

2007/2008 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
September 24, 2007**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-eight Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Van Selst, Sabalius,
Gorman, Henderson,
Lessow- Hurley, Kassing

CASA Representatives:

Present: Fee, Kao, Schultz-Krohn, Canham
Absent: Hendrick

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Najjar, Sigler, Phillips
Absent: Lee

COB Representatives:

Present: Roldan, Jiang
Absent: Campsey

Deans:

Present: Parrish, Stacks, Merdinger,
Wei

ED Represent:

Present: Langdon, Rickford
Absent: Maldonado-Colon

Students:

Present: Reyes, Lazarowich,
McDaniel, Prothro-Jones,
Howes, Grabowski

ENG Representatives:

Present: Meldal, Backer, Gao

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Thompson

H&A Representatives:

Present: Van Hooff, Mok, Butler, Vanniarajan, Desalvo,
Brown

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Bros, McClory, Kaufman
Absent: Hilliard

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Romo, Sivertsen, Liu

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Hebert, Von Till, Zia

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes – Minutes of May 14, 2007 approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Lessow-Hurley made the following announcements:

The chair welcomed Senators to the first Senate meeting of Fall and our 150th Anniversary.

The chair announced that the Senate office has a new student assistant, Merim Suleimanova.

Please come by the Senate office and meet her.

The chair welcomed our newest Senators, Senators Desalvo and Mok. The Senate is delighted that Senator Desalvo has returned.

The chair thanked the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, who worked on making the Senate policy webpages accessible to disabled students over the summer.

The chair expressed the Senate's sadness at the loss of Dr. Irene Miura this summer. Dr. Miura was a Senate chair from 1993-1994.

The AVP of Faculty Affairs asked the chair to announce that we will be participating in a national awards competition sponsored by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation in collaboration with the American Council on Education. Six institutions will receive \$200,000 to enhance tenure and tenure-track faculty career flexibility. Our application involves a faculty survey that faculty will be receiving online. In order to qualify, we must have a 40% response rate. Please complete the survey using your official SJSU email address.

Several policies would be coming before the Senate at the October 22, 2007 meeting, including the timely ordering of textbooks.

Senator Van Selst participated in a group from SJSU that has crafted a white paper on advising. Students are demanding more coherent and reliable advising.

The Professional Standards Committee is working on peer evaluation. We have received contract language about online SOTES, and we have a special presentation today about them.

The Instruction and Student Affairs Committee will be working on a referral from the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD). The UCCD is asking the Senate to reconsider the scheduling policy to restore Monday/Wednesday/Friday classes. This would make maximum use of classroom space, alleviate traffic congestion, and bring the campus back to life on Fridays.

There is a lot of support on campus from new faculty and students regarding sustainability. Senators may be hearing more about this soon.

Rona Halualani, Special Assistant to the President for Strategic Planning has been gathering data to assess the strategic planning process and our outcomes to date. The Senate may have to revisit some university policies. This will probably happen sometime in 2008/2009.

Nominating petitions for the Faculty Representatives to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Presidential Selection Committee are available on the Senate website. Each college and the general unit elects one nominee. These nominees will then present their statements at the October 22, 2007 Senate meeting. The Senate will then elect two of these nominees to represent SJSU. If you are interested in serving please turn in your nominating petition by

September 28, 2007 to the Senate office.

There will be a discussion about the qualities we would like to see both in the faculty we choose to represent us to the Trustees, and in a new President at the Senate Retreat on October 12, 2007.

B. From the President of the University –

President Kassing said, “The first thing I’d like to talk about is this brochure VP Najjar is handing out. This goes back 20 years. Amy and I were on our way to a parents’ weekend to see our oldest son at Brown University. About five or six weeks prior to this weekend, our son called us and he was just extraordinarily intense about me going to the lectures being offered by the faculty on that Saturday. My reaction was, *Nah, I spend all day with those guys; I’d rather go see your campus, and the game against Harvard.* We talked to him maybe a week later, and he said, “Dad, I really want you to go to this lecture by this professor of mine, because he is really good.” So, I went to see the lecture, and it was one of the best things I did. The guy did an hour lecture on the colonization of Africa. I went back to Colorado and we instituted that idea at Western State College with some different topics than I saw at Brown. A couple of years ago I asked VP Najjar to help us to do this at SJSU. That is what this brochure is about. A couple of your colleagues that are sitting in this room are giving lectures, such as Senators Kaufman and Parrish. I encourage you to attend them.”

President Kassing said, “VP Phillips just gave us an update on enrollment. Our Fall enrollment headcount is up 2,343 students, or a 7.9% increase. This is the biggest increase we have ever had. The in-state residents are up 7.1%, the out-of-state U.S. residents are up 23%, and the international student population is up 20%. The FTE for Fall is up 2,010, an increase of 8.6% over a year ago. Last year in the fall, spring, and summer, VP Phillips, the Provost, and I talked about what kind of target enrollment increase we’d like to see. We came up with 2 ½ to 3%, possibly 4%. When these numbers came out I turned to these guys and said, “*What’s wrong with you guys, don’t you understand 4?*” We are trying to figure out what to do about it, why it happened, and how it happened. We are also going to survey the students to see what’s going on. We are also going to start looking at our capacity and see where we’ve created stress. This was a good job by everyone involved.”

President Kassing said, “A couple of announcements I’d like to make. First, I’d like to encourage you to get involved in the campus reading program. Our campus value for this year is community. I’m lucky enough to work with Annette Nellen, and she has put together the reading group for this year and the topic is community.

The Provost will tell you that we are dead serious on following-up on the WASC recommendations. Help us do that.

Rona Halualani will be leading an effort we are labeling an exclusive excellence master plan. Those conversations will begin over the next five or six weeks.

The last two things I would mention are that at the Trustee meeting last week, there were several interesting topics. We were lucky enough to be invited to do a presentation on

undergraduate and graduate research. Emily Allen, from the College of Engineering, is doing some fascinating work on nanotechnology, and she brought two of her graduate students to do a presentation to the board. At the same time, Long Beach State did the same thing with its Aerospace Engineering program. Emily was outstanding, as were her students.”

President Kassing welcomed Gwendolyn Mok to the Senate. President Kassing said, “I got to see Gwendolyn play at the 150th Symphony last March. She is unbelievable.”

Questions:

Senator Sabalius said, “Of course we are happy we’ve increased the enrollment by 8%, but I recall that we were supposed to grow by no less and no more than 2% because we wouldn’t get any more money for enrollment growth. How is this 8% enrollment growth seen and accounted for by the Chancellor’s office?” President Kassing said, “Well, you are referencing a set of conditions a couple of years ago where you were asked to hit your target, and if you went under the target by more than 2% you could expect to have your budget cut. The current CSU system-wide strategy is that they make an argument through the budget for 2 ½% growth for the whole system. The distribution of that 2 ½% varies by campus, because some campuses are struggling for growth, and others are growing at a faster rate. There is a distribution of that 2 ½% growth money to the campuses in a proportion to their growth. There have been several campuses that haven’t met their target and their budgets were cut, such as Monterey Bay, Stanislaus, Hayward, and Humboldt. This creates a real hardship for them. If you make a target, you need to hit your target. Over the last eight years, we have grown by about 2.7% on the average. Some years we’ve grown by 3%, and some years by 1 ½%. We’ve grown way over the target and that creates a problem for us, because we’ll get funded on the CSU side, but not on the state side for a good portion of that growth. In our budget process, VP Lee, the Provost, and AVP Nance anticipated a higher target and set aside some one-time money to be sure we were okay on the academic side. We’re not sure we set aside enough, and we are going to be looking at that over the next couple of weeks to be sure we set aside enough for spring. I personally think we will be able to.”

Senator Peter said, “To summarize that then are you saying we grew by 8%, but our overall budget did not go up by 8%?” President Kassing said, “Actually, our overall budget did go up by 8%, but the enrollment growth was at 2 ½%. There is a strategy underneath this to go over your target some to get more enrollment growth money the next cycle, but the challenge for us is to find where we can do that and still address the capacity issues. A number of the campuses have sought approval at the Trustee level to have their cap raised. Our cap is 25,000 FTES. We think we will be at 25,800 or 25,900 for Spring. That cap is supposed to be a function of a set of statistics about your physical capacity. We just went 800 over that so I’m not sure what that is supposed to mean.”

Senator Peter said, “So, if this happened again then we’d be sort of in the San Diego State position, where we’d be considered an impacted university and would have to start limiting admissions?” President Kassing said, “I think that is a scenario that could occur. I’d not like

to get there, at least not on my watch.” Senator Peter said, “Probably won’t, but another 8% and we probably could.” President Kassing said, “We take control of that in the next cycle by our admissions base. If we grew another 8% there would be some real stress. What we’ve kicked around is the idea of making strong arguments for the system to get a portion of the growth we had this year beyond the formula. The debate we are having is whether we should try to grow a little next year to keep some momentum going, or just stay where we are. This is the kind of discussion we are having, and you can’t do that without discussing the capacity issue. We are thinking about this stuff hard.”

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

June 18, 2007 – Provost Sigler said there was an error in number 9d. The sentence should read, “The Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC) will be moving from under the Student Affairs Division to become part of Undergraduate Studies.”

August 14, 2007 – No Comment

August 27, 2007 – No Comment

September 10, 2007 – No Comment

B. Consent Calendar – Approved with one addition from AVC McClory.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Helen Stevens, Director, International Programs and Services, presented *AS 1364, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting International Week, October 28 – November 2, 2007 (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1364 passed unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. University Library Board (ULB) – No report.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Bros said, “Professional Standards will be working on Peer Review of Teaching. What has happened is that the Peer Review process has got a lot less weight than the SOTES do. Faculty put a lot of energy into going into classes and making comments to their colleagues, but with very little value in the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) process. One of the charges of the PS Committee is to try and look at this and see if we can come up with a better way to do this. One of the major issues is what kind of criteria you use to evaluate faculty. At the upcoming Senate Retreat on October 12, 2007, we would like to try and come to some kind of consensus about what the criteria are for this university. What you should be thinking about is that the criteria should be gentle enough to apply to any department on our campus, but we don’t want them to be too specific. The

idea is to develop the general criteria that can be customized by the department.”

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1366, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Commending the IRB Task Force (Final Reading)*. Senator Kaufman made a correction to the resolution to add Bill Coker, a Student Representative, to the members to be commended. Senator Buzanski commented that the resolution couldn’t be a final reading without the information normally at the bottom, e.g. Approved, Vote, Absent, Present, and Financial Impact. Senator Kaufman said, “The version I sent to Eva did not have this information, but I have the final version and will read it out loud.” Senator Kaufman read the information to the Senate. **The Senate then voted and AS 1366 passed unanimously.**

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –

Senator Backer presented *AS 1365, Policy Recommendation, Senate Vacancies (First Reading)*. Senator Backer said, “This resolution was sent back to the O&G committee for rework in the spring. This is the first reading of the latest version. Hopefully, we have resolved the issues we had. Bylaw 1.6 deals with how Senators are replaced when there is a vacancy. The problem is that there is no differentiation between how temporary vacancies of one semester or less, and permanent vacancies are filled. The purpose of this policy is to make it easier and faster to fill temporary vacancies of one semester or less, and to fill permanent vacancies that occur in January or February during the general election. This way there isn’t a special election and general election going on at the same time.”

Senator Backer said, “A couple of suggestions have already been made. One is under 1.6.1.a. It was pointed out that not all colleges call their council of chairs the council of chairs. The suggestion was to change this to say “chosen by the chairs of that college.” Also, in 1.6.2.d., I left out a word in the first sentence before, “shall hold the seat for the remainder of the academic year,” it should read, “the Senator shall hold the seat for the remainder of the academic year.” Senator Stacks suggested that a change be made to say “chosen by the chairs and directors of that college.” Senator Norton commented, “Directors are defined in our policy as chairs, so you don’t have to use both words, but you can if you want to.”

Senator Van Selst commented that there were procedures for CSU Statewide Senators that were different, and we don’t want our bylaws to conflict with this. Senator Backer noted that O&G had not changed any of the existing parts of the bylaw, but had only added “d” to bylaw 1.6.2. Senator Norton commented that O&G would review the bylaw for clarity on this issue.

E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –

Senator Sivertsen commented that I&SA is working on a number of issues, including the timely ordering of textbooks, the Class Scheduling policy, Textbook Affordability, and Academic Renewal.

VII. Special Committee Reports – None

VIII. New Business –

A. Presentation on online SOTES by Dr. Nira Hativa:

Chair Lessow-Hurley said, “Dr. Nira Hativa from Tel Aviv University was here last spring to share her expertise on online SOTES. She has kindly consented to join us today for another presentation. Dr. Hativa has Baccalaureate degree in Science, a Masters degree in Science and Mathematics from Israel, and a Ph.D. in Mathematics Education from Stanford. She is a full professor in the School of Education at Tel Aviv University, and has served as head of the department there. Her academic area has been effective teaching in higher education. She is in her fourth year as head of the Tel Aviv University Center for the Advancement of Teaching, which manages their online SOTES. She is also a Senate member at Tel Aviv University. Their Senate has 120 members. We are delighted to have her here today.”

Dr Hativa said, “It is a pleasure to speak to another Senate. I’ll try to talk fast.

What are the advantages of online SOTES? More and more institutions in the U.S. are moving towards online SOTES. Studies have shown that student written responses are longer, more elaborate, and more intelligible when done online than on paper. Online SOTES also reduce chances for error, save paper, time, money, and manpower. In addition, we are able to get the results of the online SOTES to the departments within two days at my university. It is a very efficient way of doing SOTES.

What are the advantages of paper SOTES? With online SOTES, students lose their outside class time. In addition, online SOTES may result in lower participation. However, at Tel Aviv University the percent of response did not change. It is also very smooth and easy to operate at our university.

At Tel Aviv University we evaluate 600 courses every semester. This is the first year of online SOTES for us. There are two types of evaluations we do, formative and summative. Formative evaluations are usually done about halfway through a course. If you want information about how you are teaching, you have it done during the semester. Summative evaluations are done at the end of the semester for decision-making purposes, such as continued employment, promotions, and to help instructors overcome problems in teaching, etc. Our surveys take place during the last three weeks of the semester. Our semesters are 14 weeks long.

What are the faculty concerns about online SOTES at SJSU? Faculty concerns include whether the results are valid and reliable, whether access is secure, and what to do about open comments. SOTES evaluate what students think about teachers. The big question is whether there is any relationship between students’ opinions about teaching and what they learn. Students, on the average, evaluate teachers high if they feel they learn from them. Studies show almost no correlation between course grade and teacher rating. Studies also show almost no correlation between course difficulty and teacher rating. There are also hundreds of studies in the U.S. that show that SOTES are not affected by irrelevant information, such as the gender, age, academic rank of the instructor, as well as whether the instructor is famous, and the time of day the course is taught.

However, studies do show a high correlation between good teaching and teacher rating. Good teaching includes instructor clarity, an interesting class, and relationship of teacher to the student. The other factor that affects SOTES is large classes. Instructors with smaller classes are rated higher on the average. Also, better performing students rate teachers higher than poorer performing students. In addition, classes that are sequential or hierarchical, such as mathematics or chemistry, are rated lower than other classes.

At the Tel Aviv University, we rate all of our courses. Courses with less than a 40% response rate are not used for decision-making. Also, for some reason, we get more responses in winter than spring.

Many studies have shown that when you go from paper SOTES to online SOTES, faculty ratings are not affected. However, at my university faculty ratings were affected. At Tel Aviv ratings are on a scale of 1 to 7. On the average, ratings dropped ½ point. However, if the ratings go down, they go down for everybody.

SJSU faculty also had concerns about being able to access the ratings online. We have had no technical problems with this at Tel Aviv University. Also, SJSU faculty had concerns about who could access the information. We give out “permissions” for access to ratings at different levels.

Another concern SJSU faculty had was when summative evaluations would be done. We do them in the middle of the semester, and we do not do them online. This is because not many people need them. Faculty at SJSU were also concerned that not all factors would be taken into consideration, such as the lower ratings for hierarchical/sequential classes. This really is a matter of educating the administrators.”

B. Motion from the Floor:

Senator Sabalius presented a motion from the floor, *Sense of the Senate Resolution, Opposition to Professional Fee for Graduate Business Degrees in the CSU (First Reading)*. Senator Sabalius said, “At the last CSU Statewide Academic Senate meeting, many Senators were surprised that an agenda information item for the Board of Trustees was a professional fee for MBA degrees in the CSU. This will come to the Board of Trustees in January as an action item. Many Senators were caught by surprise, but then we heard that this had been in the works for two years. However, it was only discussed among Business faculty, deans, administrators, and the Chancellor’s office. We discussed this in various committees and there is almost unanimous opposition to this. We came up with a compromise resolution that called for greater consultation before such a fee is discussed in earnest and acted upon by the Board of Trustees. We called for statewide consultation, consultation across the disciplines, and student organization consultation. On Thursday I got the response from Vice Chancellor Reichard to the resolution. His response was somewhat dismissive. He pointed out some inaccuracies, which kind of stresses the lack of information that we all had about this issue. I talked to the dean of my college about it, and he was not aware this was going on. I talked to other chairs and colleagues, and some had heard about it, while others had not. What I’d like is for our Senate to speak in opposition to that fee. The idea is to institute a graduate fee of \$210 per semester unit for MBA students. There are some good reasons that the Business faculty want this increase, such as their inability to hire and

retain qualified faculty, they are in danger of losing their international accreditation, and they need more funds to maintain the excellence of their program. However, these are problems that all of the disciplines face. This fee would create a multi-tier system of affluent programs versus those programs that don't see themselves able to raise additional fees. There is an implicit solidarity on campus that we aren't a competing field of disciplines, but that we are a comprehensive institution where we cherish and value all disciplines. Certainly there would be a breakdown in solidarity. And, if Business succeeds in doing this, then other disciplines will approach the Chancellor and Board of Trustees with similar issues and you will have a perennial flow of lobbyists going to the Board of Trustees to increase their fees. In addition, this would be yet another step where the financial burden that the state should have in providing sufficient funds for excellent education is again shifted to the students. Finally, there was no widespread consultation across the system and across disciplines."

Questions:

Senator Buzanski said, "You mentioned that this might be referred to a Senate committee. I think the I&SA Committee would be the proper committee. What you have presented here is just the tip of the iceberg. We have been told very recently that in order to be able to finance the self-standing doctorate in education degree, students will be paying the University of California fees. These fees are something along the order of \$210 additional per unit, or over \$2,000 additional per semester. Therefore, your resolution is only one small part in the direction in which the CSU is now going. I think if there is going to be any merit to what you are trying to do, that it should be broadened to look at this entire situation whereby the state of California is renegeing on its obligation to educate the students of the state of California at state expense."

Senator Sabalius replied, "Thank you for your comments Senator. However, if we were to broaden this resolution as you have said, it would become an idealistic document that probably defends some part of the master plan of the California Higher Education Act. This resolution is a targeted response to one of the developments that you have cited. I caution the committee it is referred to not to broaden it so much that it becomes so general that people either accept it and do nothing about it, or vote it down because it is too general, but thank you very much."

Senator Stacks said, "Thank you for putting this together. I also was encouraged by your interest in having this go to a committee, but in contrast to Senator Buzanski, I ask that you consider sending it to C&R. I was wondering why you decided to include the first Resolved clause?" Senator Sabalius said, "The resolution that the Academic Senate Statewide brought to the plenary was already a compromised resolution. The majority of the Senate was clearly against it, but we did not want to alienate our colleagues and fellow Senators who were in Business by proposing a very divisive resolution. We thought that with an increased consultation process, we could at least delay the implementation or the appearance of that as an action item for the Board of Trustees. That was the strategy behind it. Now, Senator Van Selst and I have had numerous emails and he is not necessarily in favor of this resolution. We debated whether I should be more compromising in that resolution, but I did not want to do that. We have 23 campuses, and the Business faculty have put forth a very forceful and aggressive plan to finance their own discipline. I think rather than working out a compromise among ourselves, what I wanted to do was give the Chancellor and Board of Trustees an opposing voice. I wanted

to say look this is in a way very selfish, and we are all struggling. We are all in this together. I think the Schools of Business are very worried about losing their international accreditation, which is very worrisome for the CSU and the students, but in a way I see an advantage in it. If it happens to the School of Business, then people will not sit idly by and let this happen. Imagine if this happened to disciplines such as Archeology or Social Sciences, they don't have the muscle or force and it wouldn't create such public or media outrage if they lost their accreditation. Now if Business is in that danger, and if Business finds its own individual solution, then again we have those disciplines that have muscle that fend for themselves and get by fine, and other disciplines that fall by the wayside. We all should stick together. As a university, we should jointly approach the legislature about losing our accreditation."

Senator Gorman said, "I am also a CSU Statewide Senator and I support the resolution. I sit on the Academic Affairs Committee of the CSU Statewide Academic Senate, and I can attest that the majority of people on that committee likewise were taken aback by that resolution. And, as Senator Sabalius said, in a spirit of collegiality wanted to support their Business colleagues, but many felt broadsided by this. There were arguments that this was a done deal. Well, if you go along with this, then it is a done deal. Also, where are these funds going to go? I understand that because of the contract this money can't be used for salaries, so where is this money going to go?"

Senator Hebert said, "In your 2nd Whereas clause and then the 2nd line of the 1st Resolved clause, it sounds like we would only impose this during times of rising fees for students. It kind of would imply that if student fees were stable we would not be concerned about our position."

Senator Sabalius said, "I did not want to draft a resolution telling the Board of Trustees to never do this, but if you do it debate it, and debate it with us, and this is not the right time for it."

Senator Van Selst said, "First of all, given that the CSU Statewide Senate's notification of this was as an information item for the Board of Trustees, this was actually a failure of consultation. It does lead to a two-tier system. Right now the CSU draws its resources from three sources. There are public funds, private funds, and student fees. The MBA fees are largely corporate. If there is a consideration that the fees that are charged are available for financial aid to protect the breadth and diversity of our MBA program students, then the MBA fee could be a nice way to tap private funds. For that reason, even though I seconded the resolution, I am not in favor of it."

Senator Peter said, "Where did the \$210 per semester unit come from? Would that be the differential between UC and us? Where did that number come from?" Senator Van Selst said, "From a staff report." Senator Peter said, "How did they justify that particular number?" President Kassing said, "My understanding is that it came out of some kind of a competitive analysis to other public universities with differential fees."

Senator Henderson said, "Why wasn't there any consultation?" Senator Sabalius said, "The CSU Statewide Academic Senate would like to know that as well."

Senator Sabalius said, “One of the lead arguments was that within four or five years of graduation, the average salary an MBA student would make would be \$165,000. Therefore, it would be an investment that would generously pay off. The hope is that mostly companies will pick up the fees, so this would be a way to tap the corporations. And, while this money may not be applied directly to salaries, it could be applied as assigned time, or for more money for research and travel for Business faculty. This would attract and retain higher quality faculty.”

Debate:

Senator Stacks made a motion to refer the resolution to the C&R Committee. The motion was seconded. Senator Peter made a friendly amendment to the Stacks motion to add a date that the C&R committee should report back to the Senate. The Senate decided C&R should report back to the Senate no later than the November 19, 2007 meeting for a second reading. Senator Buzanski proposed a friendly amendment to have the resolution referred to I&SA in addition to C&R. The proposed amendment was not friendly to the body. **The Senate voted and the Stacks motion was approved.**

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

A. Statewide Academic Senators –

Senator Sabalius said, “I will forward the Business fee resolution, along with the report that went to the task force, the reference to the statewide resolution, and the response by the Vice Chancellor to the entire Senate for review. It would also be nice if the resolution could possibly come before the Senate at the October 22, 2007 Senate meeting, because one of the ideas is to send this to other CSU Senates.”

Senator Van Selst said some of the issues the CSU Statewide Senate is looking at include: access to excellence, the voluntary system of accountability, the remediation report, the Institute for Teaching and Learning, the Business MBA fee, the Drop/Withdrawal/Renewals task force report, the Textbook Affordability report, general education implementation across campuses, and the lower division transfer project.

Senator Gorman said, “I have been appointed to the Commission of Extended Education, and it is likely there is going to be a resolution calling for the resurrection of a Senate subcommittee on International and Global Studies.”

B. Provost –

Provost Sigler said, “Welcome back. I have been urging you to cooperate with the university’s accreditation effort and you have. I’d like to thank you. It is wonderful to have received accreditation, and also not to have that at the top of my to do list. At the top of my to do list now is student retention and graduation. The major initiative in Academic Affairs this year is going to be looking at our retention and graduation rates, and to look at what strategies we can use to improve them. We can do better. By the end of the year, we hope to have identified strategies for improvement. Another item that will continue to be on our agenda this year is the accessible technology issue. We were

successful in redoing our top administrative webpages and we have developed guidelines for the rest of you for your webpages. This is a long-term effort, but for 2007/2008 instructional materials will be the number one item on the agenda. I am also pleased to tell you that we have hired 54 new faculty members.”

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No report.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Phillips said, “It is wonderful news that we have increased enrollment as much as we have, on the other hand we now need to do some planning. We are engaged in such planning right now, and will continue to do so over the next few weeks. Also, there have been a number of burglaries of laptops recently. I would encourage you not to leave your laptops in your office. This is not just happening at our campus however, the University Police Department (UPD) does not have any solid leads at the moment. Please be vigilant. On a happy note, we have been working very hard on the Student Center Facility project over the summer. We have visited some facilities in Washington, and plan on visiting some more. We hope to go out for bids for architectural work sometime in December. Work is also proceeding on the Student Health Center facility.”

E. Associated Students President –

Senator Henderson said, “We are working over the time, place, and manner right now. We are also working on a resolution to address advising for students with disabilities. In addition, we are working on a survey for faculty and staff to evaluate the current level of involvement in the Spartan community. We are also working on creating the position of Director of Environmental Affairs.

I’d like to give a special thank you to Senator Howes, this will be her last Academic Senate meeting.”

F. Vice President for University Advancement -

VP Najjar said, “Just a couple of comments. Our fundraising numbers continue to be wonderful. Over the past three years, we have raised over \$100 million for SJSU. It took us over 13 years to raise that amount in the past.

Also, we have now got a publication that shows the different kinds of endowments we have on campus. In addition, we will have a donor honor roll that goes out to everyone that has donated even \$1.

We have recently revamped our Washington Square magazine, and I’d like to thank Sylvia Light for her efforts.

I also wanted to mention that Senator Sivertsen said years ago that one of the things we don’t do at this university is ask you for money, so I’m asking all of you for money right now. Also, ask other people around you to donate.”

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.