

## Committee On Committees

### Annual Report

2001-2002

The Committee on Committees (COC) met on July 16 and August 1, 7 and 15 to review annual reports from 29 committees as specified in the Faculty Manual. The full committee reports are available in the Academic Senate Office.

The following committees are charged with submitting annual reports to the Academic Senate:

1. Academic Affirmative Action Committee (AAAC)
2. Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)
3. Academic Policies Committee (APC)
4. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)
5. All-University Committee on International Programs (AUCIP)
6. All-University Committee on Students, Faculty and Staff with Disabilities
7. All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTECH)
8. Athletic Advisory Board
9. Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR)
10. Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Board of Directors (CET Board)
11. Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS)
12. Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC)
13. Educational Policies Council (EPC)
14. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

15. General Education Council (GEC)
16. Graduate Council
17. Honorary Degree Committee
18. Liberal Studies Council (LSC)
19. Library Advisory Committee (LAC)
20. Professional Development Council
21. Student Affairs Committee (SAC)
22. Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)
23. University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee
24. University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee
25. University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)
26. University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC)
27. University Promotions Committee (UPC)
28. University Sabbatical Committee (USC)
29. University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review and Assessment (Fall, 2001 report)

COC evaluated each report it received in light of its charge as set out in the Faculty Manual. COC appreciates the many hours that committee members spent reviewing, discussing, and acting on issues before them. In a number of instances they fashioned creative, workable solutions to difficult problems and made appropriate recommendations. By virtue of this important work, the committees have made valuable contributions to the life of the University. COC thanks the committee chairs and members.

COC recommends that all committees review the previous COC report and appropriate committee reports. COC further urges that annual reports conform to the format outlined by the Academic Senate, including signatures by a majority of the committee.

## 1. Academic Affirmative Action Committee (AAAC)

During 2001-02, AAAC reports, it met three times (all during the spring semester), and was “mostly involved in a discussion on what is meant by the term ‘diversity’ in today’s academic climate and the departure and transition of key positions in this CSU initiative.” Although COC does not fully understand the nature of the definitional question, it commends the development of the survey questions that AAAC has developed; the survey is intended to evaluate the usefulness of existing diversity documents to departments, and to individual faculty, in promoting greater understanding of issues and how best to respond to them.

COC notes that in its agenda for the upcoming year, AAAC will distribute the survey and explore issues raised in a message from President Corrigan (3/29/02) seeking the committee’s view of the ‘defining question’ CUSP II should be looking at. COC recommends that AAAC spend some time looking at the outcome of hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion processes in relation to faculty diversity issues, and report to the campus on its findings. It also recommends that AAAC’s discussions in spring become the basis for a written recommendation to the Senate with respect to the role of diversity issues in hiring of campus administrators, especially of academic administrators.

## 2. Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)

The AFC report notes that for lack of a quorum AFC did not meet during the fall of 2001. When it did convene in spring 2002, it created “a simple web site” which interested faculty can consult. It also investigated a faculty member’s allegation that her dean had improperly changed a student’s grade despite the recommendation of a faculty grade appeals committee that the original grade be sustained. AFC has decided to continue its review before reporting on the issues raised by the faculty member’s situation.

COC is very concerned in general about lack of widespread faculty participation in shared governance activities, particularly those that speak to the very heart of the teaching profession, and sympathetic to AFC’s plight in fall 2001. For this reason, it recommends that the Senate chair and the Executive Committee develop a plan to educate faculty, including ‘junior’ faculty, about the essential role of vigorous participation in self-governance activities as a core element of their professional roles.

COC looks forward to the report on campus grade appeal issues, and hopes that AFC will both publicize its web site and expand it, if possible. It reminds AFC that in the 2001 recommendations, COC proposed that “AFC add to its agenda for the coming year preparation of a ‘guidebook’ or ‘manual’ defining ‘due process’ for all parties when complaints are made, and identifying the procedures to be followed when it and its successors investigate complaints. It suggests further that AFC may want to contact the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) for process information that could be invaluable to the committee and to the University community at large.” On the whole, COC believes, the committee will make its own job easier if it draws on available information to draw up a procedural manual for investigating faculty claims.

COC reminds faculty across the campus that preserving the basic values of the academy is at all times a

primary mission of any Academic Freedom Committee: only with a clearly-defined process ensuring a fair and detailed review of claims can faculty protect their rights to full and open expression in the classroom, in scholarship and creative activity, and in other professional endeavors contingent on their roles as members of the academic community. It appreciates the time and commitment of those faculty who serve on AFC.

### 3. Academic Policies Committee (APC)

COC congratulates the Academic Policies Committee (APC) on another extremely productive year.

Several matters related to its charge came before APC.

- In conjunction with the General Education Council and the office of undergraduate studies, APC reviewed and revised the General Education Segment II policy. The Academic Senate approved this policy revision.
- APC also reviewed a policy proposal prepared by Academic Affairs on program banking and suspension. The proposal was referred to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for further review.
- The Committee reviewed and forwarded to the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs a proposal on the use of electronic software to detect plagiarism. The committee reviewed and recommended proposed academic calendars for summer 2002 and for AY 2003-4 to the Senate.
- APC also discussed a document titled "The Validity Testing of Proposed Core Items," a report issued by the Office of Assessment.
- In other business, the Committee also reviewed and revised a proposal for a new policy on academic assessment. The proposed policy was approved by the Senate.
- APC reviewed materials from Academic Affairs regarding clarification of "equivalent units" in the Senate policy on the selection and review of department chairs and equivalent unit directors.
- In conjunction with the Student Affairs Committee, APC responded to a concern raised by the Office of Undergraduate Studies regarding the CR/NC grade option. The APC affirmed the existing policy.
- APC considered a proposed revision of Senate policy S01-14: University Policy on Written English Proficiency, proposed by Academic Affairs. The committee recommended further examination of proposed changes during AY 2002-3.

Two items that COC's last report asked APC to take up are still pending. The Committee reports that it

has not taken action on access implications of year-round-operation nor has it considered a policy on mediated instruction. In both instances, APC reports that no action was taken for lack of appropriate data.

COC asks the 2002-2003 APC to consider academic minors and existing policy on such programs, including unit loads, enrollments (specifically, the lack thereof), and student evaluations of the programs.

Finally, COC thanks APC members for their diligent work on this vital committee in the shared governance process.

#### 4. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)

COC acknowledges and commends the diligence and hard work of the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC). The committee chair provided the Senate with a summary report on April 30, 2002, outlining the completion of academic program review for Economics, Ethnic Studies, International Relations, Psychology, and American Indian Studies. The committee also held orientation meetings with the Colleges of Humanities, Creative Arts, and Health and Human Services who were beginning the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle or program review.

COC notes that APRC continues to address the problem of program assessment taking significantly longer than the original 5-year expectation. COC is concerned that no mention was made in this year's report about APRC's efforts in streamlining the process to meet a 7-year target as reported in last year's report as a APRC agenda item for this year. COC encourages APRC to continue its efforts to further streamline the process to bring completion of program review to within the 5-year cycle. COC, for the second year, strongly recommends that APRC focus a great deal of its attention on the issues of the "appropriate fit between available resources and the scope of the program under review."

#### 5. All-University Committee on International Programs (AUCIP)

COC commends the All-University Committee on International Programs for its clear and thorough report of its extensive activities during the 2001-2002 academic year. Several new initiatives were undertaken, including collaborating with CET and the Office of International Programs (OIP) to develop a searchable database on faculty expertise in international matters (dubbed "GlobalStars"), and beginning work to develop an "International Inventory," a listing of all international activities within each College such as the one created for the College of Business. Both of these efforts are designed to provide OIP and other interested parties on campus with better information about, and access to, faculty with international ties in their teaching or scholarship.

The Committee also continued to support the work and programs of the OIP, particularly critical this year in light of the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>. AUCIP's report acknowledged the efforts of the OIP and the entire campus community to help students cope with the events and their aftermath. The OIP updated AUCIP on the new international student tracking system being required by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as a consequence of the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>. The Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) will be piloted at SFSU beginning in July. COC hopes that AUCIP

will carefully monitor the piloting and final implementation of SEVIS (it becomes mandatory in January 2003) for its impact on international programs. Other AUCIP efforts in conjunction with the OIP included review of and approval of new study abroad and exchange programs. Four new programs were approved in accordance with the new university policy and procedure for approving and instituting international programs that AUCIP helped to develop in 2000-2001.

The Committee continued to oversee the awarding of Faculty International Development Grants. Five projects were funded this year with \$15,000, provided by the Provost.

AUCIP's final report notes that three of its members became part of a "leadership team" formed by the Provost to attend the annual meeting of the Internationalization Collaborative (IC) of the American Council on Education (ACE) in January. SFSU joined the IC in fall, 2001. Although the report notes the distinction between the leadership team, which reports directly to the Provost, and AUCIP, which is a Senate Committee, it is not clear how the work of the leadership team will relate to the mission and work of AUCIP. In particular, COC is concerned that the work of AUCIP not be diverted or constrained in any way by the creation of the Provost's leadership team.

In the coming year, AUCIP will seek representatives from the Colleges of Education and Health And Human Services, and an additional representative from the Division of Student Affairs, to complete the membership as outlined in its charge. AUCIP also requests that the membership be expanded to include a representative from the College Of Extended Learning (CEL), as CEL has oversight for short-term study abroad programs. Finally, AUCIP is requesting Senate help in disseminating information about its activities to the campus community, particularly about the GlobalStars and International Inventory initiatives. COC recommends that the chair of AUCIP meet with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate early in fall 2002 to address issues of membership and dissemination of information.

#### 6. All-University Committee on Students, Faculty and Staff with Disabilities

COC says "Two thumbs up!" to aucsfds, which had an unusual challenge this year: addressing a formal settlement agreement on access issues. It has met regularly with Gene Chelberg, the new Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center, "providing feedback and support" to him and his staff as they addressed tasks mandated by the agreement, and keeping him "apprised of specific campus access issues of concern." This kind of effort, if sustained, can benefit not just disabled students, faculty, and staff but the University as a whole by modeling a pragmatic and collaborative mode of addressing physical access and some of the less tangible dilemmas faced by specific "minority" populations.

COC agrees with the committee that the Director should be explicitly included in its composition. However, the committee cannot change its composition. It can, and should, invite the director to meet with it, but designating ANY change in composition will require action by the Senate. It also appreciates AUCSFSD's plan to continue reviewing the language of the settlement agreement; it hopes the committee will do this review in fall 2002, as whatever guidance it provides either to the Director or to other campus entities should be based on both practical need and principle. For this reason, COC applauds the committee's meetings with Human Resources staff and the position that "[University employees] with

either temporary or permanent disabilities [should] receive all the benefits and accommodations to which they are entitled in a process that is coordinated, consistent, and user-friendly.” Finally, COC suggests that the chair of AUCSFSD (perhaps joined by someone from HR) report to the full Academic Senate on its activities so that the Senate can acquire a clearer understanding of the settlement agreement and of the committee’s role on this campus.

The position of Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center was created as part of the Settlement Agreement concluded in 2001 between the University and various plaintiffs. Gene Chelberg was hired to fill this position starting July 2001. The director is charged with overseeing all aspects of SFSU’s policies and procedures to ensure that program access is achieved. The director is charged with maintaining an up-to-date list of all facilities to identify access barriers, arranging for the gathering of additional survey data if necessary, continually evaluating the accessibility of programs, services and activities, recommending which physical barriers should be removed, assessing whether the purchase or provision of accessible of accessible equipment is required, and receiving and responding to inquiries and complaints from students, faculty or visitors

At every meeting held during the 2001-2002 academic year, the committee received regular updates from Mr. Chelberg on the activities of his office and of the status of construction projects affecting access to campus facilities. The committee used these updates as a basis for providing feedback and support to the director and his staff as they worked on the many tasks required to implement the mandates of the Settlement Agreement. Committee members kept Mr. Chelberg continually apprised of specific campus access issues of concern.

### Recommendations:

- With the creation of the office of Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center, the incumbent has become an integral ex officio part of the committee.

The committee recommends, therefore that the committee charge be updated to reflect this fact and the new role of the committee as an advisory body to the Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center.

- Reviewing the implementation of the settlement agreement reached between the University and Plaintiffs in April 2001
- During the course of the academic year, the committee began reviewing the implementation of the Settlement Agreement. Among other specific items, the committee reviewed a preliminary draft of the new campus access map presented by the Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center.
- Providing input on the concerns and priorities of the SFSU disabilities community to the CUSP-II planning team.

In response to an invitation from President Corrigan and the CUSP-II planning team, the committee co-

chairs met with members of that committee to ensure that issues of concern to the SFSU disabilities committee are addressed in the CUSP-II planning process. Issues discussed included a request from the committee to CUSP-II for gathering data concerning the on-campus experience of students with disabilities, their retention and graduation rates and their subsequent career development. The committee also discussed ways in which the retention, promotion and tenure process can be made more accessible to faculty with disabilities.

- Reviewing efforts to improve and streamline services to SFSU staff with disabilities.

During its May meeting, the committee heard a detailed report by Marsha Alsop and Michael Martin of efforts being made to ensure that SFSU staff members with either temporary or permanent disabilities receive all the benefits and accommodations to which they are entitled in a process that is coordinated, consistent, and user-friendly.

#### Agenda for the coming year:

In its final meeting of the year, the committee decided that, in an effort to improve productivity, sub-committees will be set up in the 2002-2003 to deal with specific issues, such as reviewing emergency evacuation plans for persons with disabilities, physical access, information access, and outreach efforts and training. The sub-committees will report periodically to the full committee. In addition, the committee plans to continue the ongoing review of the implementation of the Settlement Agreement.

#### 7. All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEC)

The All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEC) met three times during the past academic year. AUTEC reviewed the requirements of CCTC (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing) under SB 2042, the legislation that created new requirements for credential-waiver programs. AUTEC also reviewed the University's blended programs. In addition, AUTEC discussed a number of other matters, including expanding AUTEC to include school district representation and creating college-level curriculum committees to review the effect of SB 2042 standards on existing Liberal Studies programs. AUTEC also discussed the President's Commission on Subject Matter and the Chancellor's Office Commission on Subject Matter. (COC is not familiar with these bodies.)

Two years ago, COC recommended to TCC that a survey of Ethnic Studies student attitudes toward teacher education be redone and that the College of Education hold an orientation workshop for College of Ethnic Studies students. COC now recommends that AUTEC add to its agenda an effort to increase the number of students in Ethnic Studies interested in acquiring a teaching credential.

COC expects that all committee members will review the year-end report in draft form and sign the final report before submission. COC is disappointed to note that only a single member of AUTEC signed the committee's report.

COC recommends that the Executive Committee give careful attention to the selection of the Academic Senate representative to AUTEK during the coming year, and that the Executive Committee schedule regular opportunities for that person to report to the Executive Committee on the work of AUTEK.

### Teacher Preparation and the University:

#### AUTEK, Liberal Studies Council, and TCC

COC is departing from past practice to comment on the issue of teacher preparation, a topic that involves three of the university's standing committees--the All-University Teacher Education Committee, the Liberal Studies Council, and the Teacher Credential Committee--as well as many individual faculty members throughout the university, the large majority of departments in the arts and sciences, and much of the College of Education. On August 6, 2002, the San Francisco *Chronicle* reported:

California, with 32,000 uncredentialed teachers, stands to lose hundreds of millions of education dollars if it cannot figure out how to hire a "highly qualified teacher" in every classroom, as the new federal Education Act requires by 2006.

Federal education officials said Monday that California is already "out of compliance" with the first step of the new law, which goes into effect this fall. It says states must hire only qualified, credentialed teachers at schools receiving federal funds for low-income students. Most of the state's uncredentialed teachers work with low-income students.

California has a serious teacher shortage and, by one estimate, needs to prepare at least 25,000 new, credentialed teachers a year during the next 10 years--but only about 17,000 a year are currently completing programs. The problem of unqualified--uncredentialed--teachers is serious in many parts of this state, especially in the schools most in need of good teachers.

The CSU has been working at increasing the number who complete the coursework for their credentials, and those efforts are currently contending with significant changes in the law governing the multiple-subject (elementary) credential. SB2042 requires significant changes in the current program.

All this means that the University needs to be prepared to devote a significant amount of time to curricular planning connected with teacher education over the coming year or two, and it needs to do more to recruit capable students into careers in teaching. COC notes that teacher education has been, is, and will continue to be an all-university responsibility, and that the new standards mandated by SB 2042 do not, and will not, change that reality. COC suggests that there may be merit in increasing the involvement of *teaching faculty* from the colleges that offer the relevant subject-matter courses, perhaps as a college-level taskforce working with the college administration and with the Liberal Studies Council, AUTEK, and TCC. COC recommends that compliance with SB 2042 should not be seen as the primary responsibility of the College of Education but instead as genuinely an all-university responsibility involving significant numbers of teaching faculty.

Thus, the coming year should require close cooperation among the three committees most involved with that curriculum: AUTECH, the Liberal Studies Council, and TCC. COC encourages those committees to work closely together and to keep the Executive Committee informed about their work and, especially, about any special needs that they may identify as they carry out the important work they have before them.

#### 8. Athletic Advisory Board

COC shares the concerns of the convener of the Athletics Advisory Board regarding the apparent difficulty in establishing a regular meeting time for this committee. The AAB met twice during 2001-2002, but was not able to achieve a quorum at either meeting. Topics discussed at the meetings included strategies for promoting awareness of and participation at athletic events on campus and the need to better maintain and support the facilities used for intercollegiate athletics. No action on discussion items was taken, nor are specific action items suggested for the coming year. The AAB report recommends that the charge and membership of the committee be reconsidered by the Senate, and suggests that the committee be smaller and given specific tasks to carry out each year. COC recommends that the convener and other members of AAB meet with the Academic Senate's Student Affairs Committee early in fall 2002 to follow-up on these recommendations and suggestions.

#### 9. Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR)

The Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR) met on the first Monday of each month during the past academic year and reviewed 78 petitions from 73 students, most of them seeking retroactive withdrawals from a prior semester. BOAR approved 46% of the petitions, a reduction from last year. The total number of petitions was up from last year.

BOAR notes that some of the increase may be due to problems with departmental or college advising of, and treatment of, students on probation. Some departments, BOAR notes, seem to approve probation petitions for student's semester after semester even though there is no improvement in the students' g.p.a. or in progress toward a degree. Of the 73 students who submitted petitions to BOAR in 2001-02, 46 were on probation and many of them had been on probation for four or more semesters with little if any improvement.

BOAR has also begun to hold some petitions in a "pending" status, and to require the students to show specified progress before BOAR approves the petitions.

During the coming academic year, BOAR will continue to develop approaches designed to "encourage departments and colleges to act early to prevent students from falling into self-destructive school-related behaviors that could interfere with professional or career opportunities."

COC commends BOAR for its hard work, its efficiency, and its concern for improving the process by which the University seeks to assist students who are having academic difficulty. COC recommends that the Executive Committee contact BOAR and invite that committee, or a sub-committee of it, to meet with the Student Affairs Committee to review current university policy and discuss whether changes are needed.

COC expects that all committee members will review the year-end report in draft form and sign the final report before submission. COC was disappointed to note that only a single member of the committee signed BOAR's report.

10. Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Board of Directors (CET Board)

COC believes that the Board of CET should win a campus award this year for the level of detail in its annual report, detail that portrays a great deal of activity. It was puzzled, however, by the design of the report, which makes it difficult to distinguish clearly between reporting on the activity of CET as such and action taken by the Board in its advisory role, although in several instances (items 5, 11, 12, and 15 – four of the fifteen activities listed), the report very clearly explains what the Board has done.

COC is very impressed by the scope of the tasks, activities, and reports brought to the Board, and its efficiency in dealing with them during its five meetings during the year. It strongly recommends that the Board do some careful thinking about the seeming emphasis on promotion of technology rather than teaching-quality as such, and develop some practical recommendations for non-technological strategies that CET could offer faculty to enhance the quality of their teaching performance. In this respect, COC wonders whether it would be useful for the Board to discuss the wide variety of tasks that fall under the heading of 'teaching,' from test and assignment design to contemporary strategies for small-group work and for practical ways of responding to and assessing the work submitted by students. COC believes that the Board could play a deeply valuable role in guiding CET toward a vision that gives as much consideration to traditional as to technological means of improving teaching and learning.

Because of the curious imbalance in CET's focus, and the values implicit in its activities, COC notes with great dismay the possibility that "Professional Development at SFSU may end up at CET" because of proposed reorganization in "the Faculty Affairs and Professional Development Office." It recommends that the campus invite comments from all faculty before any such shift takes place, and that the 2002-03 Board report to the Academic Senate on the status and direction of this proposal.

11. Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS)

The Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) fills a very important role at the University, as this committee not only carries out a charge from the University but is also the University's legally mandated review mechanism for complying with federal requirements.

During 2001-02, CPHS was reorganized and the position of coordinator was established. Formerly the CPHS chair received 0.20 assigned time to compensate for the amount of time involved in reviewing protocols on behalf of the committee, but in 2001-02 this assigned time was given to the newly created position of coordinator, whose responsibilities included supervision of the entire human subjects research area. Four new members were added to CPHS, including two from psychology, which brought the committee, and University, into compliance with federal regulations in the area of behavioral science. A non-scientist was also added, again to bring the committee and University into compliance with federal

regulations. Other changes in the committee membership, including the designation of alternates, were also undertaken to meet federal requirements.

Other changes in committee procedures, including expanded record-keeping, upgraded training of committee members, improved screening of exempt proposals, improved coordination of graduate student deadlines, and more were all undertaken to improve the efficiency of the committee or to comply with federal requirements.

CPHS met 16 times and reviewed 120 non-exempt protocols. The coordinator reviewed 1180 more protocols there were determined to be exempt, of which a majority were also reviewed by the committee. CPHS also adopted a series of requirements for projects on campus. CPHS has a long agenda for the coming year, in addition to its usual tasks for reviewing protocols.

CPHS is concerned that the University is not increasing the resources assigned to human subjects research as fast as the increase in research and extramural funding for this type of work. Consequently, the workload on the committee and on ORSP personnel is constantly increasing. At present, there is one ORSP staff member who assists CPHS but that person's primary assignment is otherwise, there is some access to student assistants, and there is 0.2 assigned time. CPHS urges that increased resources must be made available if CPHS is to be able to continue to do the work that makes the University eligible for a range of research funding.

COC endorses the CPHS requests for additional resources, specifically:

- A full-time staff member to review and oversee human subjects research
- Student assistant(s) to help with clerical work and website maintenance
- 0.2 assigned time for the CPHS chair
- at least 0.2 assigned time for the CPHS coordinator.

COC recommends that the Executive Committee enter into discussions with the AVP at the earliest possible time to present these needs and to advocate for the resources necessary to meet these needs. COC also recommends that the Executive Committee designate several people to review the current policy to determine if changes are needed to reflect current committee composition and responsibilities.

## 12. Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC)

Once again, the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC) has earned the gratitude of the Academic Senate and the faculty by its hard work in reviewing a large number of proposals for curricular change. During 2001-02, CRAC reviewed 21 proposed changes or proposed new programs. In addition, CRAC initiated, and continues to work on, guidelines for program revision and new programs.

The work of CRAC is central to academic governance more generally, because it is the faculty, acting through the processes and agencies of academic governance, who have the professional responsibility to define and offer a curriculum of the highest academic quality and because this professional responsibility cannot, by its very nature, be delegated. Faculty members appropriately have this responsibility because they possess the expertise to judge best whether courses, majors, and programs adhere to scholarly standards.

Accordingly, COC commends CRAC for its hard work and high level of productivity. However, COC notes that CRAC did not appoint a representative to serve on the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee during the past academic year, and COC urges CRAC to be certain to do so for the coming academic year.

### 13. Educational Policies Council (EPC)

The chair of the Educational Policies Council (EPC), which consists of APC and CRAC meeting jointly as needed, reports in a memorandum that the Council was not required to meet during 2001-2002.

The Council had been scheduled to review for action an anticipated General Education Segment II revision package. However, a delay in the Segment II review committee's work precluded EPC's taking up the matter. EPC's chair, which also serves on the General Education Council, anticipates that the GE Segment II Revision package will be ready for EPC recommendations and action by the Senate during AY 2002-3.

Normally COC would look for a formal year-end report from EPC signed by all of that group's members. However, COC also understands that with no business on it's 2001-2002 agenda to bring EPC together such a report was not in order.

### 14. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

COC applauds the Faculty Affairs Committee on the succinct report of its activities during 2001-2002. FAC addressed five issues on its agenda from the previous year, including 1) reviewing WASC report recommendations related to expectations of new tenure track faculty; 2) overseeing the development of a set of university-wide core teaching effectiveness assessment items; 3) reviewing the faculty manual and recommending necessary updates; 4) reviewing the reporting timeline for promotions; and 5) verifying and updating FAC relevant policies.

In addressing WASC concerns about expectations for new faculty, FAC developed a new tracking form for first year TT faculty that would ensure that new faculty are apprised of departmental and college performance expectations. The tracking form was forwarded to and approved by the Academic Senate.

FAC met several times with the Coordinator of Academic Assessment to discuss the development and testing of a set of core items to measure teaching effectiveness, and participated along with the Senate as a

whole in the piloting of the items. FAC submitted and the Senate approved a report university assessment in March 2002, and will continue to monitor the development and implementation of the assessment tool for measuring teaching effectiveness in fall, 2002.

FAC worked with the Dean of Faculty Affairs concerning the verification and updating of FAC relevant policies, the updating of the faculty manual, and the promotions timeline. The Committee reviewed and made recommendations on the "Preparing for Tenure and Promotion" document prepared by the Dean of Faculty Affairs. FAC also recommended revisions to the format of the form used to describe the promotions timeline, but decided the timeline itself did not need revision.

In addition to the five issues left over from the proceeding year, FAC discussed and forwarded to the Senate a resolution on the hiring of graduate students as Teaching Associates. The resolution called for further development of a policy on Graduate Teaching Associates (GTA), an agenda item for FAC in the fall. FAC also discussed childcare at SFSU, and referred this item to the Commission for University Strategic Planning (CUSP) II. Two other discussion items for FAC this year include equivalent units and potential changes to the sexual harassment policy. Both items were brought to the Executive Committee for their review.

In addition to continuing to work on the GTA policy and the teaching effectiveness assessment measure, COC recommends that FAC take up the implications of the new collective bargaining agreement. In addition, COC is recommending that FAC consider the implications of joint appointments for the H RTP process. This suggestion comes as the result of a concern raised by the University Promotions Committee.

#### 15. General Education Council (GEC)

The 2001-2002 report from the General Education Council was filled with the many accomplishments of this group; or, as stated in the report, the Council "has had an incredibly active year."

Among its many accomplishments, the GEC initiated a formal review of all existing Segment II courses, called for proposals for new Segment II courses, commenced a review of one-third of the Segment III clusters, and opened Segment III to new cluster proposals. The GEC worked with the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment to develop an overall assessment plan for all GE clusters and courses, and worked in cooperation with several other SFSU offices (including the Dean of Undergraduate Studies) while reviewing various elements in several GE related areas. The Council reported working with both Segment II and Segment III Committees in efforts to update those GE components. The report concluded with eight points the Council felt should be part of the 2002-2003 GEC's activities.

The COC heartily congratulates the GEC for a full and valuable year of activities that are clearly described in their report.

One question does arise as only 5 signatures appear at the end of this report although 13 signature lines are provided. COC recommends future GEC signature pages should be more complete and at least 50% of the signature lines signed by the GEC members before the report is forwarded to the Academic

Senate.

## 16. Graduate Council

The 2001-2002 Graduate Council submitted a report indicating the group had a busy year. The report states the Council is the "primary advisory body to University-wide administrators in the area of graduate studies," and it reviews requests for new graduate programs and changes in current programs. The Council's charge also allows it to function as a subcommittee of the Senate's Educational Policies Committee.

Based on the 01-02 report, it is clear the Graduate Council has many irons in many fires and is charged with making recommendations on all areas of graduate education at SFSU. It is not clear what impact the Graduate Council's recommendations have on graduate education on this campus. For example the Graduate Council complains that it should be designated as the "Blue Ribbon Task Force on Graduate Education" called for by an August 2001 report prepared by the SFSU Office of Academic Affairs; and the Council is asking for greater representation on the current CUSP II meetings as those meetings consider graduate education on our campus. It seems the Council suffers from a feeling of not being considered an active component of review for the changes being made to SFSU graduate programs. COC supports the Graduate Council's efforts to clarify its roles on campus. Such a clarification might make the Graduate Council's efforts more effective and might also restore some positive feelings in the Council about their place on our campus.

The COC supports the Graduate Council call for more support for graduate education at SFSU. The COC recommends that the Senate's Academic Policy Committee review the Graduate Council's call for all SFSU faculty who teach or are otherwise involved with graduate education have a terminal degree. The COC appreciates the detail and completeness of the 2001-2002 Graduate Council report. It is clear the Council works very hard and has detailed numerous recommendations for next year's council to consider.

## 17. Honorary Degree Committee

The 2001-2002 Honorary Degree Committee (HDC) held meetings starting in the fall semester and ultimately forwarded six new recommendations to President Corrigan for his consideration. The CSU ultimately approved one new honorary degree and reauthorized one degree to a recipient who was unable to attend the 2002 May SFSU graduation ceremony.

The HDC felt vexed by the lack of attendance of several of the HDC members. The report indicated the representative from the SFSU retirement association resigned from the HDC, most HDC meetings did not include a student representative, and a staff representative was not appointed to the HDC. COC recommends that the appropriate senate committee (e.g. Faculty Affairs) or the senate executive committee work with the HDC to reorganize the committee's membership in order to allow the committee to have quorums at their meetings while still having representation from major components of the SFSU campus. As Senate policy #591-171 states the President "shall establish a (HDC) committee," any committee membership changes must be submitted to the President for his action.

The COC notes that the HDC report was signed by the Committee Chair but not other members of that group. Although the HDC had attendance problems, a year-end report should be reviewed and signed by more than the Committee Chair.

18. Liberal Studies Council (LSC)

During 2001-02, the Liberal Studies Council met twice each month and focused much of its time and energy on meeting the new California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) standards for the multiple-subjects credential (required by SB 2042). The council also revised criteria and procedures for reviewing course proposals. This is a major task, involving substantial rethinking of this important program. During the coming year, the council will continue with this important work. The council also plans to review its advising program.

COC commends the Liberal Studies Council for its hard work this past year in addressing the changed requirements for the multiple-subjects credential, and notes that more is to come. (See separate section of COC report dealing with teacher preparation, AUTEK, the Liberal Studies Council, and TCC, following the report on AUTEK.)

19. Library Advisory Committee (LAC)

Major activities of the Library Advisory Committee (LAC) in seven meetings held during 2001-2002 included (1) consultation concerning plans for Library renovation and expansion, and for seeking further faculty input; (2) collection management issues; and (3) the Library's response to budget cuts.

LAC's reported agenda for 2002-2003 includes discussion of how Library facilities and services should be operated while the current buildings are being renovated, what features should be included in the renovation design, and what policy should govern whether materials are stored on open shelves or in the automatic retrieval system.

In its 2001-2002 report, COC recommended that "LAC add to its agenda working with the Library to specify procedures that will ensure effective and timely consultation and notification of all faculty and students concerning Library planning and management." The current report does not directly refer to any such specification of procedures nor, COC notes, does it indicate any concerns about the consultative process *per se*. Moreover, the report thanks the Librarian and Library faculty "for their eagerness and effectiveness in collaborating" with the Committee. COC appreciates this collaborative spirit and hopes that specific procedures are, or will be put, in place to ensure its continued effective implementation in the future.

Finally, COC notes that no representative for the College of Education is listed among LAC's members and hopes that all colleges will have elected representation for 2002-2003.

20. Professional Development Council

Inasmuch as the Professional Development Council (PDC) did not meet during three prior years, COC is pleased to have received a thorough report from the Council outlining its work in 2001-2002. The Council is charged to meet at least three times per semester to, among many things, invite, evaluate, and recommend funding of proposals pertaining to faculty professional development. The Council met seven times during 2001-2 with representation from all colleges save one. COC notes with dismay that, despite efforts on the part of PDC's chair, the College of Business did not provide a representative for the Council.

The PDC's report indicates that members agreed that a big part of their initial work should involve exploring the role of the PDC in supporting faculty professional development. The group established two initial goals: (1) Examining current processes used to evaluate applications for assigned time and funds for faculty professional development; and (2) exploring and discussing their practical and philosophical understanding of the term "professional development."

The Council's report indicates that in the absence of PDC activity in the preceding three years, tasks associated with evaluating applications for funding and other forms of professional development support have been taken on by other committees. The council agreed that until further notice, existing committees should continue to do this work so long as a member of the PDC serves on each review committee. Accordingly, representatives of the committee participated in the review of affirmative action grant applications and on a committee evaluating applications for assigned time, many grants and summer stipends.

In response to the general charge of supporting faculty in their professional development, the Council is engaged in developing a "Universal Grant Application Form" (UGAF) that would be attached as page 1 of all applications for professional support on campus. Preparatory to developing this form, the Council's college representatives gathered information concerning support unique to their colleges. In addition to using this information in the development of the contemplated UGAF, the Council expects to make the information gathered available to all SFSU faculty via a web site through which, among other things, application forms might be downloaded.

The council also aspires to see an expansion in the number and kinds of workshops designed to assist in preparation for tenure and promotion, including, but not limited to, the following areas: sabbatical applications, "how to use" the UGAF, writing grant proposals, and exploring funding and mentorship opportunities for faculty who are moving toward tenure and promotion.

The Council's report also includes a detailed summary of questions posed and discussion points made with reference to the meaning of "professional development." The Council's members anticipate providing a form for the dissemination of information in the results of their discussions of issues relevant to professional development. The group also expects to advise appropriate agencies within the University about the needs of faculty relevant to professional development. This is an agenda item for the Council in 2000 2-3.

The Council responded to a request from President Corrigan that it discuss some of the questions raised in

the current Commission on University Strategic Planning (CUSP II). Accordingly, the report includes the group's responses to the following questions:

- How can we attract the best faculty to the university? How can we attract top-notch faculty?
- How can we make SFSU a fulfilling place for faculty to work?
- How do we ensure that we are hiring the right faculty for our students?
- How can we provide increased research and professional support for faculty?
- How can we refresh and renew our faculty?

The Council also developed questions for interviews with applicants for the position of Dean of Faculty Affairs. Several members of the PDC attended these interviews and submitted candidate evaluations.

The PDC report acknowledges Vicki Casella, Director of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching for contributions made to the group's work, and also commends the work of PDC members Caran Colvin and Caroline Harnly, who reviewed support applications.

Items identified for the PDC's 2002 2-3 agenda include:

- Reconsideration of procedures for evaluating professional development grants/awards, along with clarifying the composition and duties of the subcommittees that conduct these evaluations.
- The gathering of remaining information on college-specific contributions to faculty professional development and the development of a comprehensive master list of campus-wide support.
- Continuing the development of the universal Grant application form.
- Developing lists of what each college values and supports as "legitimate" professional development.
- Meeting with the university promotions committee to discuss how UPC members evaluate professional development.
- Discussing means of disseminating the various types of recommendations the council has begun to, and will continue to, develop in support of professional development.
- Continuing philosophical and practical discussions of "professional development."

The COC commends the chair and members of the 2001-2002 Professional Development Council for the excellent groundwork laid for the future work of this important Committee.

## 21. Student Affairs Committee (SAC)

COC congratulates SAC on its many and varied activities during the 2001-2002 academic year, including responding to student concerns regarding certain facilities; reviewing and providing feedback on proposed policy changes concerning grade symbols, the number of units students on academic probation can take,

and support services for students with disabilities; reviewing a proposal for implementation of plagiarism software; and facilitating a new liaison relationship between management of Centennial Village and the Office of Financial Aid. The Committee also drafted a resolution concerning the impact of welfare reform on SFSU students; the Senate adopted the resolution in May 2002.

The Committee was updated by several members of the campus community on such issues as campus responses to the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, student employment opportunities, support services for international students, and the new library facility.

While SAC is one of many campus committees operating without its full complement of student representatives, this is a critical issue for a committee charged with addressing student concerns. COC applauds SAC's efforts to meet with the Associated Students to facilitate better representation in the future. In addition to seeking full student representation for fall 2002, the Committee will continue to 1) monitor the implementation of the university calendar (an agenda item left over from 2000-2001); 2) monitor student experiences in university housing, particularly the Village; and 3) consider issues related to student employment and academic success. These and other issues related to the student experience will be examined in some detail by CUSP II, and it is hoped that SAC will send representatives to the appropriate CUSP II working groups when they are organized to follow up on these issues. The newly formed university Task Force on Inter-group Relations is considering many issues of relevance to SAC, and it will be important for SAC to work with the appropriate working groups of the Task Force. COC has also recommended that members of the Athletic Advisory Board meet with SAC.

## 22. Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)

COC applauds the hard work, dedication, and enthusiasm of the members of the Teacher Credential Committee (TCC). TCC met nine times during the academic year and completed the review and approval of new or revised subject matter programs for: Professional Level II Special Education Credential, Mild and Moderate Disabilities, the new Child/Adolescent Development and Elementary Education "Blended" major for entering freshmen at City College of San Francisco and Canada College, and changes in Standards for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential for School Counseling (adopted January, 2001). COC extends its appreciation for the outstanding work of TCC in its continued discussions and monitoring of the impact of SB 2042 and AB 1059 on teacher preparation at SFSU. TCC has followed closely the extensive changes in the distribution of units in the Single Subject Credential, working closely with the chair of Secondary Education. TCC heard reports from several subject areas representative of the far-reaching revisions of the whole secondary education credential process as they relate to the new standards presented by SB 2042. The committee additionally received an informational presentation on the impact of SB 2042 from the Associate Dean of the College of Education, University Advising Center, and from the State Commission on Teacher Credentialing. COC applauds TCC's improvement in its ties to the College of Education and notes that the associate dean of that college participated in several meetings.

COC expresses its appreciation of the work done by TCC and endorses its 2002-2003 agenda: review changes in subject matter programs; continue to review changes in credential and certificate programs; work with AUTECH to solicit subject areas department reviews of the uses of technology in teaching

preparation courses; improve the quality of credential information and admission procedures work on information items and discussion of the needs of teacher entering inner-city schools; or discuss the need for joint supervision in special areas of PE, Music/Art and others; seek student representatives on TCC; to gather information about the new Teacher Preparation Center; and to gather information about the "Middle Emphasis Program with Project Include." In addition, COC directs attention to the special section of this report on teacher preparation, following the report on AUTEK.

23. University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee

COC applauds the hard work, dedication and enthusiasm of the members of the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC). Under the leadership of Dorothy Tsuruta, Ethnic Studies, the 14-member committee met six times during the year and, working in consultation with the Coordinator of Academic Assessment, completed an aggressive agenda. The committee, with consultation from the Coordinator of Academic Assessment, completed and sent to the Senate for approval a university policy on academic assessment; coordinated assessment endeavors with accountability efforts; and coordinated program review, curriculum change, and revision. UAAAC completed a review of other university's assessment policies.

COC encourages UAAAC to continue its hard work on its agenda for the coming year: especially to work with the Academic Senate to finalize action on the SFSU policy on academic assessment, to move on the WASC recommendations to secure resources for the use by the faculty in continuing to develop the SFSU academic assessment program, and further to delineate the role of assessment in the CSU accountability process.

24. University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee

The Advancement Activities Advisory Committee (AAAC) met twice during 2001-02. During the year, AAAC reviewed Advancement Division priorities including projects and goals for each department within the division. AAAC also reviewed the activities and priorities of the SFSU Foundation.

During the coming academic year, AAAC will review major Advancement Division activities, including fundraising priorities.

COC notes with approval that the AAAC met this past year and that the members are becoming acquainted with the work of the Advancement Division. COC also notes, however, that the role of faculty members in Advancement Division activities has often been problematic in past years. For some time, there was a University Development Priorities Committee that was supposed to advise on fund-raising priorities, but the committee rarely, if ever, met and apparently played no role in setting development priorities. A revision of University policy took place in Fall 1998, creating the current committee, with a broader set of responsibilities that nonetheless includes "[to] recommend developmental fund raising priorities to the President." It is not clear to COC that faculty members, either on the current committee or before, have ever functioned to "recommend developmental fund raising priorities to the President." There is no indication of such activity in the current report of the AAAC.

Accordingly, COC recommends that the Executive Committee communicate with the members of AAAC to remind them of this aspect of their charge, and to urge that next year's report include a treatment of the role of the committee in this regard. COC recommends that the Executive Committee meet with the faculty representatives on this committee and, as appropriate, take a careful look at the current policy, to see if there are any changes that would increase the likelihood of greater faculty involvement in developing fund-raising priorities.

COC expects that all committee members will review the year-end report in draft form and sign the final report before submission. COC also notes with disappointment that none of the faculty members of the committee had signed the report when it was submitted, and, indeed, that only two members of the committee signed at all. (More faculty members have subsequently signed the report.)

## 25. University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)

COC commends the University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) for its hard work and thorough year-end report. CWEP met ten times during AY 2001-2002 and focused its efforts primarily on the following projects: (1) Drafting and submitting a job description for a Writing-in-the Disciplines (WID) Coordinator, (2) Drafting a JEPET enforcement plan, and (3) Reviewing and revising the committee charge and relationship with other university Committees/constituencies. The first two projects were undertaken at the request of the Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

The JEPET enforcement plan was submitted to the Senate in May. The WID coordinator position was not funded.

A revised Policy covering the committee's charge and composition were approved by the Senate on November 6, 2001. However, as reported in CWEP minutes appended to the report, President Corrigan did not sign the policy and the administration appointed an Ad Hoc committee to review it. The final shape of the policy remains at issue.

CWEP also responded to a request from the Interim Dean of Undergraduate Studies to draft a memorandum encouraging the College of Business to consult with CWEP as it considered changes in a Graduate Essay Test (GET)/514 proposal.

Other CWEP agenda items for 2002-2003 include (1) continued consultation around implementation/enforcement of the JEPET policy, (2) continued work with the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to fill the position of WID coordinator, should the position be funded, and (3) continuing to serve as subject-matter resource/consultant by request.

COC supports CWEP's plans, especially with respect to the WID program and the JEPET program.

## 26. University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC)

COC applauds the University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC) for completing a comprehensive year of study, review, and critiques of the interdisciplinary climate on SFSU campus. COC also notes the excellent and complete summary provided by UIC. The nine members of the UIC met twice a month during the academic year and completed an exhaustive list of activities.

UIC, in conjunction with PRI, completed a three-year study to assess GE Segment III students' awareness of the value of interdisciplinary studies. UIC concluded from the results of this study that interdisciplinary exposure led students to a better awareness of what is meant by interdisciplinary and how it can help solve societal problems. UIC has completed an official report to the Provost on the results and their conclusion of the study. UIC is exploring ways, both website and print media, to make the results known to the campus community. The Council also reviewed proposed changes to the NEXA minor and to the International Relations undergraduate and graduate degrees prior to their presentation to the Academic Senate. The Council was disappointed that they were not allowed to play a more active roll in the initial development of the merger between the Music and Dance departments, since both departments' curricula have an interdisciplinary component. However, after a briefing by the chair of the Music Department, who outlined the rationale for the merger, the council concluded that the merger would enhance the two departments in a meaningful way. UIC has begun a successful collaboration with the University's program review process to assure that assessment of the University's interdisciplinary activities are included. The Council completed an exhaustive review of the program review reports from the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSS). The Council will return to their review of BSS and draw conclusion as part of their Council fall agenda. The Council proposed to the chairs of GEC, Segment III committee, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the GE Advising Coordinators the inclusion of interdisciplinary learning objectives as a part of all GE Segment III components. UIC reviewed the freestanding minors in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences. UIC generally agreed with the Dean of BSS that the freestanding minors are an important part of the college's curricula offering and need to be strengthened. UIC in its report noted several problems areas, and paid particular attention to the lack of administrative oversight, lack of student enrollment, and lack of assigned faculty positions to the minors, as especially problematic. UIC concluded that extensive work needs to be taken at the administrative level to assure that curriculum is up to date, that faculty receive regular assignment to these minors, and that students become aware of and enroll in BSS free standing minors. COC applauds UIC's diligent work on its extensive and wide ranging projects.

COC encourages UIC to pursue its agenda for the coming year. We look forward to the publication to the campus community of the results of the survey of student awareness of the importance of interdisciplinary studies. COC encourages UIC to continue the very important work of reviewing interdisciplinary activities and free standing minors both in BSS and the campus as a whole. COC applauds UIC's continuing work with GE Segment III committee and GEC and further encourages UIC to play a role in alerting new faculty to the importance and richness of the interdisciplinary nature of SFSU curriculum during their initial orientation. COC recommends that UIC take on the task of a comprehensive review of University minor programs focusing on levels of student interest, unit load, and recommendation for the elimination of low enrollment minors. COC thanks and commends the council for its diligence in attending to its tasks and carrying out its mission.

## 27. University Promotions Committee (UPC)

The 2001-2002 UPC Report clearly outlines the activities of this very important committee. The faculty promotion process is one of the most important activities for SFSU faculty. The UPC report indicates the hard work and diligent care the UPC gave the 35 promotions requests they reviewed. Congratulations are given to the UPC and the report of committee Chair Ron Compesi.

The 01-02 UPC report outlines the fall semester meetings convened by UPC and those convened by the SFSU Faculty Affairs (including meetings with promotions personnel from each College such as Department Chairs, Deans, and promotion candidates) during which the UPC played an important role. Much of the heavy lifting accomplished by UPC takes place in the spring semester when each applicant's file is given a thorough review and recommendations for and against promotion are determined during weekly UPC meetings. The five-member 01-02 UPC reviewed 35 files (although one file was removed from consideration by the candidate) and 34 candidates received recommendations from the UPC. According to the UPC report, the applicants for promotion they reviewed represent approximately one-half of the SFSU faculty who were identified as eligible for promotion. The report went on to note the 34 candidates represent a decline from the 00-01-promotion cycle when 51 files were reviewed. The report noted that the number of 00-01 candidates was probably artificially inflated by the then pending retirement of two senior college deans. The report also noted the changes in the spring 02 semester schedule due to the resignation of the SFSU Provost.

The 01-02 UPC recommended promotion to Associate Professor for 19 of the 21 applicants in this category, and they recommended promotion to Professor for 9 of the 13 applicants in that category. The UPC found no pattern with regard to positive or negative recommendations and the Colleges from which the files were sent to the UPC. The report also noted the most common reason for a negative recommendation was a lack of sufficient evidence that the candidate had accomplished the profile for the level to which they wanted to be promoted.

The 01-02 UPC report noted the following issues with regard to the files they reviewed: Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness need to be put in context. Candidates' peer evaluations need to be accomplished throughout the promotion period under review and not just when the faculty is applying for promotion. Context needs to be established to properly evaluate the significance of a candidate's professional achievement and growth, and the significance of campus and community service. Finally, the UPC wanted candidates to remember that the emphasis in their files should be on the quality of their work and not the quantity of paper in, or size of, the file.

The UPC report listed several questions for which guidance needs to be provided to future UPC Committees. COC recommends that the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee address the UPC concerns and questions and the larger promotion policy issues that are highlighted by the UPC report: What is the value of work outside of academia in the promotions process? How should post-doctoral fellowships be evaluated? What happens when a department's evaluation criteria are more stringent than Academic Senate policy? How and who should evaluate faculty with appointments in more than one academic unit? How should the proceedings of academic conferences be evaluated?

The UPC report does recommend a promotions meeting should be held during the spring term for those considering starting the process in the subsequent fall semester.

The 2001-2002 UPC report ends with an expression of admiration the committee members felt after reviewing the impressive efforts of the promotion candidates. The COC wishes to express our admiration for the quality, quantity, and thoroughness of the very professional activities of the 2002-2002 UPC.

## 28. University Sabbatical Committee (USC)

The COC finds incomplete the annual report from the 2001-2002 SFSU University Sabbatical Committee (USC). While the report does indicate the committee membership and committee activities (e. g. how many files were reviewed, what the committee rankings were, and how they ranked the 51 applicants), what is missing is what purpose the committee serves and how, if at all, the process has changed due to the committee's involvement.

The USC has completed two years in its current configuration on this campus. COC needs to have more information in order to evaluate their efforts. Unanswered, but necessary, questions include: What happened to this year's applicants after their files had been forwarded to the Provost? Were there disagreements between the USC and the Provost/President? Was there any discussion between the Provost or President and the USC? In what ways has the USC changed or helped the leave process? Should the USC continue to operate and why? Does the USC have purposes other than giving their stamp of approval to the University administration's actions? What recommendations does the USC have about the leave process at SFSU and how it might be improved? Was the USC contacted or asked for input when the administration put out the word it was considering not funding any difference-in-pay applicants during this cycle?

While the COC appreciates the hard work the USC put in during their evaluations of this year's leave applicants, the information requested is necessary to determine clearly whether or not this committee has been helpful or useful in the leave process at SFSU. COC also questions the validity of statistical evaluation formula listed in the USC's report of the committee's activities during the year of the report. The COC found the evaluation process does not seem to follow the necessary guidelines for use of statistics and seems to create an unbalanced approach to these applicants' files.

COC also finds it necessary for the USC report to be signed by more than one committee member (as happened with the year-end report currently under review). The 2001-2002 USC report was late in coming to the Senate and there is no indication 8 of the 9 committee members even saw it before it was sent to the Senate as they did not sign the document.

## 29. University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review and Assessment (Fall, 2001 report)

This committee, created in Spring 2001 by the Academic Senate, met eight times during fall 2001 to review data from the summer 2001 experience and to hear from faculty, department chairs, and deans

regarding their recommendations for future summer session. The Committee developed a calendar for summer 2002 that included two five week sessions and an eight-week session. The Academic Policies Committee, the Academic Senate, and the President approved the calendar. The Committee recommended that the two-week window for touch-tone registration by matriculated students be kept in place, but that enrollment of non-matriculated students be facilitated by increasing enrollment limits on courses. The Committee also developed a recommendation that accompanied the calendar that “Departments should ensure that their classes are taught in time-blocks appropriate for their subject.”

The two final recommendations in the fall 2001 report call for the establishment of a task force to study the feasibility of implementing a trimester system, and monitoring transportation needs with the possibility of initiating a shuttle service. COC suggests that the Academic Policies Committee review these recommendations and any other that may come from the Ad Hoc Committee. COC also suggests that a full discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of a trimester system be held in the Academic Senate and other appropriate venues before establishing a task force on this issue.

---

## **Committee on Committees**

### **Annual Report – 2001-2002**

#### **Executive Summaries**

##### **1. Academic Affirmative Action Committee (AAAC)**

COC recommends that AAAC spend some time looking at the outcome of hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion processes in relation to faculty diversity issues, and report to the campus on its findings. It also recommends that AAAC’s discussions in spring become the basis for a written recommendation to the Senate with respect to the role of diversity issues in hiring of campus administrators, especially of academic administrators.

##### **2. Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)**

COC is very concerned in general about lack of widespread faculty participation in shared governance activities; for this reason, it recommends that the Senate chair and the Executive Committee develop a plan to educate faculty, including junior faculty, about the essential role of vigorous participation in self-governance activities as a core element of their professional roles. COC looks forward to the report on campus grade appeal issues, and hopes that AFC will both publicize its web site and expand it, if possible. It reminds AFC that in the 2001 recommendations, COC proposed “AFC add to its agenda for the coming year preparation of a ‘guidebook’ or ‘manual’ defining “due process” for all parties when complaints are made, and identifying the procedures to be followed when it and its successors investigate complaints. It suggests further that AFC may want to contact the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) for process information that could be invaluable to the committee and to the University community at large.” COC reminds faculty across the campus that preserving the basic values of the academy is at all times a primary mission of any Academic Freedom Committee.

### 3. Academic Policies Committee (APC)

COC asks the 2002-2003 APC to consider academic minors and existing policy on such programs, including unit loads, enrollments (specifically, the lack thereof), and student evaluations of the programs. COC recommends that the APC review the recommendations made by the University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review and Assessment (Fall, 2001 report) and any other recommendations that may come from the Ad Hoc Committee

### 4. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)

COC notes that APRC continues to address the problem of program assessment taking significantly longer than the original 5-year expectation. COC encourages APRC to continue its efforts to further streamline the process to bring completion of program review to within the 5-year cycle. COC, for the second year, strongly recommends that APRC focus a great deal of its attention on the issues of the “appropriate fit between available resources and the scope of the program under review.”

### 5. All-University Committee on International Programs (AUCIP)

COC hopes that AUCIP will carefully monitor the piloting and final implementation of SEVIS (which becomes mandatory in January 2003) for its impact on international programs. AUCIP’s final report notes that three of its members became part of a “leadership team” formed by the Provost to attend the annual meeting of the Internationalization Collaborative (IC) of the American Council on Education (ACE) in January; COC is concerned that the work of AUCIP not be diverted or constrained in any way by the creation of the Provost’s leadership team. COC recommends that the chair of AUCIP meet with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate early in fall 2002 to address issues of membership and dissemination of information.

### 6. All-University Committee on Students, Faculty and Staff with Disabilities

COC agrees with the committee that the Director should be explicitly included in its composition but suggests that the director be designated *ex officio*, as is the case on comparable committees. COC suggests that the chair of AUCSFSD (perhaps joined by someone from HR) report to the full Academic Senate on its activities so that the Senate can acquire a clearer understanding of the settlement agreement and of the committee’s role on this campus. The committee recommends, therefore that the committee charge be updated to reflect this fact and the new role of the committee as an advisory body to the Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center.

### 7. All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTECH)

COC recommends that AUTECH add to its agenda an effort to increase the number of students in Ethnic Studies interested in acquiring a teaching credential. COC expects that all committee members will review

the year-end report in draft form and sign the final report before submission. COC is disappointed to note that only a single member of AUTECH signed the committee's report. COC recommends that the Executive Committee give careful attention to the selection of the Academic Senate representative to AUTECH during the coming year, and that the Executive Committee schedule regular opportunities for that person to report to the Executive Committee on the work of AUTECH. COC notes that teacher education has been, is, and will continue to be an all-university responsibility, and that the recent legislation does not, and will not, change that reality. The new standards mandated by SB 2042 are likewise an all-university responsibility. COC suggests that there may be merit in increasing the involvement of *teaching faculty* from the colleges that offer the relevant subject-matter courses, perhaps as a college-level taskforce working with the college administration and with the Liberal Studies Council, AUTECH, and TCC. COC recommends that compliance with SB 2042 should not be seen as the primary responsibility of the College of Education but instead as genuinely an all-university responsibility involving significant numbers of teaching faculty. COC encourages those committees to work closely together and to keep the Executive Committee informed about their work and, especially, about any special needs that they may identify as they carry out the important work they have before them.

#### 8. Athletics Advisory Board

COC shares the concerns of the convener of the Athletics Advisory Board regarding the apparent difficulty in establishing a regular meeting time for this committee. COC recommends that the convener and other members of AAB meet with the Academic Senate's Student Affairs Committee early in fall 2002 to follow up on these recommendations and suggestions.

#### 9. Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR)

COC recommends that the Executive Committee contact BOAR and invite that committee, or a sub-committee of it, to meet with the Student Affairs Committee to review current university policy and discuss whether changes are needed. COC expects that all committee members will review the year-end report in draft form and sign the final report before submission. COC was disappointed to note that only a single member of the committee signed BOAR's report.

#### 10. Center for the Enhancement of Teaching Board of Directors (CET Board)

COC strongly recommends that the Board do some careful thinking about the seeming emphasis on promotion of technology rather than teaching-quality as such, and develop some practical recommendations for non-technological strategies that CET could offer faculty to enhance the quality of their teaching performance. COC believes that the Board could play a deeply valuable role in guiding CET toward a vision that gives as much consideration to traditional as to technological means of improving teaching and learning. Because of the curious imbalance in CET's focus, and the values implicit in its activities, COC notes with great dismay the possibility that "Professional Development at SFSU may end up at CET" because of proposed reorganization in "the Faculty Affairs and Professional Development Office." It recommends that the campus invite comments from all faculty before any such shift takes place, and that the 2002-03 Board report to the Academic Senate on the status and direction of

this proposal.

#### 11. Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS)

COC endorses the CPHS requests for additional resources, specifically:

- A full-time staff member to review and oversee human subjects research
- Student assistant(s) to help with clerical work and website maintenance
- 0.2 assigned time for the CPHS chair
- at least 0.2 assigned time for the CPHS coordinator.

COC recommends that the Executive Committee enter into discussions with the AVP at the earliest possible time to present these needs and to advocate for the resources necessary to meet these needs. COC also recommends that the Executive Committee designate several people to review the current policy to determine if changes are needed to reflect current committee composition and responsibilities.

#### 12. Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC)

COC notes that CRAC did not appoint a representative to serve on the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee during the past academic year, and COC urges CRAC to be certain to do so for the coming academic year.

#### 13. Educational Policies Council (EPC)

The chair of the Educational Policies Council (EPC), which consists of APC and CRAC meeting jointly as needed, reports that the Council was not required to meet during 2001-2002.

#### 14. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

COC recommends that FAC take up the implications of the new collective bargaining agreement. In addition, COC is recommending that FAC consider the implications of joint appointments for the HRTP process. This suggestion comes as the result of a concern raised by the University Promotions Committee.

#### 15. General Education Council (GEC)

COC recommends future GEC signature pages should be more complete and at least 50% of the signature lines signed by the GEC members before the report is forwarded to the Academic Senate.

#### 16. Graduate Council

COC supports the Graduate Council's efforts to clarify its roles on campus. Such a clarification might make the Graduate Council's efforts more effective and might also restore some positive feelings in the

Council about their place on our campus. The COC supports the Graduate Council's call for more support for graduate education at SFSU. The COC recommends that the Senate's Academic Policy Committee review the Graduate Council's call for all SFSU faculty who teach or are otherwise involved with graduate education have a terminal degree.

#### 17. Honorary Degree Committee

The COC notes that the HDC report was signed by the Committee Chair but not other members of that group. Although the HDC had attendance problems, a year-end report should be reviewed and signed off by more than the Committee Chair.

#### 18. Liberal Studies Council (LSC)

COC notes that teacher education has been, is, and will continue to be an all-university responsibility, and that the recent legislation does not, and will not, change that reality. The new standards mandated by SB 2042 are likewise an all-university responsibility. COC suggests that there may be merit in increasing the involvement of *teaching faculty* from the colleges that offer the relevant subject-matter courses, perhaps as a college-level taskforce working with the college administration and with the Liberal Studies Council, AUTEK, and TCC. COC recommends that compliance with SB 2042 should not be seen as the primary responsibility of the College of Education but instead as genuinely an all-university responsibility involving significant numbers of teaching faculty. COC encourages those committees to work closely together and to keep the Executive Committee informed about their work and, especially, about any special needs that they may identify as they carry out the important work they have before them.

#### 19. Library Advisory Committee (LAC)

In its 2001-2002 report, COC recommended that “LAC add to its agenda working with the Library to specify procedures that will ensure effective and timely consultation and notification of all faculty and students concerning Library planning and management.” The current report does not directly refer to any such specification of procedures nor, COC notes, does it indicate any concerns about the consultative process *per se*. Moreover, the report thanks the Librarian and Library faculty “for their eagerness and effectiveness in collaborating” with the Committee. COC appreciates this collaborative spirit and hopes that specific procedures are, or will be put, in place to ensure its continued effective implementation in the future. Finally, COC notes that no representative for the College of Education is listed among LAC’s members and hopes that all colleges will have elected representation for 2002-2003.

#### 20. Professional Development Council

COC notes with dismay that, despite efforts on the part of PDC's chair, the College of Business did not provide a representative for the Council.

#### 21. Student Affairs Committee (SAC)

COC applauds SAC's efforts to meet with the Associated Students to facilitate better representation in the future. In addition to seeking full student representation for fall 2002, the Committee will continue to 1) monitor the implementation of the university calendar (an agenda item left over from 2000-2001), 2) monitor student experiences in university housing, particularly the Village, and 3) consider issues related to student employment and academic success. These and other issues related to the student experience will be examined in some detail by CUSP II, and it is hoped that SAC will send representatives to the appropriate CUSP II working groups when they are organized to follow up on these issues. The newly formed university Task Force on Inter-group Relations is considering many issues of relevance to SAC, and it will be important for SAC to work with the appropriate working groups of the Task Force. COC has also recommended that members of the Athletic Advisory Board meet with SAC.

## 22. Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)

COC notes that teacher education has been, is, and will continue to be an all-university responsibility, and that the recent legislation does not, and will not, change that reality. The new standards mandated by SB 2042 are likewise an all-university responsibility. COC suggests that there may be merit in increasing the involvement of *teaching faculty* from the colleges that offer the relevant subject-matter courses, perhaps as a college-level taskforce working with the college administration and with the Liberal Studies Council, AUTEK, and TCC. COC recommends that compliance with SB 2042 should not be seen as the primary responsibility of the College of Education but instead as genuinely an all-university responsibility involving significant numbers of teaching faculty. COC encourages those committees to work closely together and to keep the Executive Committee informed about their work and, especially, about any special needs that they may identify as they carry out the important work they have before them.

## 23. University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee

COC encourages UAAAC to continue its hard work on its agenda for the coming year: especially to work with the Academic Senate to finalize action on the SFSU policy on academic assessment, to move on the WASC recommendations to secure resources for the use by the faculty in continuing to develop the SFSU academic assessment program, and further to delineate the role of assessment in the CSU accountability process.

## 24. University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee

COC notes with approval that the AAAC met this past year and that the members are becoming acquainted with the work of the Advancement Division. COC also notes, however, that the role of faculty members in Advancement Division activities has often been problematic in past years. For some time, there was a University Development Priorities Committee that was supposed to advise on fund-raising priorities, but the committee rarely, if ever, met and apparently played no role in setting development priorities. A revision of University policy took place in Fall 1998, creating the current committee, with a broader set of responsibilities that nonetheless includes "[to] recommend developmental fund raising priorities to the President." It is not clear to COC that faculty members, either on the current committee or before, have ever functioned to "recommend developmental fund raising priorities to the President."

There is no indication of such activity in the current report of the AAAC. Accordingly, COC recommends that the Executive Committee communicate with the members of AAAC to remind them of this aspect of their charge, and to urge that next year's report include a treatment of the role of the committee in this regard. COC recommends that the Executive Committee meet with the faculty representatives on this committee and, as appropriate, take a careful look at the current policy, to see if there are any changes that would increase the likelihood of greater faculty involvement in developing fund-raising priorities. COC expects that all committee members will review the year-end report in draft form and sign the final report before submission. COC also notes with disappointment that none of the faculty members of the committee had signed the report when it was submitted, and, indeed, that only two members of the committee signed at all.

#### 25. University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)

COC commends the University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) for its hard work and thorough year-end report. COC supports CWEP's plans, especially with respect to the WID program and the JEPET program.

#### 26. University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC)

COC encourages UIC to pursue its agenda for the coming year. We look forward to the publication to the campus community of the results of the survey of student awareness of the importance of interdisciplinary studies. COC encourages UIC to continue the very important work of reviewing interdisciplinary activities and free standing minors both in BSS and the campus as a whole. COC applauds UIC's continuing work with GE Segment III committee and GEC and further encourages UIC to play a role in alerting new faculty to the importance and richness of the interdisciplinary nature of SFSU curriculum during their initial orientation. COC recommends that UIC take on the task of a comprehensive review of University minor programs focusing on levels of student interest, unit load, and recommendation for the elimination of low enrollment minors.

#### 27. University Promotions Committee (UPC)

COC recommends the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee address the UPC concerns and questions and the larger promotion policy issues that are highlighted by the UPC report: What is the value of work outside of academia in the promotions process? How should post-doctoral fellowships be evaluated? What happens when a department's evaluation criteria are more stringent than Academic Senate policy? How and who should evaluate faculty with appointments in more than one academic unit? How should the proceedings of academic conferences be evaluated? The COC wishes to express our admiration for the quality, quantity, and thoroughness of the very professional activities of the 2002-2002 UPC.

#### 28. University Sabbatical Committee (USC)

The COC finds incomplete the annual report from the 2001-2002 SFSU University Sabbatical Committee (USC). COC needs to have more information in order to evaluate their efforts. Unanswered, but

necessary, questions include: What happened to this year's applicants after their files had been forwarded to the Provost? Where there disagreements between the USC and Provost/President? Was there any discussion between the Provost or President and the USC? In what ways has the USC changed or helped the leave process? Should the USC continue to operate and why? Does the USC have purposes other than giving their stamp of approval to the University administration's actions? What recommendations does the USC have about the leave process at SFSU and how it might be improved? Was the USC contacted or asked for input when the administration put out the word it was considering not funding any difference-in-pay applicants during this cycle? While the COC appreciates the hard work the USC put in during their evaluations of this year's leave applicants, the information requested is necessary to clearly determine whether or not this committee has been helpful or useful in the leave process at SFSU. COC also finds it necessary for the USC report to be signed by more than one committee member (as happened with the year-end report currently under review). The 2001-2002 USC report was late in coming to the Senate and there is no indication 8 of the 9 committee members even saw it before it was sent to the Senate as they did not sign the document.

29. University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review and Assessment (Fall, 2001 report)

COC suggests that the Academic Policies Committee review the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations and any other that may come from the Ad Hoc Committee. COC also suggests that a full discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of a trimester system be held in the Academic Senate and other appropriate venues before establishing a task force on this issue.

Committee on Committees

Membership

2001-2002

---

James Edwards, Design and Industry, Chair

---

Robert Cherny, History

---

Jan Gregory, English

---

Rick Houlberg, Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts

---

Dawn Terrell, Psychology

---

Penny Warren, Counseling and Psychological Services