

1998-99 FACULTY SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Minutes
November 19, 1998

Issue #9

ROLL CALL

Present: Alexander, Amata, Anderson, Barakatt, Barrena, Bossert, Buckley, Cameron
Wedding, Chambers, DeBow, de Haas, Dillon (Parliamentarian), Dworkin,
Elfenbaum, Huff, Jacobs, A. Jensen, Jew, Kando, Kawamoto, Klyse, Lan, Lascher,
Lee, Lee-Sammons, Leezer, Lund, McCrystle, McKee, Newsome, Olson, Palmer,
Reardon, Scanlan, Scott, Seid, Stabinsky, Strahan, Turrill, Verdone, G. Wheeler,
Zucker

Absent: Banks, Bauerly, Behrman, Cleek, Dokimos, Dundon, Hall, Hill, Kim, Krabacher,
LeFebvre, Lewis, Llamas-Green, Moore, Phillips, Pickett, Raingruber, Rodriguez,
Serrano, Smith, V. Wheeler

INFORMATION

1. A Moment of Silence was observed in memory of:
STANLEY V. WRIGHT
Professor of Physical Education Emeritus
CSUS 1969-1979
2. Tentative Fall 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
November 26--No meeting—Happy Thanksgiving!
December 3--
December 10--
December 17--
3. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Faculty Senate) - Vice Chair Arthur Jensen

ACTION ITEMS

*FS 98-78/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW--GERONTOLOGY PROGRAM

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Gerontology Program (November 19, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment A) and recommends that the Gerontology Major, and

Minor/Certificate programs be approved for a period of six years or until the next scheduled program review.

Carried unanimously.

FS 98-72/Ex., Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amendments

The Faculty Senate approves amendments (FS 98-72A, B, C, and D) to the Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento (October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1) for submission to the voting membership of the faculty in a referendum.

Carried.

FS 98-72E/Flr. CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY--Amend Faculty Senate Membership

The Constitution of the Faculty of California State University Sacramento shall be amended to include the President of the University and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs as ex officio, non-voting members of the Faculty Senate [see Article II, Section 5.A (Membership) of October 29, 1998, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment B-1].

Defeated. (Hand vote: Yes= 16; No=20)

*FS 98-77/CPC, Ex. COURSE AND PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS, UNIVERSITY LEVEL REVIEW PROCESS FOR (amends AS 97-47 and AS 97-48)

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the following process for appeals against new course proposals (amends AS 97-47, "New Course Proposal Policy") and substantive course change proposals (amends AS 97-48, "Policies Pertaining to Substantive Course Change Proposals"):

A. The CPC Curriculum Subcommittee shall consider appeals against new course or program change proposals only by:

- a department, program or college against a proposal course or program change;
- a department or program *and* a college against a proposed RCE offering;
- an individual member of the Subcommittee against any proposed course or program change from any source including RCE.

B. In order to facilitate this process, Academic Affairs shall:

- circulate notice of new campus academic credit course offerings, program changes and RCE offerings to all department, programs and colleges;
- ensure that all proposals comply with current CSUS and CSU policy;

- in cases of objections by a department, program or college against a new course or program change proposal, consult with involved units;
- inform departments, programs and colleges of their right to appeal to the Curriculum Subcommittee;
- advise members of the Subcommittee in cases of appeal.

C. After the completion of these procedures, including any Subcommittee decisions on appeals, Academic Affairs shall recommend approval or disapproval of the proposals to the President.

Carried.

*FS 98-79/Flr. GLOBALIZATION, REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON CSU

The Faculty Senate adopts the report of the Executive Committee's ad hoc Globalization Committee as its position on the "Report of the Task Force on CSU Globalization" (attached) and forwards it to the President for consideration in the development of the campus response. Further, the Faculty Senate forwards the report to the Statewide Academic Senate.

Carried.

✓ *FS 98-80/FPC, Ex., Flr. CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING (Amends FS 97-18)

The Faculty Senate recommends revision of the mission statement and advisory board composition of the Center for Teaching and Learning as recommended by the Faculty Policies Committee and amended by the Executive Committee shown below as amendments to FS 97-18.

Carried.

Proposed changes to FS 97-18/FPC, Ex., CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING—
MISSION STATEMENT AND ADVISORY BOARD:

MISSION

The mission of the Center for Teaching and Learning at CSU Sacramento is to provide support to ~~faculty in achieving their greatest potential in their professional lives. Specifically, the Center provides programs and services that help individuals identify and achieve their desired level of competence in their teaching.~~ activities and services that help individuals, departments and programs to identify and achieve their desired level of teaching excellence which includes addressing issues of student linguistic and cultural diversity. The Center seeks to achieve this mission through one-on-one consultation with faculty members, presenting workshops for both departments and the campus community on a variety of college teaching issues, referral to and partnering with other support offices for assistance outside the Center's area of service, and publications about college teaching. The Center director also consults with departmental chairs, committees and college and campus administrators on faculty development issues.

AIMS

The Center's activities have these aims: to enhance student learning by helping faculty. More than simply assisting instructors to solve current problems, it is the goal of the CTL to assist them to choose the issues on which some effort will achieve the greatest results, to help them to expand their repertoire of teaching approaches and practices, and to aid them in reaching the next a higher level of teaching competence. This includes addressing issues of student cultural and linguistic background, as well as the diversity of prior preparation and differing learning styles. Another CTL goal is to and by promoting a climate of collegiality which inspires, nurtures, and rewards self-directed faculty efforts of toward professional development and which supports an expansion of the level, frequency, and available venues for campus conversations about teaching.

PRESUPPOSITIONS

The mission and methods of the Center for Teaching and Learning are inspired by certain beliefs and presuppositions including the following:

1. Skilled teaching practices promote effective student learning.
2. Teaching is a complex activity which calls for multiple pathways to the outcomes of high quality instruction.
3. There is no one right way to teach, but each individual can know when he or she has achieved teaching excellence.
4. Teaching effectiveness is enhanced when learning is planned around objectives that reflect desired student behavior that is ultimately observable and measurable.
5. Teachers are adult learners who bring insight, motivation, experience and high expectations for relevance, practicality and intellectual stimulation to the act of learning.
6. Professionals are more likely to modify their professional practice when they can anticipate with some certainty a positive consequence from doing so.
7. Professionals appreciate the ability to choose from an array of options to promote their professional development.
8. Professional growth is more likely when an individual feels part of a community of others with similar goals.
9. Helping faculty achieve self-directed professional growth directly assists them in their pursuit of retention, tenure, and promotion.
10. Connectedness between the Center's programs and all other initiatives on the campus to serve faculty in their curriculum innovations (such as the Learning Communities, and the Office of Community Collaboration) or in their use of alternate systems of delivery of instruction, such as Distance Education, operate to the benefit of these programs and initiatives and the faculty who are involved with them.
11. There are many ways to measure the outcome of professional development activities, both from the perspective of the individual and from the perspective of the provider of those activities.
12. The effectiveness of the Center is dependent on the impression that it makes on the perceptions of the faculty and the administration. Desirable perceptions include:
 - ownership of this function by faculty,
 - availability of programs and services to all faculty,
 - timely and focused responsiveness to needs articulated by faculty,
 - relevance of programs to current and future needs of students, and
 - readiness of the Center and its programs to be assessed.

In addition, the Faculty Senate recommends that:

1. The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) remain a program under the general oversight of the Faculty Policies Committee (FPC).
2. A Faculty Advisory Board be established of nine members serving staggered three-year terms to be appointed by the FPC on the basis of the primary qualifications that they be demonstrably interested in and willing to work toward faculty professional development. Assuming this qualification is satisfied, FPC shall make every attempt to make such appointments with due consideration of representativeness in such categories as gender, ethnicity, discipline, ~~or school~~ faculty status, college or academic unit. Ex officio, non-voting members of the Board will include the Director of the CTL, the Chair of the Faculty Policies Committee (or designee), and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee). The FPC will ~~nominate members of~~ submit a list of nominees to serve on the Advisory Board to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
3. The Advisory Board meets as regularly as it deems necessary to fulfill its broader responsibilities (see statement of Board Responsibilities—October 30, 1997, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment A), which will be further refined by the board itself once it is in operation.

The following item received a first reading:

FS 98-66/Flr. DISTANCE LEARNING, PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT ON

Postponed to the next meeting was:

FS 98-74/Flr. MINUTES

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.


Janice McPherson, Secretary

*Presidential approval requested.

ASSESSMENT OF THE
"REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY GLOBALIZATION"

Prepared by
The ad hoc Committee on Globalization

November 16, 1998

ad hoc Committee Members:

Mollyn Bohnen, Nursing
Robert Curry, International Affairs, Emeritus
John Henry, Economics
Tom Knutson, Communication Studies
Tom Krabacher, Geography
Mike Lee, Management
Arline Prigoff, Social Work
Richard Shek, Humanities & Religious Studies
Greg Wheeler, Geology
Angus Wright, Environmental Studies

The following assessment of the *Report of the Task Force for California State University Globalization* is presented to the CSUS Faculty Senate for its consideration and action. The assessment was prepared by an ad hoc committee appointed for that purpose by the Senate Executive Committee in late October 1998. Members of the ad hoc committee were drawn from the four standing policy committees and from the faculty at large.

Strengths of the Report

The report contains a number of strengths, perhaps the most important of which derives from the fact that it exists to begin with. In the opinion of several committee members, the recognition of the role of international education in the CSU mission that the report represents has been long overdue.

The report's recommended goal of developing global competency in our students is highly desirable. Equally positive is the acknowledgement that identification of the precise methods by which this goal will be met should be left to the individual campuses.

Regarding the recommendations themselves, there was general agreement that the first seven of the eight recommendations, at least as broadly stated, are sound and worthy of support. In particular:

- Recommendation #2: The coordination of effort called for between campus faculty and campus international programs (IP) offices in the development of international programs is highly desirable. Too often in the past, faculty have worked with the IP director on specific initiatives on an ad hoc basis, but without any real sense of the overall purpose of such programs. An institutionalization of faculty involvement within a clearly defined structure may awaken faculty interest and promote greater active participation.
- Recommendation #4: The internationalization of the curriculum is also highly desirable. It is in line with recommendations made on this campus several years ago that were never fully implemented.
- Recommendation #5: The establishment of faculty international development, as recommended here, should be encouraged and facilitated. In doing so, it is important that the CSU be prepared to follow through on the recommendation's statement that "faculty members must be assisted in acquiring or supplementing their internationalization efforts and outlook in their teaching and research." The institution must be willing to provide the resources necessary to do this.
- Recommendation #6: Expanded recruitment of international students should be pursued. It must be recognized, however, that once these students arrive the university has an obligation to address the special needs and acculturation difficulties they bring with them.
- Recommendation #7: Support for students in their efforts to study abroad is central to any effort to internationalize their educational experience. In particular, the CSU is well-poised to take advantage of the opportunities that countries of the Pacific Rim present for this purpose; this is especially so for the case of CSUS, with its numerous faculty connections to many institutions in the region. Again, however, the development and expansion of such programs calls for a willingness on the part of the university to commit the necessary resources.

Although concerns exist about some of the points found in the discussion of specific recommendations (see below), the general sense of the committee is that it is desirable that the CSU should follow through on the ideas contained in recommendations one through seven.

Areas of Concern

In addition to its strengths, the ad hoc committee also identified a number of problems with the Task Force Report that need to be addressed before the report is formally adopted by the CSU. Some of these problems have to do with the specific recommendations; others, however, are concerned with broader issues such as the success of the Task Force in fulfilling its charge, the terminology used, and the implicit assumptions that seem to underlie the report and its recommendations.

The Task Force Charge. The charge to the Task force was to:

"...review the existing state of affairs in international education, determine met and unmet needs, and develop a strategic plan for improving and as appropriate expanding CSU international activities."

Based on the Task Force report, it is the general opinion of the committee that the Task Force did not successfully fulfill all aspects of its charge. Missing is a "review of the existing state of affairs" in international education at the CSU. Without this baseline data, it is difficult to determine what the strengths and weaknesses of international education in the CSU currently are, and what actions might be necessary to improve it. The validity of the report's recommendations is determined by the degree to which they address the shortcomings of the status quo; given the absence of the necessary background information, it is unclear whether adoption of the report's recommendations will necessarily address the university's needs.

Terminology. Several members of the ad hoc committee have problems with the use of the term "globalization". While the report is correct in stating that the term is often "used loosely", one must recognize that in certain contexts the term carries highly charged negative connotations. In recent years "globalization" increasingly has come to refer to the expansion of western corporate power and organizations into more commanding positions in the international economy at the expense of non-western societies and cultures; it frequently implies a loss of national or cultural identity. For many, it is simply a new way of referring to what used to be called imperialism. While this is not the meaning the CSU assigns to the term, using it runs the risk of provoking negative reactions among the very people with whom we hope to interact. Employment of an alternate term such as "internationalization" or "global education" is recommended.

Tone and Assumptions. Rightly or wrongly, a number of disturbing assumptions seem to underlie the recommendations in the report; This often comes through in the document's tone. In fairness, the Task Force may not have been operating under these assumptions, but the impression that it was nonetheless exists. This needs to be addressed. Specifically:

- The report seems to trivialize the current role of the professoriate in international education. Little acknowledgement is made of the fact that many faculty are currently involved in such activities without any formal support of the institution. It is important to stress that what is recommended here is not new to the CSU; a large number of faculty have been engaged in it for years. Moreover, statements such as

"...technology makes possible a major and lasting change in faculty roles, creating for the first time the possibility that a faculty member can be a mentor and guide for students and not principally an information giver." (p. 7)

are condescending in their implication that faculty are not doing these things already. Such statements should be dropped.

- The report places undue emphasis on the role of educational technology in internationalizing education in the CSU. While the report acknowledges that it does not see technology as a universal panacea, the tone and emphasis suggest otherwise. It is important to recognize that no matter how sophisticated the technology, it is no substitute for direct, first-hand experience with a region and culture different from one's own.
- The assumption that educational technology will play a central role in the development of a program of global education fails to acknowledge the fact that the user systems for these technologies are based primarily in the developed world and operate in English. Non-English users are at a disadvantage. Globally and culturally, the international linkages that develop through the use of such technologies will not be reciprocal.

In addition to the more general concerns expressed above, the committee wishes to emphasize the following, more specific points.

First, the report needs to emphasize more explicitly the reciprocal nature of any relationships established with individuals and institutions abroad. The pedagogic relationship should be one of learning from as well as teaching other cultures. In addition, a principle of mutual exchange in terms of students and faculty must be part of any international relationship between the CSU and other institutions.

Second, in connection with the above point, attention should be given to the difficulties involved in attracting foreign scholars to the CSU. The necessary economic resources to make such exchanges possible must be made available.

Finally, the ad hoc committee disagrees with recommendation #8 calling for the creation of a system-wide Office of Global Education. The report does not present a convincing case for the need for such an office and most of the functions assigned to it could be performed with greater effectiveness on the individual campuses. The problems with international education in the CSU today do not stem from a lack of central administration. They arise, rather, from insufficient resources. Faculty on individual campuses already have clear ideas as to how to make global education work; what they need are the resources to do so.

Conclusion

While much of the above is critical in nature we would like to conclude by stating that CSU faculty have long demonstrated a commitment to international education. To the extent that the Task Force Report helps to expand the resources and opportunities that are available for improving this, it is likely to find broad faculty support.