

## Committee on Committees Annual Report

2002-2003

---

The Committee on Committees (COC) met on August 5, 12 and 19 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 (AUTECE)
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.	Enrollment Management Committee (EMC)
15.	Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)
16.	General Education Council (GEC)
17.	Graduate Council
18.	Honorary Degree Committee
19.	Liberal Studies Council (LSC)
20.	Library Advisory Committee (LAC)
21.	Professional Development Council
22.	Student Affairs Committee (SAC)
23.	Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)
24.	University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee
25.	University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee
26.	University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)
27.	University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC)

28.	University Promotions Committee (UPC)
29.	University Sabbatical Committee (USC)
30.	University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review

## 1. Academic Affirmative Action Committee

COC appreciates brevity, of which this year's AAAC report is a model. The committee appears to have focused on two major items: a) discussion of two documents on diversity planning and strategies, and b) development of a survey designed "to assess the awareness and implementation of "Diversity Planning in Academic Affairs," prepared by the office of Academic Affairs on this campus. It notes that not all academic units seem to have discussed (or, in some cases, to have received) this document. In addition, it met with candidates in the search for a permanent provost and was joined at a meeting with Provost Gemello by other faculty concerned about the small numbers of individuals of color hired for permanent faculty positions. AAAC and the provost will meet again in fall 2003 to see if they can agree on principles for an "effective diversity plan for Academic Affairs," which it would then present to the Academic Senate.

COC notes, unhappily, that the report was not signed by members other than the chair of AAAC. On the other hand, it values the collaborative quality of the AAAC's activity and hopes AAAC will find ways to strengthen its ties with SFSU faculty in general as it works with the provost toward campus guidelines that will be practical and successful in increasing the diversity of the SFSU faculty. In this context, COC wonders if meeting with each of the College councils in conjunction with distribution of its survey forms might be helpful to AAAC, enabling it to discuss a broad range of issues with department chairs in settings where they can talk informally and openly about the issues at hand. By doing so, it could perhaps develop one line of communicating with faculty about campus goals and strategies for implementing them, and hear from chairs about their perspective on how to attract and retain a more diverse faculty. COC hopes AAAC will be able to make this one addition to its agenda for 2003-2004.

## 2. Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)

The AFC 2002-2003 annual report says that three matters arrived at its doorstep during the year. The committee met 5 times over the course of the academic year, "finally addressing one issue that had come to the Committee's attention in August 2001." This issue was a "situation" that occurred when a College Dean changed a grade after a student grade grievance process that upheld the grade originally given by the faculty member. It further made a recommendation to the Senate.

AFC researched and made "informal" inquiries regarding the USA Patriot Act, but has not made formal recommendations.

Finally, AFC noted another "situation" brought to it from Faculty Affairs, but the committee concluded that this had "no academic freedom component," whatever that means.

The coming year's agenda includes

Continuation of a grade appeals policy procedure,

the issue of Curriculum and Workload,

Monitoring the "University's undercover surveillance of First Amendment activities on campus" with possible policy recommendations,

Continued attention to the Patriot Act

Enhancement of its Website.

COC endorses the next year's agenda but has concerns about the Spartan nature of the AFC annual report; also that only one signature accompanied the document. COC suggests that the committee make a thorough, thoughtful recommendation to the senate regarding the Patriot Act, as the university-wide ramifications of it are so immense.

### **3. Academic Policies Committee (APC)**

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

APC developed two new policies that received Senate approval. These concerned (1) a 13- unit/semester limit for students on academic probation, and (2) designation of community service learning courses. The Committee revised three existing policies, involving (1) JEPET (#F02-14), (2) the charge and membership of the University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP), and (3) the lower division portion of the University Written English Proficiency policy (#S02-15). These proposals also received Senate approval. Other items recommended to the Senate or the Senate Executive Committee included (1) approval of the Summer 2003 academic calendar, (2) inclusion of the review of minor programs in the next cycle of five-year programs reviews, (3) consideration of access implications of summer sessions to the Senate's Ad Hoc Summer Semester Committee, and (4) approval of three College of Business policy proposals. Information items presented to the Senate dealt with recommendation for an external review of the University's literacy programs and policies, recommendation for an exemption of the TOEFL requirement for upper division international transferring from a U.S. college or university, and the final draft of the "Guidelines Regarding Academic Instructional Technology at SFSU." APC also discussed issues related to mediated instruction, distance education and intellectual property; and reviewed its own charge. In addressing its tasks in 2002-2003 the Committee constituted a subcommittee on literacy issues, and a sub-subcommittee on an external review of literacy programs and policies. APC's chair participated in the newly established University Enrollment Management Committee. The chair's designee (Andres Consoli) chaired the Task Force on Academic Instructional Technology.

Along with members of the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee, APC members also constitute part of the Educational Policies Council. Activities of this body are summarized below.

COC appreciates APC's consideration of two items recommended by the 2000-2001 COC —access implications of year-round operation and a policy on mediated instruction—and a third matter recommended by the 2001-2002 COC (concerning minor programs).

The APC report lists three agenda items for the 2003-2004 committee: (1) convening a subcommittee to select external reviewers of the University's literacy programs/policies (this task was completed during summer 2003), (2) soliciting campus-wide input on the proposed "Guidelines Regarding Academic Instructional Technology at SFSU" and preparing a final proposal for Senate action, and (3) reviewing results of a survey on the academic calendar and recommending Senate action is appropriate.

COC expects that APC will also address any forthcoming proposals for revisions in the General Education Program. [Note: a GE Segment II revision packet was expected during 2002-2003 but not received.]

COC thanks the members of APC for their hard work on so many vital matters 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 May 13, 2003, outlining the completion of academic program review for International Relations, Psychology, American Indian Studies, Speech and Communication Studies, and Humanities. The committee chair attended introductory and second day meetings with external review teams for Technical and Professional Writing, Classics, Raza, Gerontology and Dance. To begin the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle of program review orientation meetings were held for the Colleges of Ethnic Studies, and Science and Engineering.

COC notes that APRC is taking step to streamline its work process in view of a doubling of the workload for 2003-2004. APRC will undertake a revision of the APRC handbook for 2003-2004. COC is concerned that no mention was made in this year's report of any effort being made by APRC to streamline the process to meet a 7-year target. In its past two reports APRC had indicated that he streamlining process as an agenda item. COC encourages APRC to continue its efforts to further streamline their process towards completing program reviews within a 5-year cycle. COC, for the third 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)**

AUCIP's report lists activities in 6 different categories: work on a database on faculty expertise in "all

things international,” work on the International Activity Inventory, international development grants for faculty, coordination of efforts with the task force on internationalization of the curriculum, supervising and supporting the work of the Office of International Programs. The report notes that AUCIP met two of its high-priority goals: full membership, with all Colleges represented on AUCIP; support from the Academic Senate for including in the body a representative from CEL.

Considering this broad-based agenda, AUCIP is fortunate in being so large, especially as its plans for 2003-2004 are at least equally ambitious, some of them oriented toward uses of technology but others more traditionally “people-centered.” (One, for instance, suggests an interest in building into the program review process a line of inquiry about department-based activities geared toward increased internationalism; another calls for AUCIP to work on financial aid for international students.) COC is impressed by the scope of the past and upcoming agendas, as with the accomplishments of this committee and its concerns for both faculty and students. It wonders, though, whether a more limited focus of activity, or the use of work-groups, might streamline the committee’s work.

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

AUCSFSD is charged with action on a number of sensitive issues about campus compliance with federal and state law pertaining to individuals with disabilities. During 2002-2003, it addressed its charge by meeting regularly with the Director of Disability Programs and Resource Center, discussing issues of mutual concern, and making recommendations to that office. Notable among these issues: ongoing implementation of the 2001 settlement agreement committing the campus to upgrade access for persons with disabilities, and recommendations to the director for further implementation; the "Access and Construction Alerts" system that automatically notifies members of the University community of events that affect access to campus buildings, and the soon-to-be-published campus access map." Similarly it met with the Library director to ensure that plans for the new library address access issues appropriately and with CUSP to ensure that issues important to the disabled are included in

long-range strategic planning. AUCSFSD also adopted a workgroup strategy, creating four "subcommittees" of which each had a specific task; each of these groups met at least once each semester. Its agenda for 2003-2004 includes a presentation to the Academic Senate about its work; policy recommendations to the Senate about matters of concern to disabled individuals on campus; increased effort to attract student representation on this committee, whose work clearly affects all persons with disabilities or with an interest in this particular range of issues.

COC applauds AUCSFSD for its commitment to fulfilling a difficult charge, and in particular for adopting a work-group plan that enables it to complete tasks more efficiently. It also applauds AUCSFSD's sustained conversations with the director of DPRC, as they have common concerns and goals which they can address more effectively by working in tandem, and looks forward to hearing on the Senate floor about the work of the committee, and the ways in which the University can continue to move in the direction of reasonable accommodation for those in the campus community who need it. In general, COC strongly supports collaborations between committees and other individuals or groups on

campus with common interests, so it encourages AUCSFSD to maintain its link to CUSP and its planning process.

## **7. All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEK)**

AUTEK serves as a forum for issues related to teacher education and is charged with fostering activities designed to improve attitudes toward the teaching profession.

The committee met twice during the 2002-2003 academic year. The main activity included reviewing the details and impacts of SB2042, the new State standards that drive waiver and blended teacher credential programs. As part of that review, the committee heard presentations on SB2042 impact on the areas of Secondary Education, Elementary Education, Liberal Studies and the CAD program.

For the next academic year, AUTEK plans to review the completion of the curriculum for the new SB 2042 standards for submission to the various University committees, as needed. COC wishes the committee well in this important endeavor and encourages AUTEK to take an active role in fostering activities designed to promote education as a career choice for SFSU students. In particular, as in the previous three years, COC strongly urges the ATEK that it work with the College of Ethnic Studies to encourage a greater participation of their students in the teacher credential programs.

## **8. Athletic Advisory Board (AAB)**

With no report to go on, the COC is at a bit of a loss for a recommendation for the coming year. One potential topic, which AAB may wish to approach as a consulting body with FAC, is the creation of a tenure/peer review policy for athletic coaches, who currently operate in an uneasy vacuum in the academic framework.

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

The Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR) meets monthly throughout the academic year and this year reviewed 66, down from 73 the year before. As is often the case, most of these sought retroactive withdrawals from a prior semester. BOAR approved 44% of the petitions, a reduction of 2% from the previous year.

As BOAR has noted in earlier reports, some of these petitions could have been avoided with better communication and knowledge of university regulations by faculty, and recommends that the University create a better training mechanism for faculty, who are not always well versed in more general university rules and regulations. (Some petitions resulted from poor or inadequate advice given to students over GE courses, and the like.)

As BOAR has also noted in earlier reports, students on probation continue to be a large part of the petition workload. These students often continue to have their petition forms signed by faculty even

when there is no sign of improved academic performance. BOAR recommends that dept advisors, before signing petitions, review the students' entire academic performance, and provide appropriate advising according to the 5 pivotal points recommended by the University, or refer students to the Advising Center?

As begun the year before, some petitions were placed in "pending" status, often requiring a student to sign a contract, stipulating contact with an advisor or the creation of an academic game plan. Only when these conditions were met would the petition be granted. BOAR feels that this is an improved way to address individual student issues.

In the previous year's report, BOAR stated that it would "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 finds that BOAR has indeed done this, and is impressed with its concern for improving the process by which the University seeks to assist students who are having academic difficulty. COC in an earlier report recommended 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, but it is not clear from this year's report whether this has indeed occurred.

COC recommends that both FAC and SAC examine the data of retroactive withdrawal petitions for patterns, and perhaps recommend changes in policy.

COC is pleased that the number of signatures on the report page has risen dramatically from the past year, but still only four of ten committee members actually signed the report. One notation indicates that one faculty BOAR member did not attend a single meeting, a distressing sign.

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

The CET Advisory Board's annual report portrays in detail a wide range of activities, in some of which -- budget review, communication about CET activities, working with the director in hiring CET faculty -- its role is clearly defined by the committee charge. In some places, however, the report appears merely to catalogue the work of CET itself, which COC finds somewhat confusing and possibly irrelevant. COC recognizes that CET is deeply committed to use of technology in improving classroom instruction and learning; it wonders, however, whether CET can in fact accommodate to probable demand for its workshops on, for instance, Blackboard, and whether faculty would also benefit from non-technological strategies for improving the teaching/learning process. Given the dreary budget climate and limits on enrollment for at least the next year, COC suggests that the CET Advisory Board look into these matters.

COC also wonders about the link between the Advisory Board, CET and activities for new faculty on matters related to RTP, but notes that Faculty Affairs is working closely with CET on these issues.

However, their relationship to CET's basic mission, like that of the New Faculty Orientation, is very limited; COC wonders whether the Advisory Board might discuss ways in which CET could devote itself more single-mindedly to that mission.

COC admires the very ambitious agenda for 2003-2004, and hopes the Advisory Board is successful in its efforts to increase faculty participation in training activities, as well as to attract students to serve on the Board. Although the latter may prove challenging, students have a major stake in the quality of the education they receive and may be able to offer particularly useful commentary on matters related to teaching and learning.

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

The COC thanks the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) for its candid and detailed report on its activities for the 2002-2003 academic year. The report preface provides an overview of the significant changes that have taken place in the area of research involving human subjects both at the national level and at the campus level. The COC appreciates the Herculean task facing the committee members, who have to deal with upholding complex and stringent requirements on one hand, and the often incomplete or inadequate submissions presented by students and faculty wishing to do studies involving human subjects. As mentioned in the CPHS report, there were unacceptable delays in the processing of some non-exempt research protocols during the last academic year. The COC believes that this is a serious campus-wide issue whose resolution must be given high priority and appropriate resources. COC applauds the efforts the CPHS has made in diagnosing the causes of the delays and in taking steps to improve the situation during the 2003-2004 academic year.

The COC endorses the agenda that CPHS has adopted for the coming year, particularly its efforts to ensure that those wishing to perform research involving human subjects are well informed of the specific procedures they need to follow. In that regard, COC supports the creation of the CPHS web page and encourages the CPHS to continue efforts to mount informational workshops for interested parties and to work closely with the various colleges to insure that communication channels remain open.

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

The Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC) is charged with ensuring that University programs follow criteria and procedures set by the Academic Policies Committee. This broad area of responsibility, coupled with the need for timely decision-making, makes CRAC one of the busiest committees of the Academic Senate.

The COC commends the members of CRAC for their hard work and accomplishments during the 2002-2003 academic year, during which they reviewed 21 proposals for the creation, modification or discontinuance of both graduate and undergraduate academic programs throughout the University. While most proposals before CRAC were approved by the committee, COC notes that CRAC sent several proposals back for revisions, an indication of the thoughtful consideration the CRAC gives the

proposals submitted to the committee.

In addition to reviewing the steady stream of specific proposals for program revisions, CRAC participated in joint meetings with the Academic Policy Committee and the Graduate Council during 2002-2003 to review program and curricular changes to graduate programs. Another significant accomplishment of CRAC during the 2002-2003 academic year was their completion of the "Curriculum review and Approval Guidelines for Program Revision, New Certificate Programs and New Degree Majors Programs". This document should prove very helpful for those proposing curricular changes in the future.

CRAC's agenda for the upcoming academic year includes plans to finalize proposal guidelines and refine the method of distribution in collaboration with the Office of Academic Affairs, assist the Senate Office to implement the use of electronic agenda and proposals for meetings, and participate in a joint meeting with the APC in Fall 2003. The COC, for the second year in a row, strongly urges CRAC to appoint a representative to the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee to insure CRAC representation in that important committee. The COC wishes the CRAC continuing success in streamlining its considerable workload and in facilitating the ongoing process of program revision for the entire University community.

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

The Educational Policies Council, consisting of members of APC and CRAC, convened three times during 2002-2003 and reviewed three proposals for academic program discontinuance, eight proposals for changes in the requirements for master's degree programs, and one proposal for a new joint doctoral program. The Council approved discontinuance of the B.A. in Science: Concentration in Meteorology, the Minor in Psychological Services, and the Certificate in Psychological Field Services. EPC approved a proposal for a joint doctoral program in physical therapy. Changes in the following masters programs were also approved: M.A. in English: Concentration in Literature, M.A. in English: Concentration in TESOL, M.S. in Engineering, M.A. in Public Administration, M.A. in Psychology: Concentration in Social Psychology, M.A. in Museum Studies, and M.A. in History. The Council declined to approve a proposal for changes in the M.A. in Art, returning it to the department for revision. EPC anticipates that the Art Department will submit a revised proposal in Fall 2003. Other than appointing an EPC liaison to the Graduate Council for AY 2003-2004, no other agenda items could be identified at the conclusion of 2002-2003.

COC commends EPC for the timely and systematic manner in which it dealt with a heavy workload in 2002-2003.

### **14. Enrollment Management Committee (EMC)**

Enrollment strategies come under the purview of the Academic Senate, and EMC invented itself this past year in response to numerous issues surrounding enrollment at SFSU. COC applauds EMC for its

self-creation, its careful consideration of charge, and for frequent constructive meetings last spring after its initial launch in March 2003.

EMC considered enrollment policy both at the local and system-wide levels, digested student data and demographics, reviewed university application deadlines, informational brochures, and other communication avenues. They capped their activities by creating an Enrollment Management Plan, presumably to be presented to the Senate in Fall 2003.

COC is impressed with the energy demonstrated by EMC, and looks forward to hearing more about its recommendations in the Enrollment Management Plan.

## **15. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)**

The Faculty Affairs Committee completed and sent to the Senate a number of items. The campus teaching effectiveness form was modified, the role of probationary faculty on hiring committees was clarified, policies concerning the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects were revised, guidelines were issued concerning promotion of faculty with joint appointments; policies regarding difference-in-pay leaves were brought into compliance with the CFA contract, and it was resolved that University-assigned ID numbers replace Social Security numbers for campus identification of students. Several other items were resolved in committee. Concerns about maintaining an up-to-date and informative faculty manual were aired with Dean Verhey. It was determined that adequate whistleblower protection was documented in current university policy. The need for written evaluation of lecturers was emphasized, and Dean Verhey responded with a memo to all College Deans reiterating the requirement for such evaluations.

Three major items will be carried over to next year's FAC: the development of policy regarding Graduate Teaching Assistants; the development of a form and charge for a campus Research Council; and a review of the various college grade appeal policies (some of which may vary from Academic Senate policy). The FAC requests that policy concerning review of coaches be transferred to the Student Affairs Committee and that perhaps the Athletics Advisory Board consult as well.

## **16. General Education Council (GEC)**

The 2002-2003 report from the General Education Council documents an extraordinarily productive year. The GEC heard from the second round of Segment III reviews of clusters and proposed new clusters, taking the opportunity to address assessment issues in this segment of GE at SFSU. 16 of the 21 clusters slated for review this year were approved, often as a result of substantial consultation with the cluster coordinators and the segment III committee.

The committee continued to monitor the Liberal Studies "exception" to satisfying GE requirements with respect to quality and outcome, worked with the office of Assessment to craft and approve an overall assessment plan for GE, and worked with the Undergraduate Studies office and the academic scheduling

coordinator to create and maintain a “Master” list of GE courses to improve accuracy in bulletin copy and provide valuable data for troubleshooting problems in GE course offerings, and generally improve student understanding and access to GE courses.

Finally the GEC began in the fall to undertake a massive and ambitious project, the creation of a grand unified GE policy document. Over the years a variety of policies have been created, interpreted, re-interpreted, and a bewildering and confusing thicket of rules and traditions have accrued. The GEC is in the process of going through this maze of paperwork to create a single, up-to-date document to help govern GE policy on campus. The COC is impressed by the scope of the GEC vision and wishes them great good fortune in this endeavor.

For the next year the GEC is prepared to finish this grand unified document on policy, begin a third round of Segment III reviews, begin Phase I of the approved assessment Plan, and continue to deal with a list of details that remain vital to effective GE operation on campus: access to courses, once-a-year-offering rules, communication with students and instructors, more accurate bulletin copy.

The COC is pleased by the full reporting of the GEC, its energy and attention to detail.

## **17. Graduate Council**

The Committee on Committees commends the Graduate Council on its accomplishments in 2002-2003. In addition to implementing its charge, the council participated on the AS APC subcommittee on the University Policy on Written English Proficiency, participated on the Academic Experience committee and writing group for CUSP II, established a program of financial support for graduate students, and discussed assessment of graduate programs.

The GC indicated in its annual report that assessment of graduate programs has often been neglected on campus. The council intends to invite the Chair of APRC to a meeting in Fall 2003 to discuss the role of the GC in graduate program assessment. The council also indicated in its final report that the issue of language requirements for graduate programs has been problematic. The GC intends to feature this issue in its 2003-2004 agenda.

COC Recommendation. The GC is encouraged to acknowledge the challenges of graduate education in future reports. An objective and thorough analysis would provide valuable information germane to improving the experience of graduate students at SFSU.

In its final report, the Graduate Council indicated that it has many irons in many fires and is charged with making recommendations on all areas of graduate education at SFSU. However, it is not clear what impact the Graduate Council's recommendations have on graduate education on this campus. Focused attention on one or two important issues would facilitate efforts to improve graduate education. For example, a procedure for obtaining human subjects approval is one issue that has not been adequately resolved. COC strongly encourages GC to address procedures for obtaining human subjects approval in

2003-2004 if only to expedite students' completion of their graduate programs. COC also encourages GC to address the need for a broad 'vision statement' with respect to graduate education on this campus as proposed by the latest WASC report.

## **18. Honorary Degree Committee**

The Honorary Degree Committee met two times in 2002-2003 in order to review recommendations from the campus community for candidates for honorary degrees. The committee recommended six candidates for the 2003 honorary degree to the President, who selected Mr. Peter Yarrow for the Doctor of Fine Arts (D.F.A.) degree.

The committee acknowledged some of the difficulties it encountered in 2002-2003. The major problem was caused by vacant positions on the committee. The report described one member who assumed the role of staff, student, and alumni representative to the committee.

COC Recommendation. The annual report was not clearly written. It was difficult to distinguish the activities of the 2001-2002 committee from those of the 2002-2003 committee. The HDC chair ought to consider soliciting feedback about the report from other committee members. In addition, COC recommends that HDC work with the Executive Committee of the AS in order to fully staff the committee.

## **19. Liberal Studies Council (LSC)**

The Liberal Studies Council (LSC) is charged with the important task of planning, reviewing and recommending academic policies for the Liberal Studies Program. As part of its duties, LSC serves as the primary curricular review and recommendation body for Liberal Studies, and assists in student advising, articulation between colleges, and evaluation of the Liberal Studies Program. LSC also serves as an advisory body to the Provost and Deans on Liberal Studies matters and as a University-wide forum for discussion and dissemination of issues connected with the Liberal Studies Program.

The LSC had a busy and fruitful year during 2002-2003. They started the year with an ambitious set of goals, all of which were met, except for the approval of an LSITE transfer program, which the LSC has decided to postpone until a decision is made on California's definition of "highly qualified teacher" to satisfy "No Child Left Behind" requirements.

The Council met twice a month during the academic year and even conducted four additional meetings. After a search conducted in the fall, the LSC selected Eva Chuck as their new coordinator. Major accomplishments of the LSC, working closely with the colleges, included the review of the "areas of emphasis" patterns as well as the "Integrated Studies" area, tasks required to meet the new CCTC standards for subject matter programs. The resulting revised major curriculum was submitted to and approved by the Academic Senate. Other accomplishments include the review and endorsement of a draft for a proposed "Gateway" course for the LS program, the review and approval of a revised LSITE

curriculum and the selection of LS honorees and the LS Hood recipient.

The LSC has developed a well-thought out agenda, which COC endorses, for the coming academic year, which includes concluding leftover issues from the LSITE program, responding to CCTC evaluators, reviewing advising programs and consider TCC recommendations regarding student exposure to technology, second language competency, guided experiences of self-reflection and analysis and awareness of special education issues. The COC urges the committee to spell out the many acronyms I uses in its report, for the benefit of committee members not familiar with the acronyms.

COC applauds the LSC for it many accomplishments during the 2002-2003 academic year and wishes it continuing success in 2003-2004, as it sets out to accomplish the ambitious agenda it has set out for itself.

## **20. Library Advisory Committee (LAC)**

The Library Advisory Committee (LAC) gathered for two out of its six scheduled meetings due to reported scheduling difficulties. Continued consultation with the Library regarding the ongoing planning efforts related to the expansion and renovation of the J. Paul Leonard Library was the LAC's primary focus in 2002-2003. The Committee's report indicates that "members were kept apprised of renovation plans and issues raised in multiple presentations to and consultation with faculty and staff members of University committees with college-based representation and College Councils through electronic and print communication." LAC also received feedback and input regarding the expansion/renovation project from library clientele.

Agenda items for 2003-2004 include continued involvement in the next phase of library expansion and renovation, consideration of issues related to collection development and management within the current facility and collections budget, reviewing the outcome of the spring 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and providing advice and counsel regarding CSU library issues including budget adjustments and strategic plan implementation.

Two previous COC reports concerning the LAC have noted the need for specific procedures that will ensure effective and timely consultation and notification of all faculty and students concerning library planning and management. While pleased to see that LAC's report indicates an active consultative process despite difficulties with scheduling meetings, COC notes the absence of any reference in the report to specific procedures *per se*. COC continues to urge the specification and campus-wide publication of such procedures ensuring ongoing, accessible and effective feedback mechanisms for Library users.

## **21. Professional Development Council (PDC)**

Building upon the excellent work accomplished in the previous year, the 2002-2003 Professional Development Council (PDC) had what its report describes as "the most productive year...in recent

memory.” Major activities included taking over the applications process for professional development awards, following up on recommendations for a more universal award application form, and responding to a request to form the Professional Development Task Force. In addition, PDC recommendations for supporting faculty professional development—through expansion of the number and kinds of workshops—saw fulfillment in 2002-2003. During the January faculty and staff conference at Asilomar, PDC’s chair and the Dean of Faculty Affairs co-facilitated a well attended meeting, presenting a model for professional development (the Boyer Model) and including a discussion of professional development and scholarship. The PDC report lists several recommendations affirmed by the group attending the Asilomar session.

PDC plans for 2003-2004 include:

Disseminating information and supporting the implementation of the Boyer model and the policy of lifelong professional development.

Examining issues affecting the quality of academic life at SFSU.

Follow-up on recommendations from the Asilomar meeting listed above.

Developing a comprehensive master list of campus-wide support, both general and college-specific, of faculty professional development resources and activities.

Asking departments to clearly specify their criteria for tenure and promotion.

Meeting with University Promotions Committee to discuss how UPC members review and evaluate professional development.

Reviewing the procedures for promotion used by other universities such as CSU Monterey Bay so that processes here can be made more efficient and focused.

COC commends PDC for its accomplishments and appreciates the thoroughness of its report documenting progress made in 2002-2003.

## **22. Student Affairs Committee (SAC)**

COC compliments SAC on achieving full student representation. In this regard it is a model for other Senate committees. In joint efforts with APC, SAC developed new policies limiting unit loads for students on probation and clarified several issues regarding credit for Community Service Learning. The Committee held productive meetings with Brett Smith (Advising) and Lilia Chavez (OSPLD) in the area of student advising and academic progress. It also monitored the ongoing budget crisis and enrollment management decisions, and it began studying issues concerning tobacco use, sale and investments on campus. Next year SAC will complete its work on tobacco policies and submit proposals to the

Academic Senate. It will continue to monitor the effects of budget cuts, and it will conduct a full review of Freshmen orientation activities.

### **23. Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)**

COC applauds the hard work, dedication and enthusiasm of the members of the Teacher Credential Committee (TCC). TCC met eleven times during the academic year and completed the review and the approval of new or revised subject matter programs for: Secondary Education Single Subject Credential; Elementary Education Multiple Subject Credential and Liberal Studies Subject Matter Program. COC acknowledges the outstanding and creative work that TCC has accomplished in streamlining its membership. In particular, COC notes that TCC has developed liaisons between itself and AUTC and Liberal Studies Council. TCC's enthusiasm and commitment in meeting the new requirements of SB 2042 and AB 1059 is outstanding and is an outstanding example of effective committee work.

COC expresses its appreciation of the hard work done by TCC and endorses its 2003-2004 agenda: to review changes in single subject programs to meet SB 2042; to continue review of changes in credential and certificate programs; to review the uses of technology in teacher preparation courses and pre-credential majors; to continue exploring how expert users may waive requirement coursework (ITEC 711, 712) most efficiently; to continue to improve credential information and admission procedures, with special emphasis on finding ways to increase the number of minority applicants.

### **24. University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC)**

COC applauds the hard work and dedication of the members of the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC). The 14-member committee met several times during the year and, working in consultation with the Coordinator of Academic Assessment, completed its agenda. The committee discussed college level funding for assessment activities and the status of support for assessment at both the college and university level. The committee began discussions with the Associate Vice President of Academic Planning and Assessment impact of the CSU dropping the requirement for each department to submit a yearly summary report. A second topic under discussion was the combining of assessment activities with the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) process.

COC encourages UAAAC to continue its hard work on its agenda for the coming year: especially to work with the Academic Program Review Committee to finalize the process of combining assessment activities with APRC

### **25. University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee UAAAC**

The University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee met once each semester during the academic year 2002-03, as required by their charge. During its first meeting, the Committee reviewed a broad range of University advancement activities, including corporate and private fund raising by Development, the work of Public Affairs in media relations and marketing, various products from

Publications, and the latest reviews of regulations, legislation and outreach from Government and Community Relations. The second meeting was devoted to a review of SFSU Foundation activities.

The Committee also selected nominees for the SFSU Bautzer Faculty Award, which is given to one CSU faculty member on each campus to train the individual in advancement-related activities. COC would appreciate knowing who finally received the award for SFSU.

The Committee's agenda for next year will be the same as this year's.

COC notes that the report was unsigned and did not list the Committee's membership.

## **26. University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)**

The University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) met twice monthly during AY 2002-2003 preparing for the implementation of a new JEPET compliance program and for the creation of an external review committee charged with studying and making recommendations about campus-wide literacy endeavors, and approving a change in the admissions policy regarding TOEFL requirements for transferring international students. The CWEP report indicates that its own charge was the subject of much discussion and debate. CWEP proposed revisions in its charge that were submitted to the Senate by way of the Academic Policies Committee and subsequently approved.

Anticipated agenda items for 2003-2004 include working closely with the external review team; continuing to monitor JEPET compliance, and discussing any changes in policy which emerge as a result of the process; discussing the nature and problems of graduate level literacy; and continuing to serve as a resource for campus groups dealing with literacy issues.

COC commends members of CWEP for their hard work and dedication to serving the needs of the University in connection with this institution's written English proficiency program.

## **27. 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 twelve members of the UIC met twice a month during the academic year and completed an exhaustive list of activities.

The Council assessed the interdisciplinary nature of the programs across five colleges. The council found that some programs clearly articulated an interdisciplinary mission, while other programs described a less integrated, multidisciplinary framework. The Council encouraged faculty in the college departments to reach beyond their present course offerings to identify complementary courses in other programs that could provide a more holistic interdisciplinary perspective. The council also agreed that there is a need to establish a definition and criteria for interdisciplinary studies to more clearly identify

and gauge the scope and adequacy of department's interdisciplinary focus. The council also completed the review of two curricular programs changes, a small modification of the Human Sexuality minor and a more comprehensive change to the Liberal Studies minor. The council also made recommendation to the chair of the Curriculum Review and Approval Committee on the proposed changes to the Minor in Human Sexuality. The Council provided a representative to General Education Segment III committee to help them toward a definition of interdisciplinary studies.

COC encourages UIC to pursue its agenda for the coming year. We look forward to the publication of the results of the survey of campus community and beyond in the UIC fall 2003 newsletter, *Interspectives*. COC applauds UIC's continuing work in reviewing the free-standing minors housed in colleges undergoing program review in 2003-2004 and the review of interdisciplinary activities within the College of Humanities. COC recommends that UIC continue its work with the Segment III committee and the GEC on developing methods to ensure the quality of interdisciplinary studies in /GE Segment III. COC encourages the Council to continue to explore the need for an interdisciplinary component in the orientation of new faculty. COC thanks and commends the council for its diligence in attending to its tasks and carrying out its mission.

## **28. University Promotions Committee (UPC)**

The Committee on Committees (COC) commends the University Promotions Committee (UPC) for its work on behalf of SFSU faculty. AY 2002-2003 was a busy year for UPC, which reviewed thirty-eight candidates for promotion: 25 were reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor and 12 were reviewed for promotion to Full Professor.

During Fall 2002 the committee participated in informational meetings organized by UPC, CET, and the Dean of Faculty Affairs. UPC conducted two informational meetings for candidates in September 2002. The committee was represented at all 10 meetings conducted with members of each of the academic units (colleges and library) organized by the Dean of Faculty Affairs. A UPC representative also attended the RTP workshop for new faculty organized by CET and the Dean of Faculty Affairs.

In Spring 2003, the committee met weekly to evaluate 38 applications for promotion. After exchanging their list of candidates recommended for promotion with the Provost's list, UPC met with the Provost and the Dean of Faculty Affairs to discuss candidates on whom the two disagreed. UPC later met with the President, the Provost and the Dean of Faculty Affairs to discuss the candidates and other issues germane to the promotion process.

In its annual report, the committee identifies several issues for consideration by the 2003-2004 UPC. First, the committee describes the challenges presented by delays in the promotion process. The committee did not receive a complete and accurate list of faculty requesting promotion until the first week of March 2003. Other delays were caused by inconsistencies in the college or lower level of review: in some instances, department review committees were composed of ineligible faculty members or the colleges were late in forwarding the file to UPC. UPC was required to conduct additional

meetings in order to complete a timely review of all candidates. The quality of the promotion reviews was the second issue identified in the UPC annual report. In some instances the reviews were not thorough and did not reflect the material contained in the candidates' WPAFs. It was not uncommon for the department review committee to adapt a candidate's tenure letter for the promotion process. A lack of classroom visits was another issue identified by the committee. Finally, departments would cite department criteria without including a copy of the actual policy. UPC recommended inclusion of department criteria with the candidates' WPAF.

**COC's Recommendation.** In their comprehensive report, UPC identified several challenges to implementing the promotion process. Given the extensive training activity related to the promotion process it is surprising that delays and the quality of reviews were so problematic. Of the thirteen sessions offered last year, UPC organized only two. COC recommends greater participation of UPC in the design and implementation of promotions workshops for faculty and academic units. UPC as the primary training service provider would facilitate consistency and accuracy in the information provided to faculty and academic units. UPC has demonstrated its expert knowledge of the promotions process in its thorough analysis of issues germane to the promotions process. Finally, COC recommends that the Executive Committee of the Senate communicate to all SFSU colleagues that one of the most treasured rights of faculty is participation in the RTP process and that this process deserves greater attention to the detail of established policy and process than it appears to be given in some cases.

## **29. University Sabbatical Committee (USC)**

The University Sabbatical Committee (USC) reviewed 42 proposals for sabbatical leave and one for the Wang Award. The committee met two times to evaluate the proposals. USC also met with the Provost to learn how his office reviewed the committee's recommendations and to discuss strategies for addressing differences of evaluation. At the meeting, the Provost and USC compared their lists of rankings before they were submitted to the President.

In its annual report, the committee identifies several issues related to the process of evaluating applications for sabbatical leave. USC discussed the problems associated with the ranking and rating procedures and agreed to eliminate the two-tiered rating scale used for college rankings. It also agreed with the Provost that in the future it would use the college rankings as an additional source of information rather than its numerical weight. Another issue identified by USC was the lack of a narrative from college committees explaining the rationale for the rankings of candidates within the college. USC encouraged all colleges to provide a rationale for their rankings.

**COC's Recommendations.** The COC finds incomplete the annual report from the 2002-2003 USC. For example, the report did not indicate the number of candidates who were granted sabbatical leave and it did not recommend strategies for improving the leave process.

COC urges USC to review procedures used in the sabbatical evaluation process. The ranking and rating scales appear to be problematic; COC recommends that USC consult with the Faculty Affairs

Committee and the Academic Policies Committee to streamline procedures for evaluating applications. Another issue identified by USC was the lack of narratives from colleges explaining the rationale for candidates within the college. COC suggests the development of a template for use by college committees to explain the rationale of their recommendations. Consultation with FAC and APC regarding this issue is, again, encouraged.

### **30. University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review**

The Fall 2002 report from the University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review (apparently the committee did not meet in the Spring) was commendably brief and succinct but possessed a large and extraneous appendix, which should not be necessary in the future. Its main business was conducting a student faculty survey of summer time university use, and the main conclusions were that the status quo is satisfying and adequate for faculty and students.

The committee made five recommendations:

A formal recommendation about the Summer 2003 calendar (which was approved by APC but not noted in the committee's report)

That the University establish a task force on YRO, and that this be done as soon as possible

.A reaffirmation of the statement (source un-cited) "departments should ensure that their classes are offered in standard time-blocks appropriate for their subject"

That touch tone schedule remain the same as in earlier summers but that efforts to accommodate as many non-matriculated students as possible, a serious worry to the committee

That the university keep track of transportation needs and upgrade (i.e. increase shuttles) as necessary.

COC would like to see a more thorough report, one signed by more than the committee chair, and wonders if this committee might indeed be the best body to embrace the *ad hoc* YRO operations committee charge it is recommending.

### Executive Summary

#### 1. Academic Affirmative Action Committee

COC anticipates the committee's work to generate a thorough and thoughtful dialog on campus regarding diversity, and urges it to provide leadership and perspective. COC surmises that communication will be a key component of any success the AAAC has, and urges it to be diligent, forthright and even aggressive when it comes to promoting university-wide dialog in this arena.

2. Academic Freedom Committee (AFC)

COC hopes that the Academic Freedom Committee (AFC) can focus its efforts more powerfully this academic year, and develop a strong, cogent recommendation for campus response to the dastardly Patriot Act foisted upon us.

3. Academic Policies Committee (APC)

COC hopes that APC will deal with the major parts of its coming agenda for the next year, particularly continuing to monitor the external review of writing programs at SFSU and the implications for campus writing instruction, as well as fleshing out their preliminary recommendation regarding technology mediated instruction.

4. Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)

COC recognizes the heavy workload of committees like APRC, and wishes it good fortune in developing more efficient mechanisms for review, cautioning it to make sure that the quality of the review not be diminished in any way during the process.

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

The COC would like to see AUCIP try for a little more focus this year, perhaps difficult with such a large and embracing agenda, which may require some thought on the committee's workflow and structure. Greater and more practical committee results would be a gratifying outcome.

6. All-University Committee on Students, Faculty and Staff with Disabilities (AUCSFSD)

A committee with a difficult charge, AUCSFSD has made good progress this year, both in movement towards a more accessible campus and in improving lines of communication around campus regarding access issues. COC only hopes that this progression can continue.

7. All-University Teacher Education Committee (AUTECH)

COC recognizes the importance of teaching at all levels, and hopes that AUTECH can find creative ways to lend its muscle to the promotion of teaching as a profession. As in past years, COC urges AUTECH to explore ways to encourage Ethnic Studies students into credential programs.

8. Athletic Advisory Board

For the coming year, COC suggests AAB consider consulting with FAC on a tenure/promotion policy for athletic coaches. If it does so, or the AAB does anything of significance in the coming year, the COC

would be pleased to receive a report of the boards' activities.

9. Board of Appeals and Review (BOAR)

COC appreciates the work that BOAR accomplishes over the year, and shares its concern over a high number of petitions, a situation that can perhaps be eased. If BOAR could consider possible solutions to this growing problem and propose them to the appropriate bodies, perhaps FAC, SAC or even the executive committee for delegation, COC would be deeply grateful.

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

AS in the past, COC suggests that the CET Advisory board consider ways of helping CET address issues of teaching besides those with a technology component, a facet that CET has done very well.

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

Research involving Human Subjects is vital to academic life, and COC appreciates the difficult and sometimes controversial nature of what constitutes CPHS' work. COC urges CPHS to continue to expand communication, engage in dialog across campus and put whatever weight it can behind efforts to improve research efforts involving humans.

12. Curriculum Review and Approval Committee (CRAC)

COC desires CRAC to appoint a representative to the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee.

13. Educational Policies Council (EPC)

COC recommends appointing an EPC liaison to the Graduate Council for the coming academic year.

14. Enrollment Management Committee (EMC)

COC is impressed with the EMC, its speedy, pragmatic and thoughtful self-creation this year, and anticipates its proposed Enrollment Management Plan this year.

15. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

FAC always seems to have a very full plate, a situation that COC recognizes and appreciates. COC hopes FAC can make progress on its three major agenda items for the coming year: policy on Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs), develop a plan for a new committee the Research Council, and review campus grade appeal policies. COC also recommends that FAC, with SAC, read the annual committee

report from BOAR and examine the data of retroactive withdrawal petitions for patterns, and perhaps recommend changes in policy.

16. General Education Council (GEC)

COC, and the campus, eagerly anticipates the grand unification project that GEC has undertaken to coalesce all GE policies under one document. COC is pleased at the rate of review for Segment III, and Segment II, but hopes issues in Segment I can also be addressed. COC also hopes GEC can make headway with its GE assessment plan, to be in phase I this next year.

17. Graduate Council

COC suggests that the Graduate Council may have to focus its efforts more carefully in the coming years. In particular, COC would like to see the council address the issues of Human Subjects in research, and develop a "broad vision" for graduate education at SFSU, as requested in the latest WASC report.

18. Honorary Degree Committee

COC would like to see an improved annual report from HDC this coming year, and urges it to consult with the Executive Committee to try to improve participation from committee members.

19. Liberal Studies Council (LSC)

LSC has had a busy year, and will likely continue to. COC realizes that LSC prudently postponed developing policy for the Liberal Studies Integrated Teacher Education Program (LSITE) until current legislation runs its course, and hopes to see some results when the appropriate laws are passed.

20. Library Advisory Committee (LAC)

The COC has noted in several past reports, that the LAC should consider developing specific mechanisms for extending communication and consultation regarding the library throughout campus. With the looming building renovation, this request has become unavoidably urgent.

21. Professional Development Council

The PDC has energized itself in a promising fashion, and COC especially awaits further progress PDC has made on improving communication across campus regarding tenure, promotion and other matters. In particular COC encourages PDC to help departments develop and specify criteria for RTP purposes.

22. Student Affairs Committee (SAC)

SAC is poised to propose tobacco policy for the campus, and COC is hoping for a balanced, pragmatic program. SAC notes that it will continue to monitor budget issues that increasingly effect students and review issues in the freshman orientation program.

23. Teacher Credential Committee (TCC)

COC appreciates the tightrope act TCC does in interpreting and adapting to legislation that affects (directs?) teaching credentials in California, and endorses its coming agenda, particularly that it find ways to encourage minority students to consider teaching as a profession.

24. University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee

COC anticipates movement from the UAAAC with respect to coordinating assessment at the university with the APRC committee.

25. University Advancement Activities Advisory Committee

The COC would appreciate a more complete report from the UAAAC, and one that arrives on time.

26. University Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP)

CWEP will need to build on the very impressive focus on managing writing programs that it did this last year, and work with the external review team, constructively and creatively, to handle this item, one of the more critical of the university's goals.

27. University Interdisciplinary Council (UIC)

COC recognizes that one of the major issues of the UIC is a workable definition of Interdisciplinarity, and hopes that the committee can make a serious contribution to campus by providing direction to the notion of interdisciplinarity.

28. University Promotions Committee (UPC)

COC would like to see UPC take a stronger role in conducting workshops and informational sessions on promotion, and urges them, along with PDC, to help departments clarify and publish their criteria regarding promotion.

29. University Sabbatical Committee (USC)

COC was disappointed in the USC's annual report and its fairly minimal descriptions of USC activities, and hopes for a fuller report this next year. COC urges USC to review procedures used in the sabbatical

evaluation process and consult with APC and FAC to improve the sabbatical application experience.

30. University Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Semester Review

COC would like to receive a fuller annual report from this committee next year and would like the committee to consider whether it would be the best body to take on Year Round Operation issues.