad Monsma, Nancy Mozingo, Ed Nuhfer, Nitika Parmar, Joan Peters, Luda Popenhagen, Paul Rivera, Peter Smith, Steve Stratton, Maria Tauber, Kaia Tollefson, Eric Toshalis, Ashish Vaidya, Dan Wakelee, Bill Wolfe, Cindy Wyels.

**Call to order**

-2:30 p.m.

**Approval of Agenda**

-approved

**Approval of the Minutes from the last (April 15) Senate meeting**

-The word “pay” cuts was changed to “budget” cuts

-approved as amended

**Consent Agenda: Revisions to SP 06-06 GE Learning Goals and Outcomes**

-Drafted by the General Education Task Force with consultation from the General Education Committee.

-B. Monsma said the task force made simple adjustments to better reflect the goals of the University.

-A. McNeill made a friendly amendment to add the word “international” in goal #1, after the word “national.” The amendment was accepted by the task force.

**Consent item was adopted**

**Old Business**

**SP 07-18 Revisions to the Senate Bylaws**

Articles 1-4

Vote taken by show of hands:

Yes: 34

No: 0

Abstain: 1

**Approved**

Article 5

Vote taken by show of hands:

**Unanimous approval**

**Article 6-10**

**Vote taken by show of hands:**

Yes: 37

No: 0

Abstain: 1

**Approved**

**All revisions passed by more than 2/3 vote**

**New Business**

**SP 07-19 Student Ratings Form**

-m/s-Stratton, Gillespie

-Ed Nuhfer, Director of Faculty Development, gave a brief presentation on the process involved in the development of the Student Ratings Form and the thought and consideration that went into its creation.

-There were several questions about the wording of some of the questions, Ed Nuhfer, requested that specific wording recommendations be submitted to the Task Force for consideration. He also reminded everyone that the form is revisable for the future in case faculty later feel that changes need to be made to the questions on the form.

-A. McNeill expressed concern over the questions that ask students how they “feel” instead of what they “think.”

-C. Cogan asked what were some of the positive changes that could be expected from changing to this form as opposed the SETE form being used now.

-E. Nuhfer, responded that Faculty Affairs expects to save between \$20,000 to \$30,000 yearly by not using the current evaluation system. Another advantage of having our own form is that it can be modified as needed, unlike the current form being used.

-B. de Oca expressed concern over some of the questions referencing things that she has no control over as an instructor. Ed Nuhfer responded that they created the form using six dimensions which will allow the questions to be weighted differently. He added that it was difficult to create a standard form that would meet the needs of each individual discipline.

-There were several concerns about the various questions, Ed Nuhfer responded that many of the concerns were discussed by the Task Force and addressed at the brown bags that were held to discuss the form.

-A.J. Biesczad said he knew how difficult this task was because he served on the previous task force that attempted to tackle the SETE problem. He would like to know how this form will help faculty improve their teaching method. He recommends instead using the learning objectives and asking the students if the objectives were met. He also recommended removing the question related to whether or not the student was able to get a hold of a faculty member via email because some students expect an immediate response and a lot of times, that is just not possible. He also requested a more specific breakdown of the estimated savings.

-Ed Nuhfer broke down the cost into a few major areas, noting that two of the biggest ones being manual labor and reproduction costs. This form could be online and therefore avoid the reproduction costs.

-N. Mozingo was still concerned about the results that will be derived from using this form and she volunteered her class to pilot the form before agreeing to permanently change the instrument.

-Chair Ballman reminded everyone that we have already approved the policy for student evaluations, which supersedes the previous policy, and now we need an approved Senate instrument.

-J. Peters reminded everyone that this form is not set in stone and can be modified in the future if needed. She states that an extraordinary amount of work went into this and there was a lot of transparency while creating the form and was based on the needs of all the faculty. She added that there was representation from the various disciplines as well as from the previous task force and open meetings were held and research was evaluated. She asked that we respect the work that was done on this form.

-N. Mozingo inquired what would happen if this form were voted down.

-Chair Ballman clarified that we need an instrument by next week, if this one is voted down: we would have to resurrect and recertify the old form.

-J. Elliott suggested using both SETE and this form for one semester so that we can compare the results and test the reliability of the evaluation.

-J. Peters questioned if this option was financially possible and how students would react to doing evaluations twice.

-M. Tauber clarified that the cost was excessive and we cannot afford to do both systems at the same time.

-A.J. Biesczad stated that he does not appreciate being forced to vote, not being given any options and he would vote against it for that reason alone.

-Ed Nuhfer clarified that the Task Force was charged with creating just the form not with creating the policy.

-Chair Ballman reminded everyone that the last Senate meeting is scheduled for next week.

-A. Denton expressed concern over voting on a form when a policy has not been developed to address the concerns being discussed.

-B. Monsma reminded everyone that we have a larger RTP procedure and the student evaluations are only a small part of the entire procedure. He would like to see the fear level of this document decrease. We should look at the larger context.

-K. Leonard stated that she was at a campus where each Professor created their own forms but was not necessarily the best solution.

-Chair Ballman stated that 21 out of 23 campuses have their own forms.

#### SP 07-21 Revisions to the RTP

-m/s- LaBonte, Stratton. B. Gillespie spoke on behalf of the Faculty Affairs committee indicating that the most difficult change to make was in reference to sun setting the old policy, that change mostly affects faculty on the old RTP policy. He added that we are contractually obligated to create a schedule that adds a programmatic level of review. He gave a summary of additional changes that were made to the proposed revisions to the new RTP policy.

-A. Grove asked what is meant by the term “division head.”

#### SP 07-22 Revisions to the Senate Bylaws

-m/s- C. Burriss, V. Adams. A change was recommended that would permanently reduce quorum to 40%.

-J. Elliott spoke against the change saying it could possibly allow for 20% of faculty to make changes for the rest.

-S. Aloisio reminded everyone that we've had to pass a policy, suspending the bylaws, for the past three years in order to be able to do business. He added that the appropriate way to alter the Bylaws is by actually changing them, not by passing policies to suspend them.

-Changes are also being proposed to the language regarding the composition and charge of the Committee on Centers and Institutes and the Center for Community Engagement.

### **Intent to raise questions**

In response to A. Grove's question about fencing and additional hiking trails in East Campus

-Erik Blaine, Executive Director University Glen, responded:

“1) The fence was put up by the neighbor and is the likely location of the property line between East Campus and the neighbor. We are in the process of confirming the property line and also working with the neighbor on appropriate signage so that hikers know when they are leaving campus land and are on private land.

2) There are no plans by the Site Authority to create additional hiking trails in the East Campus area.”

In response to A. Biesczad's question about additional exam proctoring services

Dan Wakelee, Associate Dean, responded:

“DAS provides proctoring for students with disabilities who require alternate testing arrangements. If instructors wish to offer make-up testing arrangements those need to be made by the instructor or their program. There are no resources in the projected 08-09 budget for proctoring services beyond what is available through DAS”

### **New Questions**

M. Correia asked

-On behalf of the Library Advisory Committee, who will be the interim Dean of the Library and how will we know? When will the search committee for a new Dean be formed? When will we know?

Cindy Wyels asked

-What means – other than use of my personal credit card – are there for me to pay for airline tickets, train tickets, etc. when I am arranging travel for university business? Note that if I wish to keep costs low, I must purchase airline tickets (for example) several weeks before the actual travel occurs.

Joan Peters asked

-Are the lawns around campus treated with pesticides and weed killers?

Blake Gillespie asked

-Will bike racks be added near the library?

Mary Adler asked

-Can the ringing of the Bell Tower bells be altered so that they ring just once an hour instead of several times per hour?

### **Report from the Chair**

-The President has signed all the policies we have passed this year.

-The Enrollment Management committee will be developing strategic plans to increase the percentage of international students in our campus population.

-Chair Ballman traveled to Sacramento on Monday, with President Rush and other campus and community delegates, to lobby on behalf of the CSU and CSUCI.

### **Reports from Senate Standing and Other Committees**

#### Senate Executive

-Thank you to the Committee on Committees for all their work with the Senate elections.

#### Committee on Centers and Institutes

-No Report

#### Committee on Committees

-J. Balén reported that Jorge Garcia has figured out a way to make the elections process more efficient for next year.

#### Curriculum Committee

-M. Adler reported they were wrapping things up.

#### Faculty Affairs

-B. Gillespie said they would consider RTP changes today.

#### Fiscal Policies

-No Report

#### General Education

-A. Denton reported they were wrapping things up.

#### Student Academic Policies and Procedures

-A. Denton reported they were wrapping things up and welcomed the new members to the committees.

#### Other

-A.J. Biesczad reminded everyone that the deadline to request new software was May 2<sup>nd</sup>.

-C. Buriss reported on the IRA committee and their next meeting in June.

### **Announcements**

-J. Balén invited everyone to attend the “Take Back the Night” march scheduled for tonight.

-J. Kilpatrick reported that “Midsummer Night’s Dream” was a huge success.

-A. J. Biesczad invited everyone to the Student Research presentations scheduled for May 9<sup>th</sup>, from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the library.

-V. Adams reminded everyone to send in their songs “whistle while you work.”

-C. Buriss invited everyone to attend the Performing Arts showcases being done as final presentations by her students.

-A. Vaidya reminded everyone to attend the Honors Convocation scheduled for May 2<sup>nd</sup>.

-B. Monsma invited everyone to attend the Univ. 392 poster session scheduled in the library from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., Sean Anderson will be serving gumbo.

-Authors Jack Lopez and Sean Carswell will perform their works at an event open to the public on Thursday, May 1 at 7:30 p.m. in the Aliso Hall Auditorium.

### **Adjournment**

-4:10 p.m.