Call to Order 2:35 p.m.

Approval of Agenda MSP

Approval of Minutes from 11/17/10 Amended MSP

Reports:

Provost’s Report-Ron Vogel-Vogel said that he did not think the administration ever would change the grade of faculty. When a student gets a grade, let’s say it’s a “D”. We could drop the grade point average down to probation or below probation so the student gets thrown out of the university, which is by executive order. The intent would be to allow the student to register instead of throwing the student out. The student comes back and is able to register instead of disenrolling the student. Vogel said that he could make that decision in the summer time rather than waiting for fall. It was not to change the grade it was to change the process. It allows somebody on probation to go back to school and register.

Whetmore said that those of you who are unfamiliar with the SAPAC appeals process and the grade appeals process take many, many months to resolve the issues. So you are going to run up against situations like this. In the old days it would not have been a problem. A student could have registered a week before classes.
Vogel reported on the strategic planning process. He said that it belongs to the faculty. Last semester the faculty and department chairs in academic affairs got together and came up with a list of initiatives that they thought was very important that we addressed in terms of a college based strategic plan. What is important to the college? They came up with the themes and goals. If you go back and look at all the colleges you will notice that all of the initiatives every one of them in the colleges, fit within the strategic plan as it is written the goals as well as the themes. We have a little bit more work to do. We have asked departments to get together in their colleges and rank order the importance of the kinds of initiatives. The deans will have to collaborate and put this together. Initially Vogel wanted to have this done in December so the deadline was in December. The reason Vogel wanted to do it in December was because of faculty. Vogel said that he knew that we were going to have some faculty lines depending on the budget. Vogel wanted to make sure that the ads got out as fast as possible, hoping in January we could get the ads out. The pushback was such that he asked the president for more time. February 28, 2011 is when everything is due. If colleges can do this a little more swiftly that would be good. Putting an ad out for a faculty member in the months of March, you are closing off a lot of opportunity; a lot of faculty would have been recruited right now. In February the colleges will submit their initiatives. The deans will sit around, along with myself, and take a look at what are the most important initiatives.

The strategic plan is very, very faculty driven. Like the lottery requests and the one time dollars. Those went back to the council of chairs for the process of shared governance and we will keep doing things in that form.

Murrey asked if there was a dean's search yet for the college of professional studies. Vogel said not yet. We are not moving forward with that search yet. Dr. Maki has a one year appointment that is not permanent but at some time we will have to determine if that will be permanent or not.

Fawver asked Vogel if we already have the allocation to our campus and Vogel said yes. Fawver asked why it was just sitting in administration and finance. Vogel said that it was not and that it was being moved out through the process. The deans got together yesterday, we know what we have and now we are moving the dollars out. Fawver wanted to know what academic affairs has? Vogel said that he does not have budget figures with him today. Fawver asked if we could find those please. Vogel said that he did not have them today. Fawver asked that she would like a follow up on all divisions and to see allocations. Vogel said that there may be somebody in the room that has this information from UBC. Rodriguez said that the president met with the UBC earlier this week. She said that we have 2.3 million to allocate out if we are not hit with the money being taken back. Rodriguez said that the Blue Book will be finalized and put up on the web. Moore said that there are 60 ongoing searches within the CSU system and not only at the big campuses. Rodriguez said that many of those campuses have large reserves. Moore asked why CSUDH does not have a reserve. Rodriguez said that is because we had not met our enrollment target since 2002. Once we know in January what the governor’s budget is we will be building reserves, and the faculty lines will be decided.
Hinchberger asked Vogel if there will be a search for the dean of CPS before a search for the director of nursing. Vogel said that was a good question for the acting dean. Cauthen went back to Vogel’s discussion on probationary students and noted how we operate under the illusion that the campus shuts down during the summer but it really does not, and that this should be taken under consideration. Carvalho asked if we knew if federal funds had been allocated to this CSU system. Rodriguez said that the federal money will be allocated on census, the difference between 325,000 FTE and 339,000 FTE systemwide. There will be 2 allocations. The first will be on the first day of classes and the second will be on the normal census date.

Vasquez reported that the provost brought to the executive committee meeting the changes to the student grade appeal policy. We will be posting that on the website and sending the link out to that.

**Chair’s Report-Irene Vasquez**—Vasquez reported that our website has a link to the statewide senate (not the statewide academic senate) council of chairs. We are looking at having it moved to the chancellor’s office website. The group is rebuilding and over the last 2 years it has grown to be more organized; to meet on a regular basis; to begin to issue reports; and it is made up of all the senate chairs of all the 23 campuses. When you have time you can review the agendas, minutes and reports. At the last meeting there were 2 items that were discussed at length. One of those items was online evaluations; and the other was online instruction. We will forward you that link so that you can take a look to see how the campuses are responding.

**Faculty Policy Report-Thomas Norman**—Norman reported that a meeting was scheduled for the CPS to be co-hosted by Senator Miller and the FPC chair on Tuesday 12/14 at 2:30 to gather input on changes to the RTP process. Jonathan Grasse was commended for his research on online PTEs as a member of FPC. Norman recommended that the rollout for Associate professors be optional for spring. Norman also suggested the Dr. Martin collect and shared the raw data compiled on both the success of efforts to increase response rates and data on the average scores for pilot participants with courses for which these professors had recent paper evaluations and online evaluations. Norman thanked the faculty members who have been sharing ideas with FPC on the main issues being considered—RTP and online evaluations. Norman noted that FPC had not yet been updated on the outcome of the meet and confer between Dr. Martin and CFA. The FPC chair noted his pleasure with the administration placing policies and information important to faculty such as RTP standards and guidelines online and hopes that this trend continues as there are still many faculty members lacking a clear understanding of the scholarship, teaching and service requirements needed for retention, promotion and tenure. The FPC will continue work in these areas in the coming semester.

Fawver asked about the standardized criteria for RTP for departments who want to request positions. She asked if there was any department right now or any program right now that has met the criteria beyond the school of business. Norman said that he was not sure that any
college or department has an answer to that. Vanterpool asked if Norman could clarify about the online PTE’s, he said that one of his students today asked, "when are you going to evaluate the students.” Norman said that this semester if you are full professor or associate professor there is no choice you will be evaluated online If you don’t fit those categories you will be evaluated the old way. Vasquez said that just for clarification the senate voted to work towards online PTE’s. We will get that resolution out to all of you.

Miller said that in her department she has an assistant level faculty member who is being evaluated with online PTE’s because of 4 classes they taught in extended education. Miller does not know if all classes taught in extended education must be evaluated using online pte’s. This is not an online class. Martin said that there are several categories of faculty who are being evaluated online. One is in extension and the others are in the online nursing programs and other online modalities such as MPA’s for example. Miller said that another concern that was raised by the faculty member was that he did not have the opportunity to add questions or comments. Martin said that for the online PTE’s the notifications are exactly the same as the hard copy paper PTE’s. When you receive those you can add in additional questions. If you do that we can put the questions in for the online PTE’s. It can be done. Miller said that the faculty member got an email like this but there was not any place for him to write the question. Martin said to have the faculty member contact him because there is a place to add these questions. Norman said that there should be clear distinction between the online PTE’s and paper PTE’s question form.

**Education Policy Committee Report-Jan Gasco**-Gasco reported that they are working on 2 resolutions passed by the Senate in 2009 that were never implemented. EPC 09-02 deals with academic technology and distance learning, and EPC 09-04 deals with computer information literacy. The EPC is collecting information from offices on campus and system-wide that deal with these issues to determine what should be the next step in implementing these resolutions. We will have an update at the next meeting.

Vanterpool said that he was concerned about hybrid courses and that he is navigating the process with some faculty members right now. I would like to know if there is campus policy. Gasco said that is what her committee is in the process of working on.

**Statewide Senate Report-Kate Fawver**-Fawver reported that at the November 2010 Plenum, President F. King Alexander presented a cost-benefit analysis of the CSU system. Alexander presented data which evaluated “total expenditure per FTE” “Cost/Price/Subsidy” and “comparative mid-career salaries” for the average CSU graduate. He summarized his presentation with the following message, “We’re the public university that the public wants, and they just don’t know it.”

**Time Certains:**
4:00 p.m. Cathy Jacobs-University Student Learning Outcomes: Jacobs reported that USLOAC is a faculty driven process. There was a worksheet that was passed out that Jacobs went over. She said that the information would be posted to the website, and the worksheet could be downloaded. Jacobs went over the broad categories and the standard for success. She said that they linked outcomes with the mission and listed program outcomes. We need to know what evidence is used to assess learning. Jacobs said that we have to have courses and outcomes that are measurable. Carvalho asked if this information was being compiled for WASC and Jacobs said yes. It was dropped for a while and now we are trying to pick up. We want to get the website up and running and Jacobs asked faculty to at least let her know how they are doing by May. Fawver asked if USLOAC aligned with the framework and Jacobs said that they changed it so that it aligns with the mission, vision and values. Fawver asked if GE courses are going to be evaluated and have to produce this and Jacobs said yes they will and that the details will be worked out between USLOAC and GE. Monty thanked Jacobs for her work and asked if they would link the mission to the mission statement or the mission to the strategic framework because the strategic framework talks about goals and values and goals might link directly to program learning outcomes. When we are talking about values it would make more sense to show how our mission statement matches the mission statement of the college and the institution. Then have program learning outcomes linking to student learning outcomes. Jacobs said that the problem she had was that the previous mission statement was detailed and long. This particular mission statement didn’t have a lot of meat on it. It was all encompassing but not specific enough. That was why we expanded the whole strategic framework. Every outcome does not have to link, but you would expect at least a couple of them to.

Monty said that his worry was that the more things we try to link our program learning outcomes to you see this dynamic start where we wanted to have 5 programs but now we are going to have a dozen. There are so many that are specific to the discipline that don’t necessarily link and some that do that now you have to have 8 or 10 learning outcomes. Jacobs said that if you only link in 1 place that is okay.

Vogel thanked Cathy Jacobs for her work with USLOAC and with WASC. He said that there are not a lot of people at the university that can do this kind of back breaking work and Cathy stepped up and said yes. She has worked very hard and Vogel just wanted to say thank you very much to Cathy.

John Wilkins-Program Review Panel and Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool and PEAT +
Wilkins passed out his report. There were 2 handouts one was a matrix and the other is a text statement. Copies are at the end of the minutes. One is a mid cycle report called the PEAT + and the final report is a full program self study. These are on a 6 year cycle. The medium green highlighted page is supposed to break up that cycle. The purpose of the PEAT + is to give a mid term report of what the program is doing and it tends to help get ready for the full program review at the end of that cycle. This is the latest schedule; we try to always match these schedules to other programs in the major. We also try to balance a little bit so that one college does not have too many reports due in one single year. A certificated program or credentialed program that has other outside agencies we try to align this schedule to that schedule as well.
There are years where the programs don’t really have to do anything but PEAT data and there is one exception to that which is in the guide and that is if a program is asking for extra resources which could be the major issue in the next few years. Then PEAT + is an important piece to do and may require program just to make their case that they are in need of extra resources.

Vanterpool asked if the last review was done in 08/09 does that mean the responses are complete. Wilkins said that it is more reflected in the second handout. Vasquez asked if her department was re-adjusted in the fall and Wilkins said yes and that they were trying to do some balancing with this as well as there is a brand new program which has not been out long enough to collect data. One department has a couple of different programs and we try to align their PEAT + and programs.

Vasquez asked the provost if there are departments and programs that are not scheduled for the next five years would he consider using the information from the last program review to make resource decisions, such as hiring. Miller said that her department was scheduled for a full review next fall and asked when the date would be to have the self-study complete. Wilkins said December 15, 2011.

Wilkins said that the second document is our backlog. On the first page you see the full program review starting on the 4th page are the PEAT + backlog. This is a historical record about what is not finished with the full program review and the PEAT +. We have been backlogged for any number of reasons. Most of our members are brand new and reading these documents is quite complicated. Also, it is very difficult to get external reviewers. Tracy Haney manages that and she has a lot of problems getting external reviewers. They make a commitment then they can’t do it, so it is very difficult. We have talked to the provost about that and perhaps a stipend might work. We are trying to address that need in many different ways. The other problem is that the administration has turned over a couple of times and so these programs have been backlogged because we have not been able to get to it. We have formed a plan where we can take care of these; we have met with the provost last week about how we can address the problem. The program report of 05/06 may not be of critical value but because the data is so old we have talked about ways that we can take care of this backlog. The first 2 ½ pages are the full program and where they are at right now. The last 2 pages are the ones that are coming through this year, and the PEAT +.

Keville noticed that the art department has a full program review scheduled, and also from the last review instead of saying “self study due” it says we have had 2 unsuccessful attempts to have an outside reviewer. Wilkins said he would take that to the committee. Verba said that she did not understand what final meeting means. Wilkins said that the final meeting is the meeting where all the documents of the first report by the program, the external reviewer’s report, the dean’s response, the PRP response, goes to the administration, and then the administration meets with the dean. Verba said “so that hasn’t happened yet?” Wilkins said that is correct. Verba said that they were all basically ongoing then? Wilkins said yes. Carvalho said that Biology says “need program review” Wilkins said that is a PRP. The way the PRP guide
is written we are forming a complete new subdivision with a GE person, USLOAC person, PRP person. We are trying to do a committee of the whole, but when it says that it means PRP.

Vanterpool said that in Africana studies it says they need an external reviewer, but we have not yet identified the reviewer, is that correct? Wilkins said that is correct. Fawver asked how long this process should take from the beginning of the submission of a program review to the final meeting, and are we in violation of any chancellor’s office mandate? Wilkins said that what we report to the chancellor’s office is just the USLOAC portion. Tracy Haney keeps a very tight rein on that. The rest of the report is for us. Wilkins said that he thought this should be done in May. We collect December 15 and it should be done in May. That certainly should be true for PEAT + and it almost never happens for full program. Pawar asked what the purpose of the final meeting was. Wilkins said the purpose of the final meeting is to review the report, review the recommendation; other campuses make recommendations and create a memo of understanding. Pawar said that her department has to start with self study for next year yet it hasn’t been completed from the last time. Wilkins said that we have a 10 year window. Fawver asked what the role of the senate was in all of this. Wilkins talks about a meeting with the provost and the final recommendations and all the materials, but Fawver does not see where any of these recommendations have been brought to the senate or at least shared with the senate; or in regards to program development and program elimination, suspension for example the recreation and leisure studies does this mean that program is now defunct? Why is this the first time we have heard about this? Vasquez said that she scheduled Dr. Wilkins and Dr. Jacobs because there were questions that came up to the executive about USLOAC and PRP so we invited them to come to the senate to answer those questions and that is why they are here now. Fawver said “so the answer to my question is that the senate has no business in this.” Wilkins said that his understanding was how the original PRP guide was established that is was passed by the senate and also approved by administration. Wilkins and his panel are looking at that document closely and need to improve on it. Wilkins said that we want to get the PRP process to be a consistent flowing process and once we get it to that point we can bring it back to the senate for approval. Whetmore said that the reason why both of these processes began is because we were nearly denied accreditation. At that time administration was under president Detweiler. We immediately put together taskforces to try and address the 6 of the 9 criteria that we did not meet. A few years later the PEAT process was developed and Mori was provost at the time. All of those processes were brought forward. All of them came as a result of WASC. They are all internal and it is one of the first things that WASC is going to look at. These processes are important and crucial so that we don’t find ourselves back where we were with respect to accreditation.

**Gus Martin-Online PTE’s**-Martin reported on the online PTE process. Full professors were brought into the online PTE system last spring. Beginning this academic year associate professors were brought in on the online PTE’s. We have had a third meet and confer with the CFA yesterday. As far as the technologic upgrades are concerned remember that previously students were receiving only one email to click on the link to go to where they can respond to the PTE instrument. There have been several additional notifications and systems we have put in. If you go into My CSUDH you will see in the left corner notification that students can now go
to the online instrument. If you go into the student My CSUDH you will see a pop up box every single time the students go in. It is exactly the same as the first notification. It simply says please answer the online PTE’s; it is 100% confidential, etc. In addition to that students will receive repeated emails. So what we have are several different notifications that they are going to see beginning in week 12 which is when the usual paper PTE’s begin. Next semester there will be an additional upgrade. In the left column of the student’s My CSUDH we have a list of professors and a list of their courses, and links to all of our websites whatever faculty have. In addition to that, beginning in week 12 which says you can now answer your online PTE’s. If you click on that it takes you automatically there. A lot of redundancy is being built into this. The IT staff has done a remarkable job at researching what is done at other campuses. We have adapted what we do from what Pepperdine has done, CSU San Diego, and a couple of other campuses. They have very high return rates. There are other incentives we may look at. Stanford will hold a student’s grade for 2 weeks until they complete the online form. Then there are raffles held on other campuses. We are not there yet. In terms of the data collected, we are going to compare full professors—we will select one class for each full professor—beginning in 08/09. We will also do 09/10 and the fall semester for last year. Beginning in spring 2010 that was the first time the full professors were rolled into the online PTE’s and that is also the time when we had the one email going out to students. We are going to compare those findings to this year when we have the redundancy and all the upgrades coming in.

We are looking at 2 things. One is response rates. When we first began doing this we were testing the technology and the technology works. The second thing we were looking at were response rates to see how they compare to the paper PTE’s and they are lower. We think with the upgrades we think we can get past that the way other campuses have done. The most important thing we are going to look at-- are the scores. Whether there is any difference in scores with the online PTE’s in comparison to the paper PTE’s. Assuming there is no difference in the scores this means it has no impact on RTP review. If the scores are very similar then it is an honest evaluation of how we are doing in the classroom.

The meet and confer that occurred yesterday was the third meet and confer. We are reducing the agreements to writing. CFA’s council and the Universities council are doing that right now. We will have the option for associate professors to opt out if they wish to next semester. We will also write a disclaimer for RTP review because on other campuses where we have these transitional moments between paper PTE’s and online PTE’s there are differences in the response rates. The disclaimer will be directed to RTP reviewers saying pretty much don’t pay attention to the response rates that much, but look at the scores. Martin said that he did not have language on how the disclaimer is going to look yet. The data collection will also be part of the agreement that we reduced to writing and we will share that with you.

Carvalho said that he was concerned about the online PTE’s and wanted to know how much lower the response rates were. Martin said that there is a range from very low to no difference at all. Those who have been doing this for some time say there is not a whole lot of difference. For the most part it is in-between from very low to very high at about 50% somewhere in that
range. Carvalho said that would be important for his disclaimer and that if you are getting a slanted group that will sway the results one way or another. Martin said that question has come up quite a bit and there is research about whether disgruntled students only respond or the frat party scenario. So far, there may be anecdotal evidence that has occurred but there is no hard data. This idea whether the response is higher or lower is really the key we are looking at. Martin said that he did not know if we could ask students if they are truly disgruntled or was it a frat party where you answered this, but we are looking at the scores very closely.

Pawar asked if Martin could respond to response rates to the open ended question for paper versus online. Also, when you are going to compare the results from last year’s online to people’s previous paper responses, keeping in mind that there were furloughs. Martin said yes, the furlough issue is one that the system is looking at in terms of RTP. As far as the open ended questions the instrument is written the way the paper instrument is written. So we will have 1 through 12 or 13. Looking at question #12 very carefully—is the person an effective instructor?—as far as the additional questions are concerned the comments those are already reproduced with the online system. Pawar was wondering the percentage of students that utilize those questions whether it is on paper or online. Kalayjian said that she urged her class to complete the online PTE’s and they told her that they had filled it out and they keep getting the pop up reminder. Martin said that they would work on that. Kalayjian also said that she was in favor of online PTE’s. We just had a situation where a student became horribly upset after realizing that she gave her professor all low scores rather than all high scores with the paper PTE’s. One thing really nice about the online PTE’s is that it does not have numbers, it says (agree, or strongly agree) and so on.

Prado asked when the online and paper evaluation will be the same in significance. Martin said that hopefully the data will show us. Prado asked if there was any history of this kind of assessment at another university when this kind of significance has been reached. Martin said that what he sees from other universities is that transitional moment we are in right now. They began with the low response rates and then moved into high response rates. The scores were not different. But they had that moment where they had to write that disclaimer saying to viewers, “understand response rates may be lower.” That sort of information has come up. It is primarily verbal and there is not a whole lot of quantitative data available. Miller said that you do have current data on how much the response rate is but you don’t have current data on how much the scores are. Martin said that was true. Martin said that everyone will have their own personal link to the online portal and only you will have it. There won’t be individual sheets, you will have the final scores with strongly agree, and strongly disagree, and also every comment. Furtado asked about next year associate faculty being able to opt out and she wondered if it was based on internal rationale and why administration was providing that option to associates and not full faculty. Martin said that there is little to no risk for a full professor but associates are still in the stream of being evaluated and therefore they have the option to opt out. Ideally what we hope to see is that there is no reason to opt out. Carvalho asked what happens if a computer crashes while a student is trying to fill out the online PTE. Martin said that if the form was not completed the student will be able to go back in and complete the form. Pawar said that with regard to the “transitional moment” Pawar just
wanted to make sure that this process is not finished next semester. Martin said that the process was ongoing.

**Greg Saks-Donations and Gifts**—Greg Saks gave a power point presentation on the university donations and gifts. If you want a copy of the presentation please email him.

**Unfinished Business:**

**Second Reading Item-FAC 10-15-Resolution on Emeritus Status**—Bill Gould-Gould presented the revised version of the resolution. He said that the intent was to protect the process of obtaining Emeritus status. This came up this year because there was a retired faculty member who was FERPing and he applied for Emeritus Status and was denied emeritus on the basis of being FERPed. This was due to part of our campus policy not being written down. Faculty members on FERP are fully eligible for emeritus status. Some further language was added about the president’s decision or the president’s designee decision to discourage future administrators from interfering, this should be a faculty process, and it should not be multiple levels of evaluation like an RTP process. There is language in there that includes the phrase “serious and compelling reasons” which is intended to discourage administrators from interfering in this process. There is one change in here that is a change in process and that is in item #4. The candidate has the right to appeal to the faculty leaves and honors committee if there is a problem. There was a discussion and it was suggested that we should just make emeritus status automatic. Gould said that retiring and receiving emeritus status is a ceremony of degree. Retiring is a transition step and emeritus status is not completely automatic. Departments have the right to say no, but it should be for a very good reason. Pawar said that saying that the department has a say in whether emeritus status is granted undercuts the statement that it should be granted. Why have a policy? Fawver said that she would vote against this resolution. Fawver said that the one situation that brought this all forth was a misunderstanding and was easily resolved. Do we really need this resolution if the problem can be easily resolved. Gould said that the incident was so painful for the faculty member that was denied for no reason. There was a vote. **MSP.**

Vogel said that the resolution has some language problems that will have to be worked out before it can be made into policy. The resolution restricts the authority of the president.

**Elections-Ericka Verba**—Verba held an election for the Deans Search Committee for the College of Arts and Humanities. Three faculty were nominated: John Davis (TED); Jim Hill (Physics); Sue Needham (Anthropology). Sue Needham was elected.

**Open Forum:**

Thalia Gomez, a student, brought several students with her and asked for a sense of the senate in support of the Dream Act. There was a vote and all were in favor except 1 abstention. **MSP.**

Krochalk reported that yesterday a subject of importance came up at the Asian Pacific Advisory group meeting that had been pulled together by Mitch Maki, and which has been meeting for the past several months and looking at building Asian Pacific Studies on the campus and
implementing more languages. House Bill 2281 was put forward and approved in the House of Representatives in the state of Arizona. Although it focuses on public schools K-12 it is Krochalk's understanding her colleagues see this as a prelude to something that may be proposed at the college or university level. Krochalk went over the bill. This is being viewed as an opposition to ethnic studies. This is something that the senate may want to watch closely. Fawver asked what body Krochalk was representing. Krochalk said the Asian Pacific Advisory Group. Whetmore said that he thinks item #1 in the document to overthrow the government of the state of Arizona is a good idea.

Bradfield announced that the CFA luncheon will be held tomorrow and for faculty to please come and attend.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 p.m.