

Minutes for December 9, 1997 Academic Senate Meeting

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Mark Phillips at 2:10 p.m.

Senate Members Present: Aaron, Eunice; Barnes, Paul; Bartscher, Patty; Bernstein, Marian; Blank, Mark; Cancino, Herlinda; Chen, Yu-Charn; Cherny, Robert; Consoli, Andres; Craig, JoAnn; Duke, Jerry; Eisman, Gerald; Fehrman, Ken; Gillotte, Helen; Goldsmith, Helen; Graham, Michael; Hammett, Jennifer; Harnly, Caroline; Hom, Marlon; Homan, Bonnie; Houlberg, Rick; Hu, Sung; La Belle, Thomas; Lee, Wanda; Leitao, David; Lyles, Lois; Mallare, Marie; Nicholson, Joel; Oñate, Abdiel; Pestrong, Raymond; Phillips, Mark; Raggio, Marcia; Rivas, Mario; Scoble, Don; Smith, Nina Jo; Swanson, Deborah; Thomson, Lana; Turitz, Mitch; Verhey, Marilyn; Warren, Mary Ann; Warren, Penelope; Wilkinson, Nancy; Fox-Wolfgramm, Susan; Wong, Yim Yu; Yee, Darlene, Zoloth-Dorfman, Laurie

Senate Members Absent: Wade, Patricia(exc.); Woo, George(exc.); Terrell, Dawn(exc.); Choo, Freddie; Wong, Alfred; Haw, Mary Ann(exc.); Smith, Erna; Tarakji, Ghassan; Flowers, Will; Hammerstrom, Gary(exc.); Kelley, James(exc.); Collier, James; Corrigan, Robert(exc.); Chang, Paul (exc.); Shouse, Amy.

Senate Interns Present:

Guests: T. Rutter, G. Whitaker, H. Matson, M. Kasdan, J. Kassiola, J. Curtin, D. Bianchi, P. Saffold, D. Schafer, R. Kahn-Hut, W. Bonds, B. Macher.

Announcements and Report

Chair's Report

The faculty meeting scheduled for December 10, 1997 is to provide a faculty forum for discussion and information updates on CETI. No presentations will be given. David Ernst, Don Scoble, Gary Hammerstrom, and Peter Dewees, who are all involved in the SIP/CETI process, will be there to respond to questions and concerns. Faculty and students will have an opportunity to speak through an open mike.

Phillips read a letter from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to the President of the State Board of Education (SBE) opposing the proposed math standards for schools. The letter strongly urged the SBE to revise their proposal in accord with the work of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, the California Education Round Table and the Standards Commission. He stated that the issue is obviously a larger one than math in terms of who and what drives public education in California.

The Cornerstones principles document has been completed and is available via e-mail and the web.

The Faculty Leadership Conference will be held on January 21. The conference will consist of centralized meetings at Seven Hills and the Guest Center. Expected attendees include administrators, the Executive Committee, Department Chairs, and representatives from each department. The morning will consist of a panel discussion and a plenary session focusing on how we meet the challenges facing faculty given the level of stress and time constraints. The afternoon will consist of another panel with the focus on alternative solutions followed by a plenary session. The morning panel, *Perspectives on the Challenges Facing SFSU Faculty*, will consist of Teresa Carrillo (La Raza Studies), Marlon Hom (Department Chair, Asian-American Studies), Joel Kassiola (Dean, BSS), Hollis Matson (former Senate Chair, Director, Space Management), Vanessa Sheared (Administration and Interdisciplinary Studies), and Laurie Zoloth-Dorfman (Department Chair, Jewish Studies). The moderator will be Pamela Vaughn (Department Chair, Classics and Comparative Literature). The afternoon panel, *Opportunities and Solutions*, will consist of Ron Compesi (BECA), Jerry Eisman (Department Chair, Computer Science), Bonnie Homan (Business Analysis and Computing Systems), Phil McGee (Dean, Ethnic Studies), Mario Rivas (Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies), and Yim Yu Wong (International Business). Carlos Cordova (La Raza Studies) will be the moderator.

December marked a very special occasion - Lana Thomson's 30th anniversary at SFSU. The Senate honored Lana with a standing ovation and a lovely bouquet of flowers. Phillips said that this is Lana's 11th year as the 'Real Head of the Senate' or 'She Who Really Knows'. The Senate plans an extended period of celebration for this significant event. Phillips said that there is probably no one who better knows the ins and outs of this University and that Lana is almost indispensable in her role. Phillips said that Lana is truly one of the major reasons why he agreed to serve in his present role. He values her insightful intelligence, her incredible commitment to the University and especially the Academic Senate, her sharp wit, her wise judgments, and her deep human warmth. He asked the Senate to join him in saluting the woman who best represents the heart and soul of the Academic Senate. The Senators responded with another standing ovation. Lana thanked everyone.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting of December 9, 1997

As there were no objections, the agenda was **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting of November 18, 1997

As there were no additions or corrections, the minutes were **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #3 - Report From Vice President for Academic Affairs Tom La Belle

La Belle offered his congratulations to Lana Thomson. He reported on enrollment related issues because there are implications for how we conduct academic business. He introduced **Tom Rutter** and **Penny Saffold** as additional resources.

He spoke of three types of enrollment - 1) enrollment on this campus funded by the general fund, 2) enrollment off campus funded by the general fund, and 3) enrollment off campus funded through the College of Extended Learning (CEL).

The projected SFSU enrollment for AY 97/98 is 19,807 Full Time Equivalent Students (SFTE) and 20,050 SFTE for AY 98/99. That means that next year enrollment will be capped on this campus. SFSU is not permitted to have more than 20,050 students on this site. So there are questions about what happens when that cap is reached. How does the University admit students into the institution and on what rationale are students turned away? The Enrollment Management Committee is looking into these issues.

One step might be to stop lower division transfers, which would eliminate about 500-700 students per year. Another step might be to require students to have completed an AA degree in a Community College before transferring. These steps might slow the flow of students without having to go through the labor-intensive process of reviewing every application. La Belle guessed that, over time, admissions to higher education will become more labor-intensive. Future admissions could be reviewed for the breadth of courses taken, travel experiences, community service, student leadership, and other criteria.

The CSU asked the campus to project enrollment for the next several years annually through 2006/7. These enrollment numbers include both on- and off-campus figures. The CSU has said that on-campus enrollment is capped. However, the CSU will continue to fund, from the General Fund, off-campus students at off-campus sites, at the same funding level as on-campus students. This refers to supervision, typically associated with professional programs such as student teaching, nursing, and social work. Other off-campus offerings could be through technology or face-to-face offerings of SFSU classes at a different location (for example at a community college campus). The projects are for relatively modest growth off-campus so that by 2006/7 there will be 23,096 projected SFTE.

Assuming that this happens, SFSU will become more of a regional institution with off site courses offered more frequently. Decisions will need to be made as to what courses will be offered off site. It is possible that community colleges might become a host to degree granting programs through a four-year university. SFSU is working with the College of San Mateo, Diablo Valley College, and College of Marin to potentially offer courses on those sites. These courses will be funded by the General Fund. The SFSU academic units will still have complete responsibility for what courses are offered, their content, instructors, and other course attributes.

La Belle felt there would be implications for the use of instructional resources and who those instructional resources are. He felt that it may be advantageous for some because they live near the off-campus site, for some it may be perplexing, and it might be something that CFA would take to the bargaining table. However, he said that he didn't know what the implications will be. He said that this is one possible income stream for the University. One question is at what level will off-campus courses be funded.

A third opportunity for income is through the College of Extended Learning (CEL). Since 1991, \$6.5 million has been passed back to the colleges through the initiative of faculty teaching courses through CEL. The colleges have used these funds for travel, support (clerical and secretarial), and other needs. The incentive to continue to cooperate with CEL is through the profit sharing that comes back to the colleges. CEL pays a tax to the system and will support the University in its General Operating Fund this year with \$650,000. CEL operates on its own bottom line and operates the Downtown Center, summer and winter sessions, and the weekend college. CEL is an extremely important resource and we need to recognize this.

With the three potential funding sources, there are interesting policy issues including matriculated and non-matriculated students, fee structures, course and program types, on- and off-campus offerings, and graduate, undergraduate, and professional students. He questioned how do you assure equity and access? Equity includes fee structures since it is conceivable to have two students in the same class paying different fees. The fee structure for distance learning is another issue. There are a lot of policy questions related to this.

One option is to take the 20,050 SFTE and stay there. The cost of this option is that any growth, change in curriculum, or new ventures would have to come from reallocated funds. The trade-off of an existing program for a new one is the cost.

He felt that this is a very important time for SFSU with the enrollment cap next fall. Some of the issues include the selection process on campus, growth process off campus, policy issues, and relationships with community colleges.

Jerry Eisman asked about professional supervision courses. He asked if some of the community service learning efforts could be funded this way? Would there be a way to recapture some of the funds by having CEL courses share a classroom on campus with a community service course if the latter does not meet on campus every week? **La Belle** replied that some courses are already being counted as off-campus such as the business courses that are taught at Stonestown. If a service learning course is conducted off campus, then it could be offered either through the General Fund or CEL. He continued, how do you build risk taking into off-campus offerings? CEL is now trying to build a multimedia studies program. The program is well known, but very costly and risky. He asked how do we treat risk in the future? Do you use CEL to originally create opportunities and then spin the course off into the General Fund or the other way around?

Robert Cherny asked if students who pay full fees (non-resident) count towards the 20,050 SFTE or only students funded through the General Fund? **La Belle** replied yes.

Tom Rutter stated that the new subject requirements will increase the number of eligible students, increase the preparedness of students, and exclude some students.

Agenda Item #4 - Report From Statewide Senators

Cherny reported that the Statewide Academic Senate passed five resolutions. The Sonoma campus admissions policy passed since the report addressed all the previous concerns. Another resolution passed regarding a new high school course pattern for admission which is aimed at making CSU and UC patterns more consonant. The CSU will now require a second year of social sciences, which is required for high school graduation and add a second year of lab science to bring the CSU in alliance with UC admissions requirements. The first change will probably make no difference in admissions since it is a high school graduation requirement. Studies have shown that 66% of high school admissions have completed the second year of science, so it will not affect those students. The new requirements will make it easier for high school guidance counselors to advise students about what they need to do for admission. There has been considerable flexibility from UC by moving in the direction of accepting the visual and performing arts requirement. He said that he hoped the admission patterns will be the same for both systems in the near future.

The revised Statement of Baccalaureate Education in the CSU was attached to the agenda and he said that he would be glad to answer questions. The Statewide Academic Senate approved a resolution on CETI, urged the CSU to go more slowly and that ample information be made available to all campuses and faculty.

The Teacher Education Committee introduced three resolutions that will be dealt with in January. All of them concern teacher preparation. A resolution was introduced concerning Boalt Hall admission policies. Since that time, changes were made by Boalt Hall, so the resolution will not be considered in January.

Most of the November meeting was spent reviewing the Cornerstones document. The Cornerstones group accepted most of the proposed revisions. Several resolutions were written opposing legislative measures concerning the way that teachers teach reading.

Eunice Aaron reported that the Board of Trustees received and accepted the Faculty Affairs Committee revision on the Policy on Selection of Presidents. The statewide faculty felt that individual campuses should have more of a voice in presidential selection. CSU Long Beach anticipates having to replace about five presidents in the next 7-9 years, and there was a lot of publicity about the role of faculty in the Chancellor's search, so it was felt that both policies needed to be examined. The discussion on this policy was vigorous. The committee felt very strongly that faculty have the right to be elected by other faculty to serve on these committees and NOT to be selected by the Chancellor or a group of Trustees.

The revisions that were proposed and accepted include that there be added a Vice President or an Academic Dean to the Advisory Committee. It modifies and specifies the rationale for appointing up to two additional members to the Advisory Committee based on the complexity of the search. It allows the Trustee Chair of the selection committee, after notice and an opportunity for a meeting, to dismiss any member that violates the rule of confidentiality or whose behavior is deemed unethical, unprofessional, or disruptive to the conduct of business.

The revisions permit the naming of a second panel to meet confidentially with a short list of candidates to determine compatibility of the candidate with the campus. It makes clear that only the Chancellor has the responsibility to determine how reference and background checks are conducted. The policy maintains the practice of announcing the names of the candidates being presented to the Board of Trustees. Of the proposed revisions, only the naming of second panel was not accepted.

The principle of the Merit Pay Task Force Report was attached to the agenda. The full Senate accepted the report in the plenary session. Aaron stressed the comment on the front page "No one we contacted, including presidents and a former Trustee, could clearly state the rationale for the PSSI." In a parallel process, the Outstanding Performance Program committee is considering other performance award mechanisms. It was accepted without comment that until the salary gap is closed, the notion of merit pay will not be well received.

Cherny said that the complete text of the Merit Pay Task Force Report is on the Statewide Academic Senate web site. **Phillips** thanked Cherny for work done on Merit Pay Task Force.

Rick Houlberg asked Aaron about the problem with confidentiality. Did Long Beach still consider that the faculty leaked this? Aaron replied that this was the case and the language was included in the policy so the faculty members could have protection. The policy includes holding Trustees and the Chancellor to the same rules. Houlberg asked about the prediction of five presidents leaving and how that was determined. Aaron replied that this is called future forecasting and the CSU anticipates that 5-6 presidents will be gone within 4-5 years, but no specifics were given.

JoAnn Craig asked what was leaked. Aaron answered resumes, pictures, and home addresses. Someone evidently handed off files to a journalist and no one would condone that. But Munitz insisted it was a faculty person and it was dreadful. Cherny added that across the country there is a concern about making these searches highly secretive. Even revealing the names somehow compromises the search process and he seriously questioned these assumptions.

Agenda Item #5 - Resolution on the California Education Technology Initiative (CETI)

Phillips introduced this consent item. The Executive Committee endorsed this resolution and had consciously taken a middle course. The concern was over time lines and about the degree to which issues are addressed as opposed to other concerns. The passing of resolutions on CETI has not been high on Executive Committee's priority list. The resolution from Sacramento State was received. That resolution is before the Senate is with minor changes and with credit given to Sacramento State.

M/S/P (Cherny, Ferhman) to move second reading. **M/S/P (Barnes, Gillotte)** to close debate. The vote was taken and the resolution **passed** unanimously.

Agenda Item #6 - Revision to BA in Sociology

CRAC Chair Darlene Yee introduced this item which includes several curricular changes in the requirements for the degree. Three specific changes include 1) that a lower division course be replaced by an upper division course in order to better introduce students to the major and the lower division course may still be taken as elective, 2) a third Area requirement on Institutional Perspectives will be required, and 3) one or two capstone courses will be required so that students can integrate prior experiences to better prepare for their future career. The number of units was increased from 35-36 to 41-42. She introduced **Rachel Kahn-Hut, Sociology Chair**, and **Joel Kassiola, Dean of BSS**, as resources.

With no one seeking recognition on this consent item, the item was automatically moved to second reading.

Cherny commended the Sociology department for taking the External review so seriously and **Phillips** agreed.

M/S/P (Fehrman, Gillotte) to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed** unanimously.

Agenda Item #7 - Revision to Sociology Minor

Yee introduced the proposed curricular changes to revise the minor to bring it into closer alliance with the revised major. The changes are 1) to replace a lower division course with an upper division course, 2) to require a research design course, and 3) in addition to the Area requirement on Interpersonal Perspectives (which is also required for the major), a second area requirement was added. The unit requirements increased from 21 to 23-24 units.

Helen Goldsmith asked a question. If the Additional Elective Units in Sociology are 1-4, then the numbers do not add up. **Kahn-Hut** replied that it should read 3-4 units not 1-4.

Laurie Zoloth-Dorfman asked about the title of SOC 484, questioning whether Population Problems is the current way of thinking about the issue. Kahn-Hut replied that yes, that is the old nomenclature or old pattern of naming courses. Currently there is a search for someone to teach Urban Demography and they are holding off changing the name until it is known what that person would like to call their course.

With no one else seeking recognition on this consent item, the item was automatically moved to second reading.

M/S/P (Fehrman, Gillotte) to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed** unanimously.

Agenda Item #8 - Revision to the BA in Chemistry

Yee introduced the proposed curricular changes in the requirements. Biochemistry I or General Biochemistry would be required as a core course since it serves as a prerequisite for elective courses. This change would essentially be truth in advertising since students will have to take the course to

complete their degree. The second change would be to include Inorganic Chemistry and Advanced Organic Chemistry as elective courses. The number of overall units would increase from 51-55 to 55-57. She introduced **Bruce Macher, Chemistry and Biochemistry Chair**, as a resource.

Houlberg said that when the major is up to 57 units, he would suggest to train advisors about the 60-unit limit. Unless the advisors are on top of the issue, the students can get through the major and not be able to graduate from the University.

Cherny asked what is the maximum number of units in a BA program? Yee replied up to 60.

M/S/P (Houlberg, Fehrman) to move second reading.

M/S/P (Fehrman, Gillotte) to close debate. The vote was taken and the item **passed** unanimously.

Agenda Item #9 - Proposed Master Plan Projection for an MA in Human Sexuality Studies

Yee introduced this proposed Master Plan Projection for an interdisciplinary degree. The faculty of the Human Sexuality Studies Program and the College of BSS proposed this degree which would be housed in BSS. This new degree program would offer courses from at least 25 faculty from across the University. It would consist of three basic components: 1) Background and Foundations, 2) Three Major Subdivisions including sexual populations, community health and services, and policy issues in schools, and 3) learning derived from community participation and service. This is a recommendation from CRAC since some members of CRAC have concerns about: 1) why can't this be offered as a concentration, certificate program, or bachelor's degree, 2) what is the anticipated employer demand for graduates with an M.A. in Human Sexuality Studies, and 3) what is the availability of faculty and other resources, especially for advising and instructional activities. She introduced **Bill Bonds, Acting Director, Human Sexuality Studies**, and **Dean Kassiola** as resources.

Kassiola stressed that since this is a program that goes throughout the University, attempts were made to consult with all the departments that would be interested. In the last two days, a Department Chair, who had been consulted, asked that the proposal be withdrawn. However, he could not reach the Chair to discuss the Chair's concerns. He asked the Senate, in the spirit of collegiality, to consider and adopt the proposal with the assurance that he would get back to that Chair and consult before the proposal leaves the campus.

Lois Lyles had a question about the first paragraph on page 2 which reads "Besides the sexual minorities, the Bay Area is comprised of large African American, Asian, and Latino communities of adults and young people, many of whom are immigrants or first-born American children, whose sexual and gender cultural traditions are at odds with those of mainstream North American society." She felt that the term "at odds with" implies that there will automatically be conflicts, while there may or may not be conflicts. She suggested the use of a more neutral term such as encompassing the variety of cultural traditions, for example.

Andrés Consoli expressed his support of integrated studies and commended all the people who worked on the proposal. He also expressed support for CRAC and the questions that they raised. He expressed his specific concerns since the proposal extends to a number of areas, particularly counseling. In order to practice counseling or psychotherapy, one must be licensed. He felt it was not clear how this proposal will meet those requirements. The first paragraph on page 7 states that some of the prospective students are already established professionals. Those students might already meet the licensing requirement, but he felt that it should be better articulated in the proposal.

Cherny asked why this is not a consent item. Yee replied for specific concerns, previously presented, that CRAC had.

P. Warren said that she didn't wish to close off conversation, but in view of the concerns that Kassiola expressed and other concerns, she hoped that this item would not move to second reading so that it would come back to the Senate in January for further discussion. She asked about the implications if the proposal was approved, what is the process that is followed for Master Plan Projections? **Donna Schafer** replied that, if approved, the proposal would go to the Vice President for his signature. Following that, the proposal would go to Long Beach where it would be put on the Master Plan Projection. If approved by Long Beach as a concept or idea, then it would be up to the proposing faculty to come up with the curriculum. That curriculum would go through the normal curriculum review process on campus. She said that the question before the Senate was "Is offering this program an idea that the campus wants to do?". The implications are that there is one time per year that Master Plan Projections can be received by Long Beach. If the proposal were not approved at the current Senate meeting, then it likely would not be considered by Long Beach for another year.

Nina Jo Smith commended the people involved for their work and specifically for including Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender communities, violence against women, and the feminist perspective. She asked about the community services section and the degree of consultation and coordination with social work, health education, and counseling and how inclusive is that process?

Bonds replied that consultation has taken place with various departments since there have been a faculty of 25 who include health education, social work, counseling, women's studies and others who have worked for 5 years to put together this idea. If the proposal were approved by the Chancellor, then consultation about curriculum would also take place. Many of the courses in the program would be cross-listed in several departments. In terms of advising, there are 25 faculty on the current roster of the program and at least 20 are tenured/tenure track and all would be available to serve as advisors of theses. With respect to concerns about duplication of courses, because the program is so interdisciplinary, it will involve the collaboration of many programs. In some cases, the duplication is its greatest strength since courses that already exist do not have to be duplicated. The program is able to draw from the talent around the university. In terms of wording, Lyles' point is well taken, and he forgot to make that change after it was previously brought up. He indicated that other wording changes would be made if needed to make it more felicitous and more intelligible.

Gail Whitaker said that she did not want to exert any pressure on the Senate, but the Board of Trustees only looks at Master Plan Proposals once a year. The materials for the annual report are due January 12 in order for the Trustees to look at it at the March meeting. If the Senate is not ready to act on the proposal at the current meeting, it will be a full year before the proposal could be considered by the Board of Trustees. She stressed that this is the conceptual phase. The Senate should consider if this is a program that we would like to proceed with developing for this campus and that actual details would be worked out subsequent to the acceptance of the Master Plan Projection. She felt that CRAC had done an excellent job of raising key issues. She had seen enough response from the makers of the program to be assured herself that it is a sound idea. She asked that the Senate focus on whether this master's degree would be a good idea for the campus.

Zoloth-Dorfman was puzzled by some of the conceptual issues and suggested that some of her confusion might arise from the program's strength as an interdisciplinary program. Referring to the employer's part, people with expertise in Sexuality and Gender Theory generally work in discrimination; however the degree is not in Gender Theory. She said that in other places Sexuality is a part of Queer Theory, which is a subdiscipline of Cultural Studies. Since Queer Theory is a strong and important academic discipline, she felt that it should be honored if that is what the program covers. In some places the proposal seemed to be about Feminist Studies, so she questioned why that is not part of Women's Studies. She expressed concern that the program included Counseling and asked if that then suggested that some sexualities need therapeutic intervention? She said that she felt confusion about the meaning of the program and was concerned that a random Trustee might also be confused.

Cherny asked which department wanted to withdraw the proposal and why. Kassiola replied the department was Women's Studies but he didn't know why. He said that the Chair was consulted, and from his perspective the discussions seemed to be concluded successfully. But he wasn't able to discuss the recent memo and phone call with the Chair, so he didn't know why since the reasons were not included in the memo or phone call.

P. Warren felt deeply troubled by the fact that the Senate was having to make a response to a proposal for a substantive and important addition to the curriculum without having the time to give it the thought that it deserves.

Lee expressed some concerns that someone who wanted to become a sex therapist could take this program and then call themselves an expert in sexuality and then provide unlicensed therapy. Sex therapy is not mentioned in the proposal but she felt that somebody reading into it might want to do that. When the proposal gets to trustees there could be some confusion since the proposal is unclear on that issue. She was also concerned about licensing.

P. Warren was recognized for a point of personal privilege. **M/S (P. Warren, Barnes)** to extend the time of the Senate meeting to 4:15. The vote was taken and the motion was defeated.

Lyles said that she supported the need for a Master of Arts in Human Sexuality Studies but the design of

this program needed to be rethought and reworked. She felt that its strength, its global emphasis, might be its greatest weakness. She questioned whether all the disciplines had been worked into a cohesive package. She also asked the reason for the use of the term sexual minorities and suggested that the term be rethought.

M/S/P (Houlberg, Homan) to move the agenda.

Agenda Item #10 - Proposed BA in Criminal Justice

Yee introduced this proposed new degree which would be housed in BSS. The new degree would replace the present concentration in Criminal Justice for the B.A. in Social Sciences. The unit requirement would increase from 31-33 for the concentration to 41-44 for the new degree. CRAC had ongoing concerns about the availability of faculty especially for mandatory advising and for teaching new courses. She introduced **Jack Curtin, Director of Criminal Justice** and **Dean Kassiola** as resources.

Cherny asked if CRAC had any concerns other than the availability of faculty for advising. Yee replied that perhaps a concern was the philosophical understanding of why it should be changed from its current status to a degree. Cherny said that the full proposal makes clear that this would change the name of an existing program and that the purpose is to enhance marketability of the degree for graduates. Most, if not all, of the content would continue, the change would be to the name only. He said that he had a large concern. There are existing criminal justice programs at many CSU campuses and that all of the existing Criminal Justice programs differ substantially from the proposed SFSU program in terms of orientation and content. The existing Criminal Justice programs explicitly carry a training emphasis as preparation for careers in law enforcement. The proposed SFSU program would be first a Liberal Arts program and secondarily would provide for a broad spectrum of occupational and post graduate opportunities. This would not be a 'cop shop' nor would it be designed for its graduates to enter law enforcement, it would be a Liberal Arts program. He felt that calling the program a Criminal Justice program when it would really be a Liberal Arts program would provide confusion and questioned whether such a program would serve the students' needs.

Sung Hu echoed Cherny's comments and felt that he had valid concerns. He said that he felt there was a typo in the second paragraph on page one. The first line read eleven courses and 41-44 units. He felt that it should be or.

Lyles asked what populations would be served by such a program and what would be the substantial difference between a Liberal Arts degree and a Criminal Justice program. Kassiola replied that it was not so much who receives the instruction but what the nature of the instruction is. 'Cop shop' is vocational training down to how to take pictures of arrested suspects. Professionals in this field would gain a great deal from the nature of the proposed instruction. Many of the involved faculty feel that it is the Liberal Arts - the political, economic perspective - that people in the profession need perhaps more than anything else. He felt that the majority of the faculty and perhaps CRAC wanted to recognize the positive side.

The reason that it was designed not as a "cop shop" was not so that Police Officers should not take the degree program, but that the nature of the instruction would be very different than in the other programs. He felt that Police Officers and others involved need this broad-based education much more than the technical based vocational education.

N.J. Smith said that her concern was on the interdisciplinary options. She noted the absence of issues addressing women, youth, prisoners rights and victims rights, which all might need to be addressed.

Phillips said that, in the absence of a motion, this item would return in second reading at the next Senate meeting.

The Senate was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Homan

Secretary to the Faculty