

Academic Senate Meeting
Tuesday, May 5, 2009
Martin V. Smith Decision Center, 2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Minutes

Attendance

Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Terry Ballman, Julia Balen, Harley Baker, Gary Berg, Michael Berman, Bob Bleicher, Geoff Buhl, Catherine Burriss, Rainer Buschmann, Minder Chen, Renny Christopher, Tracylee Clarke, Manuel Correia, Colleen Delaney-Rivera, Amy Denton, Beatrice de Oca, Jesse Elliott, Therese Eyermann, Scott Frisch, Nancy Gill, Andrea Grove, Ivona Grzegorzcyk, Lupita Gutierrez, Beth Hartung, Debi Hoffman, Robin Horne, Tiina Itkonen, Karen Jensen, Antonio Jimenez-Jimenez, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, Liz King, Jill Leafstedt, Kristen LaBonte, Daniel Lee, Steve Lefevre, Kathryn Leonard, Alex McNeill, Jim Meriwether, Alexandra Mitchell, Andrew Morris, Joanna Murphy, Laura Newton, Ed Nuhfer, Nitika Parmar, Joan Peters, Luda Popenhagen, Carl Reed, Don Rodriguez, Sue Saunders, Tom Schmidhauser, Peter Smith, Steve Stratton, Kaia Tollefson, Eric Toshalis, Ashish Vaidya, Bill Wagner, Dan Wakelee, Amy Wallace, Ching-Hua Wang, Julia Wilson, Bill Wolfe, Greg Wood, Cindy Wyels

Called to order 2:36pm

1. Approval of the Agenda

m/s K.Leonard, D. Lee

2. Approval of the Minutes of April 14, 2009

Change to minutes that were distributed. Addition of table on Pilot study report.
m/s G. Wood, T. Clarke
Approved

3. Intent to Raise Questions

In response to J Elliott's question on scheduling Commencement during the heat of the day, Nancy Gill responded:

“Even though I chair the Commencement Committee, major decisions such as this suggestion are at the direction of the Cabinet. In reviewing this very same question last fall, it was determined that an evening ceremony would add additional expenses for lighting and would interrupt students' plans for post-event celebrations. As you know, resources are very tight and the student graduation fees only cover a small portion of the over-all event expenses.

“Though last year was unseasonably warm, most other years have typically had overcast skies, which of course we prefer for our guests' comfort. As we've done in the past, we

will continue to provide water and as much shade seating as possible as well as keep our fingers crossed for cloudy skies.”

A.J. Bieczad asked that the following question be addressed:

“Apparently the PC Refresh program has run out of money. It is unclear which computers are enrolled in the program and which ones are not. Can we be provided with a list of the computers that are not in the program because they will have to be "refreshed" by some other means?”

Chair Hartung said that she would distribute the answer via e-mail to senators.

4. Report from the President

Richard R. Rush spoke to the faculty.

“Thank you for a wonderful year. It has not been an easy year. The work you have done has been magnificent. Those that were at Honors, all the students and guests wanted me to know how much your work has meant to their family and how much this university means to them. Thank you.

“A year ago I raised the question about branding the university. Due to the good offices of Julia Wilson the campus met with Jon Ridgeway and he worked on a branding process *pro bono*. He met individually with many campus administrators, faculty and staff. The process resulted in a formal brand and an informal brand.”

The President continued that for the Formal Brand he requested something flexible with a font that is clean, contemporary, forward-looking and modern. This will be phased in as business cards and letterhead runs out. There will be a designation for each program.

For the Informal Brand it was proposed to have a contest among students. The President’s response was “Sure”! He thanked Liz King and Luke Matjas, the faculty members of the committee, and mentioned that there were 120 applications. The committee picked five finalists for the President to make a decision and all were outstanding. The President showed the group the winner.

He then talked about CSU Advocacy Day -- President Rush and Ashish Vaidya went to Sacramento to meet with legislators on CSU Advocacy Day. Legislators don’t have a plan “B” if the propositions fail. The President also discussed Lease Revenue bonds regarding West Hall that has been listed with the department of finance. All six regional officials will back the Lease Revenue Bond. North hall we are moving along.

What happens on the 20th of May? Democrats may try to simply raise taxes. Republicans will challenge it in court. If all 6 propositions go down, the people do not want taxes raised, they want cuts.

At this point it is unclear what is happening. There is discussion that there will not be another budget until Sept. 1st. Field polls indicate that criminal justice is the number one area that the voters would cut. The President will keep the campus informed via e-mail over the summer. He left Sacramento with no confidence that our legislators know what to do. Currently there is a movement for a Constitutional Convention. Nobody knows what to do; there are no ideas being floated and it is absolute confusion.

In all of these situations there are great opportunities. This is the time to create opportunities. We have the ability to do things in different ways. How can we take advantage of opportunities now? The President is meeting with Chancellor next week in a private meeting. He will request that our campus be allowed to go forward and CI be the campus on innovation. UC Merced is being allowed to do just that.

He concluded, "I wish you all a great summer, get rested and refresh yourself. Thank you for all that you do."

5. Report from the Senate Chair: election results

Chair Hartung thanked the Committee on Committees for their work on election results and announced the outcome. She also thanked and congratulated outgoing student body president Alexandra Mitchell for her work with Senate this year.

6. Time Certain: 3 p.m. Renny Christopher: on-line delivery of student evaluations

Renny Christopher presented what an online evaluation might look like and the fiscal information related to the different options. Vendors of online evaluations presented their system to a group of faculty and administrators. CourseEval by Academic Management systems meets all the requirements of our campus. Renny presented a PowerPoint provided by Academic Management Systems looking at web-based evaluations.

Questions/Comments:

-G. Wood-Option can we add "this question does not apply to me" –YES

-J. Peters-Can we have coercive techniques? For example, -'You must evaluate the faculty to see your grade'?

-M. Berman, Interim CIO -- FERPA law states that students must have access to grades, so that would be illegal.

-A. Morris-It is known that one bias in evaluations is that better students write comments. Is that the only bias?

-I. Grzegorzcyk -Online evaluations will give us the opportunity to evaluate online courses and those that meet irregularly.

-B. Wolfe-Is it possible to have students complete the evaluations while in class if the class meets in a computer lab?

-A. Jimenez-Jimenez-International courses could be evaluated as well

-J. Peters-We learn the most from those students that are not the best students. How do we get better percentage rates?

-H. Baker-45-50% was the response rate for the pilot study for last semester.

Renny reviewed the costs of the different options for the Student Evaluations. (see handout)

SETES-\$17,020

SRT to Scantron (Paper)-\$21,725

SRT online administration (course eval server)

1st year: \$17,874

Yearly: \$12,550

SRT online administration (our server)

1st year: \$16,545

Yearly: \$10,720 (up to 4000 FTES)

SRT on paper (In house)

1st year: \$42,268

Yearly \$15,760

-Ivona-Does our campus have Scantron already? Renny answered the Scantron machines we do have are not capable of handling this capacity.

-J. Elliott-Is it possible to use Blackboard for course evaluations? Renny stated no.

-J. Peters-The choice is online. Is there a downside? Renny does not see the downside; it is the 21st century. SDSU has had a positive experience.

-D. Hoffman-what are the costs after 4000 FTES? Will be minimal? Currently we are only at 3150 FTES. Renny commented that there is no resolution instructing Faculty Affairs to black out question 16-20 on the current SETE's. Faculty Affairs will no longer black out the 16-20 questions on the current SETE's.

-A. Denton-who will make the decisions regarding the SRT? Renny stated that these decisions can go back to Faculty Affairs in Fall 2009.

7. Second Reading Items: Resolution 08-01; Resolution 08-02 SR 08-01

-A. Morris-The argument for the instrument is the cost and flexibility. 360 appraisal evaluations, this is one of many instruments. There is always a fear of change.

-B. de Oca-Will the entire instrument be submitted to RTP File or only the global? She moved to only have global scores placed in RTP file.

-J. Elliott-It is unknown what will be put in the RTP file

-H. Baker-There is no global form, so it gives us the opportunity to make a global score or several. We will have time to do that and make informed choices.

-T. Ballman-85% of the students who participated in the pilot study preferred the new evaluation or did not have a preference. If we accept this instrument then the first task of Faculty Affairs and the Senate will be to answer how the data will be used and put in file. For example: will program questions be allowed?

-I. Grzegorzcyk -Not all of the questions evaluate the instructor's performance.

-B. Hartung-Faculty Affairs will be looking at the issues

J. Griffen m/s to call the question
C. Wyels-Second

The discussion continued.

-A.Denton-At what point do we need to know the questions for the SRT? Renny answered the Senate has to adopt SRT today or not. Looking at reporting, we would have until late Oct. or early Nov.

-S. Stratton-I thought everything that is asked on the SETE is in the file. Why would all the SRT questions not be in the file?

-B. Bleicher The instrument has been through a lot of the filters including how should it be used and what should be submitted to the RTP file. First step is to say we will adopt or not. We have complete flexibility. We have had a lot of faculty input on the SRT.

K. Leonard reminded the chair that the question had been called.

Vote on Resolution 08-01:

Yes-36

No-3

Abstain-6

Resolution passes

Vote on Resolution 08-02

Yes-45

No-

Abstain-

Resolution passes

-A. Jimenez asked that Faculty Affairs take into consideration international, service learning, team taught and online courses when they discuss the SRT.

8. Time Certain: 3:45 p.m. Dave Chakraborty, OPC

The Infrastructure Project was suspended for two and half months. It was re-started on March 6. Jim Walsh gave a presentation on Infrastructure Project. The restart costs were between \$15,000 and \$20,000.

Q. from Julia Balen-Will faculty in Bell Tower West be moved? OPC is working with Dan Wakelee to minimize moves. It is possible that there will be 1-2 weeks of restricted access during the summer.

9. Reports from Senate Committees

Three announcements from the Technology Advisory Committee were read into the minutes on behalf of A.J. Bieszczad.

1. In collaboration with IT, TAC has created a common template for the faculty directory that was given to the administration in Faculty Affairs. As far as we understand, the new template is used for new hires, but any current member of faculty can have her or his directory entry upgraded,
2. In response to the TAC requests, IT has created a directory of hardware and software configurations of the computers labs, and a repository of software licenses available to the CSUCI community.
3. Software requests for Fall 2009 are due at the same time as textbook requests.

10. Other Announcements

Michael Berman-The Chancellor's Office has prepared Training for all CSU employees regarding data security. IT is now launching it on May 11th. If you are here and have time please take it. It is regarding the security of student and staff information. This is mandatory training for all CSU employees.

Terry to Beth, Thank you for the great job you have done!!

Ashish Vaidya announced that AVP Candidates for ORSP are coming to campus and forums are scheduled. Faculty Student Research Forum will take place May 9. Commencement is May 16th with an 8:00 a.m. line up in Fountain Courtyard

Chair Hartung introduced Carl Reed, the new Athletic Director.

Damon Blue is convening a Veterans Task Force and would like faculty participation. This task force will discuss and create policies regarding the GI Bill Benefits.

John Yudelson, incoming President of the CFA, said that CFA urges a No vote in the upcoming May 19 elections. He also announced his dissertation defense scheduled for June 17 and was congratulated.

11. Meeting Adjourned at 4:20

m/s J. Balen, D. Hoffman