

2005/2006 Academic Senate

MINUTES
September 26, 2005

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-four Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Veregge, Nellen, Van Selst,
Sabalius, Gutierrez, Kassing
Absent: McNeil

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Phillips, Lee, Ashton
Absent: Sigler

Deans:

Present: Hegstrom, Stacks, Merdinger,
Wei

Students:

Present: Fithian, Glover, Le, Balderas,
Bridgeman
Absent: Estrada

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Thompson

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Absent: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Griffith, Moriarty
Absent: Thames

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Fee, Perry, Butler

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, El-Shaieb
Absent: Osland

ED Represent:

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Maldonado-Colon, Parsons

ENG Representatives:

Present: Singh
Absent: Gao, Meldal

H&A Representatives:

Present: Van Hooff, Desalvo, Leddy, Belet, Hilliard, Fleck

SCI Representatives:

Present: Bros, McClory, Kaufman
Absent: Messina, Kellum

SOS Representatives:

Present: Von Till, Peter, Hebert

SW Representative:

Present: Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –
Minutes of May 16, 2005 – Last - approved as is.
Minutes of May 16, 2005 – First - approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Veregge said, "Welcome to the second meeting of the 2005/2006 Academic Senate. This will be a very important year for the Senate as we participate in the implementation of the university strategic plan in order to realize our vision and goals for 2010. This process is

one in which we will consciously align our resources with our highest priority goals. We also have many other significant tasks ahead of us including; voting at the next meeting on changes to our Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policy, developing more effective ways to enhance teaching effectiveness (including developing an effective procedure for peer evaluation), developing ways to evaluate and reward faculty for their advising activity, and reviewing and acting on recommendations from the Department Chairs Task Force.”

Chair Veregge said, “This year as many of you know, the university has chosen student success as its strategic planning value theme. As I mentioned in the President’s fall address, many activities and practices promote student success such as; high academic expectations for students, high quality advising, and student-faculty interactions out of the classroom. One of the strongest predictors of success for freshman is whether a student feels a connection with a faculty member early on in his/her career. Other predictors include; students feeling they are a part of the community, student involvement in the intellectual or extracurricular life of the university, student participation in undergraduate research or graduate research, academic intervention programs for students at risk, first-year experience seminars, and many other activities.”

Chair Veregge said, “This year through the leadership of past chair Annette Nellen, members of the campus community are exploring the best practices to promote student success. President Kassing and past chair Annette Nellen are facilitating a book discussion on vision 2010 and student success. A group of faculty and staff are reading the book “Student Success in College.” Also, the Educated Person Dialogue is continuing this year, and the focus topic will be research on what supports student success.

Chair Veregge said, “In addition to these activities, those currently involved in the strategic planning process are developing plans for a working institute, the SJSU Achieving Greater Expectations Institute, which will contribute to strategic planning over the winter recess. And, as we act globally, I encourage you all to act locally by beginning a conversation with your colleagues about the ways that your departments, units, or colleges currently promote student success. I also encourage you to initiate a discussion about additional means by which we might facilitate the success of our students.”

Chair Veregge said, “As I said last spring, this is a great university. It’s great not because of its budget, or its infrastructure; it’s great because of the staff, administrators, and faculty who have chosen to serve society by providing a rich educational opportunity for our students. And, of course, our students make it a great university. As we focus our efforts on our vision, and those goals we hold most high, we will be better able to serve our students in this next academic year.”

Chair Veregge introduced Ms. Wiggys Sivertsen. Ms. Sivertsen said, “I’m here to talk about the Campus Climate Survey. There were a lot of people involved in this survey including; Senator Nellen, Chair Veregge, the WASC team, and members of the Campus Climate Committee. People have worked really hard trying to develop a survey for the campus that will define campus climate, and give us some ideas about what we can do to improve, or expand our campus climate. The only way this is going to be successful is if you get your

colleagues to answer this survey. The first survey is a preliminary survey, so that we can get a notion of how you define campus climate. Then we will put out another survey that begins to assess how do meet those things that you defined as valuable elements in campus climate. It is a two-stage process. The first stage will be going out in a couple of weeks. It will also be on the web. We have also made sure that people that don't have access to a computer get a paper copy. Everybody will be surveyed. Whatever we come up with, you will get that information back. We are not going to withhold anything. Please get your colleagues to answer this survey, and if you have any questions contact me in counseling services."

Chair Veregge introduced the Vice Chair, Judith Lessow-Hurley. Vice Chair Lessow-Hurley made an announcement that the Senate Retreat will be held on November 18, 2005, in the Library. Vice Chair Lessow-Hurley said, "We will be focusing on our theme of student success. Eva has already sent you a "save-the-date" email, so it should already be on your calendars. If it isn't on your calendar, please put it there. Eva will also be sending out formal invitations asking you to RSVP. Please RSVP so that we can make sure we have enough lunch for everyone."

B. From the President of the University –

President Kassing said, "I would like to second Chair Veregge's welcome to the new Senators as well as returning Senators. I'm going to provide a report on a number of different things. The Provost couldn't be here, because she is ill. However, this morning she provided us with an enrollment report. It looks like we are about 3% over where we were last year at the same time, maybe even a little more than that. It looks like we will hit our target for the year and probably even go over the target. That is very good for us."

President Kassing said, "We were invited and drawn into, the rescue attempt from New Orleans. We've enrolled 16 students, and provided housing to others. I'm also going to read an email to VP Phillips thanking all the wonderful people at SJSU for making it possible for a family that lost everything to Hurricane Katrina, to have their daughter attend school here. I don't know if any of you have relatives there, but it is a very devastating experience."

Senator Peter asked, "If we have faculty or students that want to contribute, particularly to the people in our housing, how do they do that?" VP Phillips said, "I did send out an email regarding the student emergency fund. It is not necessarily meant to be only for victims of Katrina, but it will be available to them. Beyond that, the Red Cross, is of course is the lead agency."

President Kassing said, "A couple of other items I'd like to mention. Have you seen the email from the CSU on the salary increase for faculty of 3.5% for this year. It came out on Friday. I guess they are going to continue to negotiate. There was also a press release saying the Governor had signed the bill authorizing the CSU Educational Doctorate. Bob Maxim is retiring and will be leading and coordinating that program next year."

President Kassing said, "I had the opportunity to attend one of Debra's (Senator Griffith) forums on Academic Integrity. I'd like to encourage that kind of dialogue. I'd like to compliment Associated Students, the Judicial Affairs Office, and the Academic Senate for

taking the lead on that.”

President Kassing said, “The housing village has opened up. There are about 800 students living on campus that weren’t here last year.”

President Kassing said, “This summer the senior team came up with some goals that I’d like to share with you. VP Lee will be working on chargebacks. We will also be paying particular attention to enrollment management, and space allocation. And, VP Ashton will be working on promoting the university.”

President Kassing said, “If there are students in your classes that you think could do what we do, we want to find ways to mentor and encourage them. I would also like to find a way to enrich the discipline-based clubs.”

President Kassing said, “We will also be taking a look at IES funds. There is a lot of money sitting around in this university that we aren’t able to use, because of the definitions for the use of the money. I’d like to see that changed. In addition, VP Lee will be taking a look at our information technology and email systems.”

President Kassing said, “Homecoming is coming up on October 22, 2005. There are a couple of interesting things happening at homecoming. There will be an Alumni college on Saturday morning with a range of topics from China’s emergence as a world power, to Road Trip America, etc. I’ve seen this at a number of places and it is very effective. The football game is also that day. And, there is a dinner event Friday night, October 21, 2005, featuring Dana Karvey. Tickets are \$20 at the event center.”

President Kassing said, “We are also going to be renovating Tower Hall. VP Lee was able to get funds for this. Maybe we’ll finally get matching tiles in there.”

Questions:

Senator Peter asked, “How do your term appointments of the VPs fit in with our campus appointment of administrators policy which specifically prohibits these kind of appointments.” President Kassing said, “That policy is currently under review. I made an argument to the Executive Committee that it was very important to have people associated with the university, that know the university, here while I’m temporarily appointed. The VPs’ appointments will extend through the first year of the new president’s appointment. After that, the new president can decide what he/she wants to do. I would argue that in these circumstances, this is what I felt I needed to do.” Senator Peter said, “Perhaps you could record those sentiments in a letter to the Senate Chair. The reason I suggest this is so that the new president doesn’t come on board and look at what was done by his/her predecessor, and think that he/she can do something similar. The policy is there so that there is widespread consultation with the faculty, and an open process for nominating faculty members. That couldn’t take place under these circumstances, and I would hate to see that become typical.” President Kassing said, “Good point, I hadn’t thought about that insight into it.”

Senator Buzanski said, “The Executive Committee approved a resolution on President Clark.

Usually, these resolutions are brought to the Senate for approval. Why wasn't this one?" President Kassing said, "The Senate wasn't in session, and there wasn't enough time to wait until it was." Chair Veregge said, "We would be happy to bring it to the next Senate meeting for confirmation."

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

May 16, 2005 – No questions.

June 13, 2005 – No questions.

August 12, 2005 – A change was made to item 11 to add "personnel matters" after "discussed."

August 29, 2005 – A change was made to correct the attendance by adding Senator Parsons.

September 12, 2005 -- A change was made to item 4 to change "Veril Phillips" to "Gerry Selter."

B. Consent Calendar – Approved as is.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator McClory presented *AS 1304, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring J. William Fulbright (Final Reading)*. Senator Sabalius made a friendly amendment to change "San Jose State" to "San José State." **The Senate voted and the resolution passed unanimously.**

Senator Nellen presented *AS 1305, Policy Resolution, Appointment and Term of the Faculty Athletics Representative (First Reading)*. Chair Veregge said, "Last year the Senate voted to join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). The COIA has a number of policies it recommends regarding the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), and other issues related to athletics. This resolution is a result of us trying to abide by those recommendations."

Questions:

Senator Sabalius said, "On the bottom it says that the financial impact is none. Is there time release for that position? Senator Nellen said, "That hasn't changed, there has always been time release for that position. It is .40 release time."

Senator Peter said, "Does the idea of appointment of the FAR in consultation with the Executive Committee, instead of the way other faculty are appointed, come from the FAR association, or do other campuses appoint their FAR this way." Senator Nellen said, "I don't know how other campuses do it. COIA does recommend that there be a strong relationship between the Athletics Board and the governing body, which would be the Senate and Executive Committee." Chair Veregge said, "Actually, COIA does recommend it be something equivalent to the Executive Committee." Senator Peter said, "It would be interesting to see how other campuses appoint their FAR, and see how this policy compares

to their policies.”

V. Unfinished Business - None

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.

A. University Library Board – None

B. Professional Standards Committee –

Chair Bros gave a presentation on RTP. Chair Bros said, “What I want to do today is give you an overview of what the Professional Standards Committee has been working on. As many of you may know, the Professional Standards Committee has been working on a large scale revision to the RTP policy. What we want to do at the next Senate meeting is bring to you a core of ideas and recommendations.”

Senator Bros said, “First of all, a lot of people have been involved in these revisions. There have been several committees, etc. The kind of information we used to be able to decide what changes to make has been considerable. We conducted several forums, held various meetings with different committees, conducted several surveys, and we also looked at other CSUs. In particular what we did was work with several different groups, including the Deans and Department Chairs, to make sure our recommendations were workable.”

Senator Bros said, “The presentation I’m about to make is **concerns** four of our most important recommendations. The first section is about developing a Professional Development Plan (PDP), the second is a change in the role of the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) committee, the third is a change in the timing of the performance review, and the last is required guidelines for scholarly achievement. These are the four areas we feel are essential.”

Senator Bros said, “The PDP is a four page document that describes accomplishments over the past year, and a plan for scholarly or professional activity over the next 2 ½ years. We need the PDP primarily for career planning. Right now untenured faculty don’t have a clear understanding of what they need to do. There is a large demand for help in that area. Our current system is reactive. Right now faculty really don’t know what is happening until after their fourth year review. There is no way for them to know if they are on track until after that fourth year review. The second year review is pretty much a practice run for the dossier. What we propose is that the PDP be done only during the non-performance review years. What I mean is that it would be done in those years that the candidate is not going up for retention, tenure, or promotion. In the current system that would traditionally be years 1, 3, and 5. Basically what would happen is that in the Fall the candidate would develop the PDP in conjunction with the department chair. Then in the Spring, the PDP would be reviewed by the department RTP, college RTP, and Dean as part of the mini-dossier. Now, the real goal is for the RTP committees to comment on the appropriateness and adequacy of recent accomplishments along with feasibility, appropriateness, adequacy, and equity with respect to the faculty. The idea is to have the review committees exam these plans, particularly with regard to scholarly activity, and to comment on how doable they really are. The benefit is that the faculty have a clearer understanding of expectations. And, faculty

should be able to start developing a workable plan early in their career. Finally, being a chair, this should give you a better understanding of what your faculty are doing. This should put department chairs in a better position to guide that department.”

Senator Bros said, “Jumping ahead, we want to change the role of the university RTP committee. We want to do this because the area of promotion, and not tenure, is the area of greatest discontent. Currently, they are not reviewed at the university level, and we want them to also establish guidelines for scholarly achievement. We evaluated both the college and university level. And, the university RTP has too much work to do under the current system. What we want them to do is to review dossiers only when there is a no recommendation from the evaluating body. Under this proposal one of the problems is how can you evaluate a person if you only see the bad side. Our answers to that are that we want to move away from dossier to dossier comparison and move toward a dossier to standards comparison. We don’t want reviewers not to be able to sample dossiers. The catch is we don’t want them to sample dossiers from only one year. If they are going to sample dossiers, they should be looking at the first through third year. That should help keep down the inflation of expectations. We want the university RTP committee to be responsible for promotion as well. Another thing we want them to do is to be the body that evaluates the college guidelines for scholarly achievement.”

Senator Bros said, “What we are proposing under the new system is that a PDP be developed during the first year with a 2 ½ year horizon in the Fall. Then in the spring, the summary of achievements would include the PDP. In this case, the big difference is that the college RTP committee would be engaged in this process.”

Senator Bros said, “Under the current system, review of the dossier happens in the fall. In the spring, the dossier is reviewed for retention-tenure by the university RTP committee. Under the proposed system, the same thing would happen in the fall, but in the spring the university RTP committee would only review those dossiers with a no vote. Also, during promotion years, dossiers are reviewed in the fall, but nothing happens in the spring. Under the proposed system, dossiers would be reviewed in the fall, but in the spring the university RTP committee would review no votes.”

Senator Bros said, “The current timing of performance reviews is at 2, 4, and 6 years. In the second year, there typically isn’t enough information for an adequate review. What usually happens is that faculty use the 2nd year as a practice run at doing the dossier. The 4th year is really the first time you get a concrete review. If you think about it, this is the point where candidates get the information that they need more scholarly achievement, but there just isn’t enough time to do it. At this point, faculty have one academic year and 2 summers to comply with any recommendations. However, the review time for many scholarly journals is about a 1 ½ years now. Thus, we are putting our faculty in a difficult situation by making them wait until the 4th year. What we are recommending is that the system be changed. So, if a faculty member comes in with 1 year service credit, they would go through the 3rd and 6th year review. If a faculty member comes in with 2 years of service credit, they would automatically be required to have a 4th and 6th year review, the same as we do right now.”

Senator Bros said, “We also want to require guidelines for scholarly achievement. Right now guidelines are optional, and they are often vague. One of the things we are really concerned about is the comparison of dossier-to-dossier. What happens is our current system a lot, is that candidates will talk about what is expected by comparing each other’s dossiers. We feel that this is kind of a dangerous practice. What we should be doing is evaluating expectations. Also, departments are very different, and one dossier doesn’t fit all. What we want to do is have required guidelines that list what is acceptable scholarly artistic or professional achievement. And, we want to specify the type of documentation that is necessary to indicate that this accomplishment has been met. We also want the guidelines to say how the achievements are normally evaluated, and then specify the type of documentation needed based on the level of achievement. By being very specific in telling the faculty what is required for documentation, this should give us exactly what is needed in the dossier and no more. Hopefully, this will limit the size of the dossiers quite a bit. And, finally we want the guidelines to comment on the degree of difficulty that is appropriate.” These guidelines should give clear instructions to candidates on what type of achievement would be considered for RTP, and what documentation is needed not only for the achievement itself but also for the level of achievement. This should also give clear directions for reviewers how specific levels of achievement are normally evaluated, and reviewers should have exactly the amount of documentation they need.”

Senator Bros said, “The departments are going to have to do this. We want the guidelines at the level where the faculty are practicing. We want the departments to make sure they actually do this. Under the current system, the department or college puts together the guidelines and they are sent to professional standards. Professional standards can either send them back, or send them on to faculty affairs. Faculty Affairs looks them over and sends them back if needed. The problem is that whether they are used in the RTP is optional, sporadic, and hasn’t been very effective in the dossier review. Under the proposed system, we would have the departments put together their proposed guidelines. They would work with the college RTP committee to ensure there is equity amongst the departments. And, the college would work with the university RTP committee to be sure that there is equity amongst the colleges. Finally, the guidelines would be sent to Faculty Affairs for review.”

Questions:

Senator Fleck asked, “How soon would this be implemented?” Senator Bros said, “The biggest problem is getting it approved. If it passed this fall, then it would be a year from this fall. What would happen is that those new faculty would automatically go to the new system, and those already in the process would be given the option of converting to the new system or remaining with the current system.”

Senator Buzanski asked, “Scholarly publications are different depending on which publisher they utilize. For instance, we know that University Press is very prestigious. On the other hand, something like the Pacific Press is not evaluated in such a prestigious manner. Department A may say that Pacific Press is a first rate publisher, where department B says it isn’t.” Senator Bros said, “This is the purpose of the guidelines. They are to specify what is

acceptable and how it will be evaluated. These guidelines are then reviewed at the college level, and university level.”

Senator Campsey asked, “You said that the university RTP committee would only review the no votes. Did you mean that if only one person on a department RTP committee voted no, the university RTP committee would review, or that it had to be a 3 to 2 vote.” Senator Bros said, “It would be a no vote from the recommending body.”

Senator Kaufman asked, “Will this have any impact on people that are past the retention-tenure stage, but not the promotion stage?” Senator Bros said, “Yes, it would actually. The major difference would be the PDP. One of the exciting things about that is that it would allow individuals to have a plan that people reviewed and approved as far as scholarly achievements, etc.”

Senator Van Selst asked, “You are having the individual and department chair create the PDP. Where do the current problems in the RTP process show up?” Senator Bros said, “In the promotion area, they show up primarily at the college level. In fact, most of the conflicts do occur at the college or university level. What we are proposing is that the PDP be reviewed at the department and college levels. This way any problems with the PDP at the college level can be identified at the earliest possible time.”

Senator Peter asked, “Many departments may have strong disagreements among the faculty members about what should be in the guidelines. What kind of checks and balances can you have to ensure that minority members of departments that are in disagreement with the majority on what should be in the guidelines will have their due?” Senator Bros said, “Good question. The establishment of the guidelines will give people a chance to voice their opinions and hopefully come to an agreement that most people can live with.” Senator Peter said, “What if the faculty member wants to engage in a plan of professional development that the chair doesn’t agree with?” Senator Bros said, “They would go into their chair and tell them they disagreed, then the plan would move forward through several RTP committees to get their input.”

Senator Wei asked, “The PDP involves the use of resources. What if these resources aren’t available?” Senator Bros said, “The PDPs are used only as development plans, not standards per se in RTP. **If resources are not available, the faculty member or any other reviewing body just needs to make a note of that.** The university RTP looks at a broader scope.”

Senator Nellen asked, “The current RTP process is focused on teaching. I just want to confirm that the language in this policy is moving away from “what are you teaching” to “what are students learning.” Senator Bros said, “This is being addressed, but not in this particular policy. We addressed the four most important elements first.”

Senator Sabalius asked, “I believe the dossier was a great way for faculty to show their achievements. Are we trying to make faculty fit their dossier to certain guidelines?” Senator Bros said, “The guidelines aren’t meant to be prescriptive or restrictive.”

Senator Butler said, “I’d like for the Professional Standards Committee to consider making it a requirement that a probationary PDP be required for employment with a department.”

Senator Hegstrom said, “My department chairs are concerned about what the PDP is going to look like, and the amount of time this is going to take.” Senator Bros said, “The amount of additional work should not be more than an additional week.”

Senator Van Hooff asked, “What if the chair’s expectations are too high or too low, and the faculty member comes back and says you didn’t tell me I needed to do this. Have you thought about this?” Senator Bros said, “Absolutely, that’s why there are so many levels of review. **The faculty member will receive recommendations from all reviewing levels, not just the chair, and the PDP can be revised accordingly.**”

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, “What if you have a chair that isn’t tenured giving PDP guidance to non-tenured faculty? This puts the faculty member in an awkward position.” Senator Bros said, “Remember that this is a document that will be reviewed every year. It is a living document. The chair’s comments will be reviewed at the college level as well as university level, and feedback will be given.”

Senator Leddy asked, “Are minimal plans acceptable?” Senator Bros said, “What happens is that a faculty member wants to be cautious and says I’m only going to say I’m going to do one publication, or they say I’m going to get published in 8 journals. This system would allow a number of people to weigh in and say that this isn’t going to fly.”

C. Curriculum and Research Committee –

Chair David said, “We will have a resolution to establish a taskforce to examine the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects. You should have this resolution before you no later than the November 2005 Senate meeting. The second item that we are anticipating is some revisions to the Program Planning Committee’s guidelines. After Program Planning makes their recommendations, we expect to bring them to the Senate. We also hope that we are able to get to an issue with Interdisciplinary Programs. We don’t have a very good way of encouraging or evaluating these programs, or the faculty that get involved with them. The last issue we hope to get to this year is the goals statement. Our goals statement has really only been applied to undergraduate programs. We will be looking at how it applies to graduate programs too.”

D. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Parsons presented *AS 1296, Policy Resolution, Update of Senate Bylaws (Final Reading)*. Senator Lessow-Hurley presented a friendly amendment to change the 1st whereas clause to read, “Whereas, portions of the Senate by-laws are unclear because some positions and/or office titles are no longer used on campus, and.” Senator Bros presented a friendly amendment to change “should” to “shall” in the 2nd sentence, and to change “shall” to “should” in the 3rd sentence of by-law 2.24. Senator Nellen made a motion to return the resolution to the committee to incorporate additional anticipated changes. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion failed. Senator Bros made a

friendly amendment to change “which” in the 2nd sentence of by-law 11.1 to “that.” Senator Bros made a friendly amendment to add “a” before “one-year term” in the 5th line of by-law 6.11. Senator Van Selst made a friendly amendment to add “elected” after “responsibility of each” in the 1st sentence of by-law 11.1. **The Senate voted and AS 1296 passed as amended.**

E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee – None

VII. Special Committee Reports –

A. Strategic Planning Process Report –

Chair Veregge presented an overview on what has been happening with strategic planning. Chair Veregge said, “This year a value theme was chosen, and that value theme is student success. We are going to be looking at what student success is, and ways we can promote it throughout the year.”

Chair Veregge said, “The strategic planning structure set up by the Senate begins with the Goals Advisory Council (GAC). The GAC establishes a vision and goals for 2010. The GAC has already done its work, and the Senate approved those goals last academic year. The GAC then passes that vision and goals on to the University Planning Council (UPC). The UPC then develops strategy and implementation plans related to the various goals that have been established. The UPC is currently very busy. The UPC gets input from University Planning Council Advisory Panels. Those advisory panels are being formed as we speak. Some have already been formed, others are seeking additional membership, and still others are waiting to be formed. The membership for those panels comes from individuals applying to participate on those panels. On the Senate webpage there is an application to fill out to serve on the UPC Advisory Panels. Today, we had the great pleasure of reviewing 21 applications for the UPC Advisory Panels at the Executive Committee meeting. We will be forwarding those names to the UPC Advisory Panel chairs. The UPC Advisory Panels will provide information to the UPC, and the UPC will give feedback to the advisory panels. Then recommendations will be made by the UPC to fund certain activities. Once the UPC makes those recommendations, it passes them along to the Resource Planning Board (RPB). The RPB finds resources and makes recommendations for allocation of resources to the President of the University. Some UPC Advisory Panels have already made recommendations for funding. The RPB will be meeting on October 3, 2005, and will review these recommendations.”

Chair Veregge said, “There have been some questions about when the proposals for Professional Development will be coming forth. The RPB will be creating the requests for proposals. The RPB meets on October 3, 2005, and one of the tasks the RPB has is to create a request for proposals for Professional Development Lottery Funds.”

Chair Veregge said, “So, just to give you a brief overview of the work of the councils, panels, and boards. Again, the GAC establishes the vision and goals for 2010. The UPC develops strategy, action plans, and performance indicators. This process is assessed, it is not open-ended. The performance indicators let us know if we are accomplishing what we think we are. The UPC also consults with the UPC Advisory Panels. And, finally, the RPB finds funds and

recommends allocation of funds to the President for specific items that have been identified by the UPC.”

Chair Veregge gave a brief presentation of the vision and goals for 2010. Chair Veregge said, “The first theme is enhancing academic quality. Under that theme are reinvigorating the curriculum, learning assessment, enrollment management, investment in faculty. Theme 2 is enriching the student experience, community, and connection. Theme 3 is improving the campus work environment and infrastructure. And, theme 4 is strengthening community alliances.”

Chair Veregge said, “While most of the university was on summer break, the UPC was very busy. The UPC came up with plans to address these goals. Under the theme of enhancing academic quality, a panel has been developed on curriculum reinvigoration and learning assessment. There are three goals; curriculum reinvigoration (they are just beginning discussion about this goal), learning assessment, and first-year experience. Learning assessment is underway in degree programs, and there is a panel working on the first-year experience. The UPC has recommended funding for assessment activities such as, college facilitators for assessment, assessment workshops, assessment tests, information competency tests, and improving writing (including faculty development and a 1-day retreat).”

Chair Veregge said, “The theme enhancing academic quality also includes enhancing enrollment management. Some of the goals in this area include; developing a comprehensive enrollment management plan, advising, and enhanced graduation rates. These are topics that the Enrollment Management Panel has been working on very diligently throughout the spring and summer. Enrollment management includes implementing policies and procedures for recruitment, retention, and graduation. Recommendations to the RPB include, funding to study best practices in advising and student registration practices at other campuses. We are going to visit other campuses to find out how they register their students.”

Chair Veregge said, “Building community connections and the first-year experience fall under the theme of enriching the student experience, community and connections. A plan has been developed for the first-year student experience. Planning teams are being formed, so if anyone is interested we are still filling the advisory panels. Some of the recommendations to the RPB are funding for planning events for students, new positions to support student organizations, and a recommendation for an AVP of Student Services and Student Affairs. There has been a vacancy in Student Affairs for some time. They really need to be able to fill that vacancy to make their operation effective.”

Chair Veregge said, “Under the theme improving the campus work environment and infrastructure, Associated Students (AS) was willing to put up a lot of money to pay for a wireless network. This is something the students really wanted. The infrastructure panel recommended supplying some funds to augment this process. There is also a recommendation to refresh classroom information technology and for desktop support for Student Affairs.”

Chair Veregge said, “Moving along to strengthening community alliances, there are two recommendations. First, develop a comprehensive marketing plan, and second, find additional revenue sources.”

Senator Peter made a motion to extend the meeting for 5 additional minutes. The motion was seconded.

VIII. New Business – None

IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

A. VP for Student Affairs - VP Phillips said, “As President Kassing mentioned, the campus village is now open. Jerry Mimnaugh commented during a recent tour, that in a place where we tore down 3 red brick buildings that housed 600 students, we put up a group of buildings that house 2,200 students, and we have more green space. The housing for freshman is 100% full, and we have overflow into the existing red brick building. Upper class and Seniors housing is 77% full, we have 1,122 people occupying that structure. Joe West is empty, and we are leaving that for some refurbishing. So the student stage is about 71% full. That is somewhat short of our target. On the other hand, there are more than 2,200 students living on campus today, and that is an all time high for SJSU. We are very pleased with that.”

VP Phillips said, “There were some questions regarding Hurricane Katrina. We have 16 students from the gulf area that are attending classes on campus right now. In addition, we have made available 53 apartments in the Spartan Village that was decommissioned at the end of the summer as a temporary recovery center. In terms of donations, there is a Salvation Army truck on that site, and the residents at Spartan Village have first crack at donated items. Student Affairs also has a student emergency fund. We’ve had this fund available for years, and we made available grants of up to \$500 last year to 12 students.”

VP Phillips said, “There was also mention of the fact that we are forming a Student Experience Advisory Panel. We had a subcommittee that worked over the spring and summer, and we also held some forums. We would love to have more student representatives on the panel. I encourage you to get the forms from the Academic Senate, and to encourage your students to apply.”

B. AS President – moved to the next meeting.

C. Statewide Academic Senator(s) – moved to the next meeting.

D. Provost – moved to the next meeting.

E. VP for Administration and Finance – moved to the next meeting.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.