Academic Senate Minutes
March 6, 2013


Voting Members Not Present: Carvalho, Claybrook, Ganezer, Graham, Han, Kalayjian, Kaplan, Kravchak, Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Present: Bersi, Borrego, Bradfield, Bragg, Furusa, Gordon, Joshi, Maki

Non-Voting Ex-Officio Members Not Present: Manriquez, Parham, Poltorak, Rodriguez, Torrecilha, Wen Wilkins

Guests: Laura Robles, Keona Concannon, Ben Zhou, Susan D. Einbinder, Peter Kim

2012-2013 Academic Senate Executive Committee: Jim Hill, Chair; John Davis, Vice Chair; Matt Jones, Parliamentarian; Jan Gasco, EPC Chair; Hamoud Salhi, FPC Chair; Kate Fawver and Pat Kalayjian, Statewide Senators.

Recorded and Edited by MLB and the Executive Committee

Meeting Called to Order 2:30 p.m.

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes from 02/20/13 Amended MSP

Action Item

FAC 13-02 Resolution Institutionalizing Budget Transparency and Shared governance Practices at CSUDH-Fawver went over the changes that were made to the resolution. There was a vote to accept the resolution with the changes. All were in favor. MSP.
Time Certain

2:45 p.m. General Education Committee Report-Lorna Fitzsimmons-Fitzsimmons gave the following report: Actions taken by the General Education Committee this semester are as follows:

1. Continuation of the GE Area Assessment.
2. Approval of POL 101 American Institutions hybrid proposal.
3. Approval of AFS 205 Introduction to Hip Hop proposal.

On other campuses the rush to conform to 120 units has resulted in parts of GE being suspended, is this happening at DH? Fitzsimmons said that they are working through several drafts to make sure we are in compliance and the faculty will hear about it. We are looking at these case by case and not by overall policy. We meet on the 2nd and 4th Monday. MSP.

2:50 p.m. University Curriculum Committee Report-Cathy Jacobs-Jacobs gave the following report- On Nov. 28, a change to the DMA major audio recording option to include a new class on mixing and mastering was approved.

For the Cal State On line, new courses for the new concentrations were approved
   a. UCC 12-13  020  BUS 591- online  NC
   b. UCC 12-13  021  FIN 526- online  NC
   c. UCC 12-13  022  HRM 524- online  NC
   d. UCC 12-13  023  MGT 526- online  NC
   e. UCC 12-13  024  MKT 542- online  NC
   f. UCC 12-13  025  MKT 551- online  NC
   g. UCC 12-13  026  MKT 570- online  NC
   h. UCC 12-13  027  MKT 571- online  NC
   i. UCC 12-13  028  MKT 586- online  NC

At the Jan. 23 meeting, an online mode of instruction was approved for a section of ENG 350 for nursing students. Two COM classes that are no longer offered were retired, COM 386 and COM 396.

The BA in Biology was changed, dropping the requirement for a minor, to bring in in compliance with the STAR act. The BS in Biology, both the Cellular and Molecular Option and the Ecology(Environmental Options, was changed to no longer require CSC 101 from the required classes, reducing the major by 3 units.

Two new classes were approved for the Cal State on Line on global supply chain logistics, OMG 570 and OMG 575.
The STAR Act required that juniors who are community college transfer students be able to complete their degree at the CSU in 60 units. There is now a new push from the governor for all undergraduate degrees (with a few exceptions) to be no more than 120 units. Degree programs between 121-129 units are in the first set that has to be in compliance by fall. Programs over 129 units have additional time to be in compliance. Strategy of how to accomplish this was started by calling a meeting with the college deans and all department chairs with programs in excess of 120 units to inform them of the situation, identify who needs to be in compliance with this new guideline, and when this must be accomplished. A list of possible solutions was suggested, some of which involve GE. The UCC meeting on April 24 will be reserved for consideration of proposals that bring programs into compliance.

At the Feb. 13 meeting, a new class in History, HIS 370, on Early Monotheism was approved, and the Accounting Concentration in the BS of Business Administration was modified, moving either Auditing ACC 336 or ACC 435 (depending on whether the student wants a Certificate in Internal Auditing or a Certificate in Management Accounting, or the student wants a CPA license) from an elective to a required core course.

The Feb. 27 meeting was cancelled due to a lack of new materials to be examined.

Once again the Chair would like to thank her committee for the assiduous attention to the work of the committee. MSP.

**Faculty Development Update-Kaye Bragg**
CSUDH Faculty Development- Mission
To support the University’s mission of success in education through a student’s contact with faculty members who effectively combine teaching, scholarship, and service and to help create a campus culture that values and supports excellence in teaching, learning, and research. Faculty development at CSUDH includes support, resources and services that enable faculty to achieve excellence, integration, and satisfaction in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service across their career lifespan.

Faculty Development Spring 2013
- Faculty Development Web site http://fdc.csudh.edu/default.shtml
- Appointment of Co-Directors for spring 2013:
  - John Davis and Emily Magruder
- Listing of services, events and resources
- Faculty spotlight- acknowledge and celebrate
- Blogs- virtual community and conversations
- FDC facility
  - The Center: Physical area designated as the faculty development center
  - Space committee review and discussion
  - Staff search process
  - Center as multi-use area for faculty members:
    - Department and individual gathering
    - Reading groups
    - Research circles
Learning communities

Spring 2013 activities

Scholars Writing Institute:
- January 7-9 with 22 participants
- Part time orientation face-to-face format
- January 18th 9-1pm, with 21 participants
- PowerPoint posted on web site
- Lecturer meeting- Emily Magruder
- IPAD workshop: Title V and FDC collaboration
  - March 1st, Nicole Gordon and Catherine Dingh
  - 47 participants

Spring activities 2013
- Goal to build community among faculty
- Spring 2013 “learning communities”
- IPAD inquiry community- 6 participants
- IPAD apps for student engagement in spring courses

Spring activities 2013 continued

Reading groups:
- What the Best College Teachers Do, Ken Bain with Emily Magruder facilitator
- The Academic Self, Donald Hall with John Davis facilitator

Celebrate - March 27th Symposium
- The Faculty Role: High-Impact Practices for Student Academic Success March 27, 2013 11:30 to 2:30
  - Keynote Address – Dr. Ken O’Donnell
  - Acknowledge faculty innovation in these activities
- Lunch and Table discussions:
  - Faculty sharing practices
  - Discussion of obstacles and opportunities
- Report out per table
  - Summary working paper for planning Fall Symposium

Join us: Susan Sanders ssanders@csudh.edu

Collaboration
- Admissions and Records: FERPA training
- Advising Center and IT: CMS training
- IT: instructional design, blackboard and digital learning tools
- Research and Funded projects:
  - California Hispanic Serving Institution Research Collaboration Conference
  - First Year Experience for GE courses
  - Faculty Dyads course themes
  - CSUDH and Cal State Online:
    - BS Applied Studies
    - MBA and MPA new concentrations

Additional ideas
Questions
Reports
Senate Chair’s Report-Jim Hill-
- Elections for the next senate chair are imminent.
- CSO update (reprise): Webinars! Of interest to those who might run a CSO course or want to learn more about the system. Next is March 7th (Th), 2pm. Document with link can be distributed separately.
- Calls for UBC representatives and Search Committee for VP of Advancement are still lacking representatives from some colleges. Please...
- Last time I raised the topic of our campus having no "Outstanding Professor" for two years in a row now. FPC is looking into drafting some recommendations for a change in the charge of the Leaves & Honors committee that would make it more clear how this award could in fact be used. Interested parties are invited to help, particularly those who might have insight from having served on the committee.
- Dr Bragg has some information from the Faculty Development Center; a handout is distributed and she has a few words. [defer to Dr Bragg]

Parliamentarian Report-Matt Jones-Jones reported that he is still receiving names of elected faculty for the VP of University Advancement Search Committee as well as the University Budget Committee. There will be a call out for the Search Committee for AVP of Development and Academic Programs.

EPC Report-Janine Gasco-Gasco reported that the senate has several resolutions that have not been made into policy. EPC is working with Academic Affairs to resolve this issue.

We are updating guidelines for online courses and Gasco and Caroline Bordinaro are working on this. We have 2 more meetings before we will have a report.

Gasco asked about the PeopleSoft Training and what is really expected of us. Maki said that there will be 2 more training meetings and that faculty should plan on going if they advise students. Faculty will get familiar with the degree progress and the report will highlight what a student needs. Bradfield said that it caught the CFA’s attention. This is unit 4 work and isn’t this another problem. We are not clear what duties the faculty are being asked to take on. Maki said that he would welcome talking with Bradfield. Maki said that the only thing this is for is to help facilitate advising and to be more user friendly.

Monty said that this looks like a new policy for grad check advisement with no discussion at senate. It is happening in the middle of the term and is ill advised. It should have been talked here first. Heinze-Balcazar said that she would like more sessions and that there are only 2 left. Maki said that the deans should have all the information. Fawver said that she has been attending training sessions and wants to know what is wrong with the way we have been making substitutions. She is still floundering and a longer timeline is more appropriate. We have built up an articulation table so what is the point of a system.
Maki said that there is no one uniform process across campus so we changed the process so that there is one uniform process—not having things uniform resulted in students not graduating. Fawver said that EPC should take this up. Blackaller wanted to be sure that this is something we will use.

Monty said that this is a change in the process of graduation advisement and there is no consultation. The Provost did alert the Exec and the Senate. Hill said that he thinks it came up at the end of last semester. Fawver said that we want a formal senate position to investigate. Fawver said that she does not want the University Advancement advising history majors—this is for the History Department to do.

**FPC Report-Hamoud Salhi-Online PTE’s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>F 2008</th>
<th>Sp 2009</th>
<th>F 2009</th>
<th>Sp 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants/Form machine Accepted**</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Online 1: The objectives of the course were stated clearly.**

Paper 5: The instructor stated clearly what was expected of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Online 2: The course content covered the stated objectives.**

Paper 6: The course content covered the stated purpose of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Online 3: The instructor presented the course material clearly.**

Paper 2: The instructor expressed himself/herself clearly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>average score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Online 4: The class included appropriate student participation and discussion.  
**Paper 10: (same)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online 5: The instructor was responsive to student’s questions.  
**Paper 9: (same)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online 6: The instructor showed enthusiasm for the subject.  
**Paper 4: (same)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online 7: The course assignments & class activities were helpful in learning the course content.  
**Paper 7: The assignments were helpful in learning the subject matter.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Online 8: The instructor’s teaching was effective.  
**Paper 12: The instructor in this course was an effective teacher.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: the machine may not have been able to recognize all responses resulting in conflicting totals.**
RTP Online

Suggestions for Online Evaluations for Faculty

**Goal:** To assess how well the instructor did in his/her classroom
To identify instructors’ strengths and weaknesses
To meet CSUDH teaching standards of excellence
To control for students’ learning habits and behavior

1) **Closed ended questions**

   A. Important, but by no means a perfect indicator. It is also important to note that adjunct faculty should be evaluated separately from full time faculty because full time may have a built in advantage because of their accessibility and presence.

   B. Good potential measures:
      i. Overall satisfaction
      ii. Overall effectiveness
      iii. Approachability
      iv. Accessibility
      v. How much a student learned over the course of the semester
      vi. Quality of instruction
      vii. How understandable the professor was
      viii. How much the professor cared

   C. It is also important to measure other variables to control for student types (disgruntled, lazy, overachiever) – this can prevent instituting incentives by way of the evaluation which could result in easier classes, less constructive criticism, grade inflation.
      i. Difficulty of curriculum
      ii. How often student attended class
      iii. Student’s expected grade
      vi. How much of required reading the student completed
      vii. How much time the student devoted to the class each week
      viii. How often student attended office hours or spoke to professor after class

2. **Open ended questions**

   A. Must also be included. These are most effective in that instructors can actually use this more specific feedback to improve classes or instruction.

   B. **Good potential measures:**
      i. Sincerity of the student
      ii. What the instructor did well
      iii. What the instructor needs to improve upon
      iv. Parts of the class the student thought were most effective
v. Parts of the class the student thought were least effective
vi. Feedback on the instructor’s powerpoints/lectures
vii. Feedback on the instructors exams
viii. Feedback on the instructor’s assignment/homework
ix. Feedback on the instructor’s research paper

3. Drawbacks/Issues and Solutions

A. Behavioral Implications - The biggest drawback of evaluations is conditioning the behavior of professors to ease up on the curriculum and evaluations/grades so to enhance their evaluations. To address this, the evaluation could include control variables so to sift out or identify potential outlier/problem students. This could reassure the faculty that problem or bad students will probably be able to be identified and thus, controlled for. Thus, there will be a way to identify true outliers.

B. Non-response - Another drawback of online evaluations is the fact that often not all students fill out online evaluations. This can bias the output and present an inaccurate report. One way to address this is to incentivize student participation. A way to control against this is to hold back the posting of grades (few days) for those students who did not fill out their evaluation. It was important that this delay in reporting be made known to students. The school could also require that all students fill out evaluations and institute a penalty for non-participation.

C. Timing & Bias issues - It is also important that evaluations not be biased by final exams or final grades. It is very important that the period in which students are asked to submit them online end prior to the first final exam date.

D. Effects on Morale - It is also important to solicit and work for instructor buy in. In other words, an ideal system should be supported and bought into by the faculty. Besides instituting control variables, the evaluation policy must be explicit in the consequences or non-consequences for faculty. Whatever the consequences are, they must be clear and explicit so that there is no confusion. Most people don’t mind being evaluated as long as they know that the criteria are fair and that the consequences/benefits are explicit and clear.

E. Student access issues

4) Benefits of Online
A. Does not take up class time
B. Ability to ask more questions. Generally, students can finish online responses quicker than in class responses.
C. Flexibility
   i. Ability to tailor the questions to the departments and classes.
   ii. Ability to ask follow up questions
D. Quicker data entry
E. Less error in data entry
F. Range of options for reporting
G. Ability to control for alternative explanations

Spring 2012

PTE Sent: 46,246
PTE Responses: 12,534
Percentage: 27.10%

Fall 2012

PTE Sent: 48,264
PTE responses: 16,109
Percentage: 33.38%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th></th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Participants</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>2330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statewide Senate Report-Kate Fawver - The Academic Statewide Senate of Cal State University 50th Anniversary reception will be held next Thursday at the Chancellor’s Office.

Open Forum - Bradfield reported that he would not be running for president of CFA this time. He reported that the labor and management meeting took place and they need to follow up. The faculty rights committee meets every week. April 2 and 3rd are Sacramento lobby days. Bradfield reported that the assembly would be taking place April 6 through 28.

Adjournment