

2009/2010 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
September 21, 2009**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:09 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Kaufman, Lessow-Hurley,
Whitmore, Baker,
Sabalius, Van Selst, Meldal

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Phillips, Selter
Absent: Lee, Najjar

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Roldan, Jiang

Deans:

Present: Parrish, Merdinger, Stacks,
Bullock

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Smith

Students:

Present: Levy, Armendariz, Montross,
Orr, Pulu, Gonzales

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Du, Backer

Alumni Representative:

Present: Sheryl Walters for
Melissa Ferguson

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Van Hooff,
Absent: Butler, Desalvo

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: d'Alarcao, Williams
Absent: McClory, McGee, Silber

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

SOS Representatives:

Present: Von Till, Heiden, Ng
Absent: Lee

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Fujimoto, Sivertsen, Li

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of May 11, 2009, Last meeting of 2008-2009, were approved as is.
The minutes of May 11, 2009, First meeting of 2009-2010, were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kaufman welcomed everyone back for Fall 2009.

Chair Kaufman read several emails relating to the state budget cuts and furloughs from students and faculty. One student wrote that all his classes had been dropped while he was waiting for financial aid. The student said that the fee increase coupled with the lack of a

CAL Grant had made it impossible for him to attend SJSU this year. A faculty member emailed the chair of the Senate that a parent had called him irate that his daughter couldn't get an add code for his class. Last, a staff member from Student Services wrote that he/she had spent his/her entire career helping students get into SJSU, and now was being forced to tell students that if they did not get their fees or paperwork in on time, they would be dropped. Chair Kaufman said, "In this environment it is easy to get absorbed in statistics, targets, and the like, and I just wanted to take this minute to remind people that we are talking about individuals here. Now more than ever, the work of the Senate is of utmost importance."

Chair Kaufman thanked everyone for agreeing to serve on the Senate this year, and welcomed all the new Senators (Correia, Jiang, Lin, Ng, Silber, Smith, Williams, Baker, Bullock, Armendariz, Gonzales, Montross, Orr, Pulu, and Ferguson).

Chair Kaufman recognized Eva Joice, the Senate Administrator, for her efforts to keep the Senate running this year even with furloughs and the lack of funds to hire a student assistant. Chair Kaufman announced that all paperwork would need to be given to Eva as early as possible to give her some processing time.

Chair Kaufman presented some of his goals for the 2009/2010 Senate.

- To ensure the integrity of the curriculum, specifically, making sure curricular changes occur for curricular reasons and not for budgetary reasons.
- Insist on budget transparency.
- Respond to mandates from the Chancellor's Office in ways that protect Academic Freedom and acknowledge budget realities.
- Work with the President's Office to incorporate sustainability into the campus.
- Examine burdensome policies, and eliminate committees that are no longer needed.
- Postpone policies that prevent us from focusing on our core mission.

Chair Kaufman reminded Senators that part of their role as Senators was to communicate information from the Senate meetings back to their constituencies, and to bring forward ideas/comments from their constituencies to the Senate.

Chair Kaufman announced that the Senate Retreat was scheduled for October 23, 2009, a Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the University Room. The theme will be sustainability. Vice Chair Von Till commented that it was a very important topic and urged Senators to attend. Please RSVP to Eva by phone or email if you can attend.

Chair Kaufman announced that "Students for a Quality Education" are organizing a rally for tomorrow, September 22, 2009, by the campus village. There will be a march followed by a barbeque for anyone that would like to attend.

Chair Kaufman welcomed back Past Chair Sigurd Meldal.

B. From the President of the University –

President Whitmore made the following announcements:

The President will be going to the CSU Trustees' meeting tomorrow, and will have more information to provide afterwards.

During the Town Hall meetings, the President was asked if SJSU will have furloughs next year. Each of the unions would have to approve furloughs for the new year. It is not an automatic thing. The other question the President has been asked is whether there will be layoffs next year. The President stated that it is highly likely that there will be some layoffs next year. \$18 million must be permanently cut from SJSU's budget. Attrition and retirements will take care of some of the \$18 million, but not all of it. Layoffs would be handled differently based on the individual union contracts. The President commented that questions and answers from the Town Hall meetings would be put on his web site.

The Provost search is moving along. There are a lot of candidates and the committee has begun the initial process of screening the candidates.

Questions:

Senator Lessow-Hurley commented that there is a website for the Provost Search and it is located at <http://www.sjsu.edu/president/provost>. Senator Lessow-Hurley also commented that San Francisco has been asking for donations of between \$5,000 and \$7,000 to support a course section, and asked whether the President had any plans for this kind of fundraising at SJSU? President Whitmore responded that he had not been planning on it, but he could look into it. However, the President was curious to see how many course sections were actually funded this way, and thought it might be only a few. Senator Lessow-Hurley then asked if there was any reason why faculty could not park in "R" permit spaces on days when the staff/administrators were on furlough, but the faculty were working. The President didn't know, but said he would ask about it.

Senator Sabalius wanted to know if spring faculty furlough days would be handled by the same process used this semester, and whether the spring 2010 furlough dates had already been chosen. President Whitmore responded that the spring 2010 furlough dates had already been chosen and were on one of the calendars on the website, and that he believed furloughs would be handled using the same process for spring 2010 as had been used for fall 2009. Senator Sabalius also wanted to know how soon faculty could select their furlough days for spring 2010. The President referred the question to the Provost. Provost Selter commented that faculty could start planning their individual furlough days now, if they know their schedule.

Senator Smith commented that K-12 reports have indicated that furlough days don't save as much money as anticipated and wanted to know what the true savings were at SJSU. President Whitmore responded that the \$18 million had been pulled out of the budget and it was gone. Provost Selter further commented that all the money that was saved from our

salaries was used to hire a large cohort of lecturers this year.

Senator Levy wanted to know if the Town Hall meetings had been taped and whether the tapes would be put on the website. President Whitmore commented that he would ask communications personnel. Larry Carr commented that the information would be posted soon.

Senator Van Hooff wanted to know why most of the furlough days were on Fridays. President Whitmore responded that it was thought that having the furloughs on Fridays would save the most money, since there are very few classes on Fridays. However, Friday classes are still being allowed, except for this summer when no classes will be held on Fridays in order to close down buildings.

Senator Stacks clarified that she believed what Senator Smith was asking was whether the closing of the campus entirely on furlough days allowed us to save money. President Whitmore responded that it saves thousands of dollars. The President did not have the exact amount saved, but commented that it was substantial due to savings from not running the heating and cooling systems, etc.

Senator Baker wanted to know why some CSU campuses were able to take a whole week of furloughs, such as a week at Thanksgiving that gives students a longer vacation, while we were not able to do so at SJSU. President Whitmore explained that there were a lot of restrictions, such as not being able to furlough too many days in a row because employees could apply for unemployment insurance. However, the President noted that he had tried to get the whole week at Spring Break as furlough days and that, in fact, he had submitted 3 different plans, all of which were denied. The President indicated that there may be differences in requirements between semester and quarter systems, and this could account for some differences in scheduling.

Senator Pulu wanted to know why some students are still having classes on Tuesday, September 22, 2009, when all faculty are on furlough that day. The President referred Senator Pulu to Senator Merdinger. Senator Merdinger commented that some classes may be taught by teaching assistants, and that teaching assistants are covered by the United Auto Workers Union. The United Auto Workers Union is not part of the furlough program. Therefore, that could be the reason some classes are still being taught.

Senator Van Selst commented that the priority application date for graduate admissions is now November 30th, and he was hoping for some relief from that deadline. President Whitmore responded that he only knew about the issue in general, but would look into it if Senator Van Selst would send him an email with his specific concerns. Senator Phillips responded that there are separately negotiated dates for graduate applications. However, if Senator Van Selst will send an email to Senator Stacks, Senator Phillips, and Senator Whitmore they will all look into it.

Senator Heiden wanted to know if this meant that all applications for graduate admission had to be received by November 30th. Senator Van Selst replied that the implication is that if you

do not apply by November 30th you will not get in, and that this cutoff is much earlier than in the past. Senator Backer commented that the web site states that the deadline for graduate admissions is to be determined. Senator Phillips provided the following clarification. “The priority application deadline is a specific term that the CSU uses for all applications, but is not necessarily the date that has to be used by any particular campus for any particular program. This campus before the Fall 2009 admission cycle never used November 30th, which has always been the priority application deadline, even as the deadline for undergraduate students. It was used for Fall 2009 and will be used for Fall 2010 for undergraduate applications, but that terminology has always been in use. That does not mean that each campus and each program has to use that date.” Senator Van Selst responded that the implication from the CSU Statewide Senate is that that is going to be the drop dead deadline. President Whitmore again asked Senator Van Selst to send an email and he would put together a team to look into this in the next few days.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

May 11, 2009 – No questions.

June 25, 2009 – No questions.

July 23, 2009 – Senator Stacks commented that 4B refers to 600 students as being super seniors and she thought the number was closer to 5,000. Senator Phillips commented that there were 5,000 that had more than 120 units altogether. Senator Gleixner commented that when referring to these 3 groups, if you take out all the groups of majors that require more than 120 units that number goes way down and that might be the difference.

August 24, 2009 – Senator Stacks stated that in item number 9, 4th line, she thought it should say “admissions” rather than “enrollment.” Chair Kaufman said the minutes would be changed.

September 14, 2009 – Senator Buzanski asked for clarification about the Provost Search. Chair Kaufman responded that all information pertaining to the Provost search was on the website at <http://www.sjsu.edu/president/provost>. Senator Buzanski also asked for clarification as to what was meant by a “serialized faculty member” in item number 4. Provost Selter explained that he had always used that term for tenure and tenure-track faculty as opposed to lecturers or temporary faculty.

B. Consent Calendar – Chair Kaufman commented that Arlando Smith and Joshua Levy should be added to the consent calendar for the Organization and Government Committee. A motion was made to approve the consent calendar. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as amended.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1420, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Preservation of Core Academic Activities (Final Reading)*. Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change the 2nd Whereas clause to read, “Such pressures will be felt in both academic and non-academic activities of the university; and.” Senator Sabalius presented a friendly amendment to add a new first Resolved clause to read, “Resolved: That the San José State University Academic Senate deplores the cutting of the RSCA funds by the CSU system, and be it further.” Senator Lessow-Hurley presented a friendly amendment to change the last Resolved clause to read, “Resolved: That the San José State University Academic Senate encourage the Provost/VP for Academic Affairs to continue support for the fundamental components of university success and educational quality.” Senator Fee presented an amendment to eliminate “the fundamental components” in the last Resolved clause. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Fee amendment failed. Senator Van Hooff presented a friendly amendment to change the “e” in “Jose” in the last resolved clause to “é.” Senator Buzanski made a motion to call the question. The Senate voted on the Buzanski motion and it passed. **The Senate then voted on AS 1420 as amended and the resolution passed with 1 Nay and 1 Abstention.**

Review/Approval of the Revised 2009/2010 Academic Senate Calendar due to Furlough Dates. Senator Sabalius argued that a 10% cut in salary should result in a 10% reduction in workload, and therefore the Senate meetings on furlough days should be cancelled. Senator Lessow-Hurley argued for the revised calendar and commented that there were other opportunities to take furlough time, and that as a body, the Senate needed to have its voice heard. Senator Buzanski argued for the revised calendar and commented that as a democratic body, when the full Senate does not meet, the Executive Committee acts in its place depriving the Senate. Senator Meldal argued that co-governance was a vital part of the institution, and was especially important at this time. Senator Backer argued against the revised calendar and commented that one consequence of furloughs is that activities won’t happen. Senator Smith argued against the revised calendar and commented that after many years in the K-12 system and watching cut after cut, he had found that people continue to do the same amount of work for less because they don’t want to hurt the students. However, we are continually being asked to do more with less. Senator Stacks suggested a compromise and commented that since we were getting a 10% pay cut, we could cut 10% of the Senate meetings, which would amount to one Senate meeting instead of two. Senator Norton argued in support of the revised calendar and commented that the Senate does not have many chances to have its voice heard and that cancelling these Senate meetings limits the opportunities for the Senate to express itself. Senator Van Selst argued in support of the revised calendar and commented that for the last 4 months there has not been a Faculty Trustee present at Board of Trustees meetings and this has had a negative impact. Senator Van Selst further commented that if we abstain from our responsibilities as the highest body of faculty representation at the university, we are not doing ourselves any favors. Senator Von Till argued in support of the revised calendar but commented that if we were to eliminate just one meeting, then she would recommend the October 12th meeting, because the Spring semester is very busy. Senator Baker argued in support of the revised calendar and commented that the faculty should be here for the students, and that this was one of the opportunities to show their support. **The Senate voted and the revised calendar was**

approved with 5 Nays and 1 Abstention.

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) – No report.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No report.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) - No report.

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

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1421, Policy Recommendation, Scheduling of Advance Registration and Priority Registration (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Senator Van Selst commented that it says that the workload will be reduced, and that he could not imagine that. Senator Gleixner responded that this policy came out of the Student Success Committee that is responsible for the review of the priority registration packets. The Student Success Committee spent a lot of time debating this. The thought was that the categories in the original policy were very vague, and Student Success spent a lot of time debating them. However, by firming up the vagueness in the categories, Student Success felt it would reduce their workload. Senator Van Selst commented that it was his understanding that many of the priority registration groups had not changed over the years, and that this policy would require them to resubmit an application every fall. Certainly, this would be an increase in workload overall. Senator Gleixner responded that the policy Senator Van Selst was referring to was actually passed last spring, and all groups are required to resubmit their applications for priority registration.

Senator Van Hooff commented that on the second page it refers to 2nd Baccalaureates, and that she thought that 2nd Baccalaureates had been cancelled. Senator Gleixner responded that while we are not admitting 2nd Baccalaureate students, there are still 2nd Baccalaureate students on campus.

Senator Backer wanted to know why the committee didn't set any standards in 3.2. Senator Gleixner responded that in the original policy, F97-1, all groups had to resubmit applications every 5 years. The Student Success Committee felt a shorter time was necessary for some groups, whereas a longer time frame was needed for others. Senator Backer expressed concern that without some specific guidelines, it might be difficult for the Student Success Committee of the future to determine which groups should have to submit their requests sooner, and which groups could wait longer.

Senator Parrish was curious about section 1.1., and wanted to know why graduate students got priority over seniors. Senator Gleixner replied that the Instruction and Student Affairs

Committee had debated this, but did not feel that it was critical because the overlap in coursework was minimal.

Senator Heiden asked if 2nd baccalaureate students were above seniors. Senator Gleixner said they were above juniors, but behind seniors. Senator Heiden explained that what she meant was that by placing 2nd baccalaureate students ahead of juniors, we would be delaying juniors getting to be seniors and thus delay their graduation. Senator Gleixner replied that this was another issue they debated a lot, but in the end decided to leave it as it is in the current policy. The issue is that 2nd baccalaureate students are always identified as 2nd baccalaureate students. They never move into other categories such as juniors and seniors, so they might never finish up. Senator Heiden wanted to know if these students could be identified as 2nd baccalaureate juniors, and seniors. Senator Gleixner responded that they are currently not identified this way in peoplesoft.

Senator Van Selst wanted to know if non-NCAA athletes are included in category B. Senator Gleixner responded that category D includes all athletes.

VII. Special Committee Reports – No reports

VIII. New Business – No reports

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

A. Provost –

Provost Selter thanked the faculty, department chairs, and deans for working hard to manage our enrollment. When the Provost took over in August, he did not know if we were going to have furloughs, or how we were going to deal with the \$42 million decrease in funding. What the Provost did know was that the Chancellor had taken a stand, and said that if our funding was decreased we would have to reduce the number of students we could teach to what we got funding for. Last year we were 12% over our enrollment target. This year we were told that for every FTE that we were over our funded target, we would be reduced by that amount in academic year 2010/2011. What that meant in practical terms was that if we encouraged faculty to let more students into their classes that would come back on us the following year. It was a no win situation. The Provost asked the deans and chairs to work with the faculty to strictly enforce the enrollment caps that had been placed on the individual courses. As of about a week ago, we were at 101% of our target and 99.8% of our resident target which is what we are being held to. Our goal is to learn how to manage our enrollment. The Chancellor has said we cannot come in over our funded target, but we can come in below our target. The Provost's interpretation of that is that we should come in under, but not by very much. The Provost would like for us to come in at 99.9% of our target. Our goal for spring is to strictly manage our enrollment, but to also put more of our resources into bottleneck areas to allow students to graduate, while coming in under our target enrollment. The university is also planning a very robust summer session run on self support. This gives us the opportunity to offer as many courses as we can for students, and we hope to offer them for a fee as close as possible to the state university fee so students can afford them.

Provost Selter said the funding for next year is very depressing. We won't have any furlough money, but we expect to have an increase in student fees of 10%. It is not certain, but we are not anticipating any additional decreases. Our target is to reduce our FTE by 2,470 next year, which amounts to a loss in the Academic Affairs Division of about \$5.5 million. After being reduced by about \$4 million this year, Academic Affairs will be reduced by another \$12 million next year. If we don't get the 10% fee increase, then we will be out \$17 million for fall 2010. This essentially eliminates all the funding we have for temporary faculty. The Provost does not think that is going to happen, but thinks the amount of money we have to hire temporary faculty will be substantially reduced. Therefore, the Provost asked the deans to work with the chairs on an exercise where they took their adjusted targets for next year and used only tenure and tenure-track faculty, and 1.0, 3-year entitled, temporary faculty (there are only 22 or 23 in the university). Chairs were allowed to use any money that they had as a result of faculty buying out their time using externally funded grants. Chairs were then asked to put together a normal fall schedule and tell the deans what their capacity was in terms of offering their curriculum without temporary faculty. All this was is an exercise to give us a baseline of what our capacity would be. The Provost believes there will be some money for lecturers, but this will have to be managed much more strictly than it has been in the past. The new Provost coming in doesn't have to use this plan, but Provost Selter will be refining it this year.

Provost Selter commented that it had been mentioned in the last Executive Committee meeting, that there was some dissatisfaction with how faculty are being communicated with. An example was given where a memo would be sent to deans and chairs and they would be asked to forward it to their faculty. Some deans and chairs would forward it, whereas others would not. The Provost has now arranged a system with the new Chief Information Officer, whereby he can send an email to all faculty when need be.

Questions:

Senator Van Selst asked the Provost to describe the faculty involvement in establishing the adjusted targets for the departments for next year. Provost Selter responded that in Academic Affairs we tend to fund enrollment based on a year-to-year basis. In other words, if a college's enrollment increased 5% one year, the tendency would be to give them an increased target the next year, which would probably be less than 5% but greater than 0. If a college reduced its enrollment, there would be a reduction the next year. We have now gone to dollar-based budgeting. What the Provost has done this year is to take the targets the deans assigned to their departments, and simply prorate them down for next year. Once all of the chairs complete the exercise, the Provost has asked the deans to do a global analysis of their programs college-wide and to report that information to him. The Provost has then asked several of the AVPs to do a global perspective for the university. This information can then be used to readjust our targets, and/or suggest programs that can be scaled down. Provost Selter commented that it would really be up to the new provost to look at all of this information and make some tough decisions. The Provost did not feel it would be appropriate for him to do so, given the short duration of his appointment.

Senator Sabalius commented that it is hard for the faculty to swallow budget cuts when the chair blames it on the budget given to the dean, and the dean blames it on the Academic Affairs budget. It would be easier for the faculty to accept the cuts, if there were more transparency in seeing where all the cuts are university-wide. Senator Sabalius suggested that perhaps, we need to revisit our priorities and how much money is being given to Academic Affairs versus other programs. Senator Sabalius would like Provost Selter to be an advocate for us now with the Chancellor's office, and not to wait for the new provost to be put in place.

Senator Ng thanked Provost Selter for the mass communication sent to faculty about the student fee deadline.

Senator Van Hooff commented that some of her programs were very small, and that it would be very difficult to find faculty to teach them without lecturers. Senator Van Hooff asked if volunteers could be used, and whether she should ask the local community to fund some of their courses in order to keep the program alive. Senator Merdinger responded that due to the new furlough agreement between the CSU and the CFA, no new volunteers can be added this spring. However, it might be possible to use volunteers that have volunteered in the past. Senator Merdinger is not sure what the contractual agreement between the CSU and the CFA will be for fall.

Senator Jiang commented that if the Business, Management and Organization Department lost their lecturers, they would have to reduce their program by 40%. This would mean a drop from 1,000 FTEF to 600 FTEF. If this percentage applies across Academic Affairs, then Academic Affairs would be taking a 40% decrease. Senator Jiang asked if a 15% cut to other divisions results in a 40% cut to programs, and wanted to know where our priorities are. Provost Selter responded that if the money is not in the budget, then we have to manage with what we do have. However, Academic Affairs receives about 70% of the non-mandatory university funding. This is a pretty large fraction. The Provost commented that it is very difficult to shift money between the divisions, and other divisions receive only a small amount of funding. Even if we did move money from the other divisions to Academic Affairs, the Provost commented that it would not make a dent in the \$17 million cut to Academic Affairs this fall. The Provost said he understood the critical need in Senator Jiang's department, but that there were many departments that had just as critical a need. The Provost said he is hoping there will be some money to put back into hiring lecturers, but just in case we don't get the money then we need to have a plan to deal with it.

Senator Heiden commented that if we reduce our programs by 40% then our classes will be packed. Provost Selter said that the deans and chairs had not been asked to increase class size.

Senator Van Selst commented that one suggestion at the CSU Statewide Senate is to stop program reviews for the fall, which could include delaying accreditation for some programs, and asked if the Provost would support this. Provost Selter responded that in

terms of program review, there has been some discussion about putting some of the programs on hold for 1 year. In terms of WASC, the Provost personally is okay with pushing it out 1 year, but would have to ask WASC about it. WASC is not as concerned with faculty taking furlough days as they are about students meeting the learning outcomes. The Provost doesn't think we are in trouble with WASC. AVP Jaehne commented that we would be in trouble with WASC if we stopped meeting the demonstrated learning outcomes. WASC is not concerned with seat time, or how furloughs take the faculty out of the classroom. WASC knows that we are being furloughed and they are collecting data on it to determine how they can help.

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance – Not present, no report.

C. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Phillips thanked the chairs, deans, associate vice presidents, and faculty for their efforts to reduce enrollment. Our budgeted enrollment for 2010/2011 has been reduced by another 10.8% from 22,460 to 20,027 FTES. Our campus impaction plan was submitted in May and approved in June. After learning of the additional enrollment reduction, VP Phillips added additional impacted majors to the plan. On Thursday that plan was approved. Next, the Student Affairs Division will be working on getting the web-based and printed materials to match the new impaction plan.

VP Phillips said that if you go to the web site <http://info.sjsu.edu>, you can find information on the impaction plan for the year 2010/2011. In the next couple of weeks, the web site will be revised to show the latest impaction plan and additional majors. Majors have been sorted into 3 color groups, green, red, and yellow.

Green majors are not available at other CSU campuses and the local area is the entire state of California. Red majors are impacted majors. They have supplemental criteria that are used. Students both local and non-local will compete for spaces in these majors. All the other majors are yellow majors. Those students that apply for a red major, but can't be accommodated, will fall in along with the yellow majors for campus-wide impaction. For campus-wide impaction, the local area is Santa Clara County for freshmen, and Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties for new transfer students. Students applying for a yellow major that are non-local, will be accommodated on a space available basis. Students will no longer receive provisional admission letters shortly after they apply. All students will have to wait to see if they are admitted until after all applications have been received on November 30, 2009.

VP Phillips asked for volunteers for a phoneathon on October 13, 14, and 15, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. in CCB 100. Volunteers will be notifying all new freshmen and transfer students about these changes. A script will be provided. Student Affairs will be sending out an email in the near future.

VP Phillips commented that it is very difficult to keep track of all communication these days. Please encourage your students to look at MYSJSU.

Questions:

Senator Meldal commented that peoplesoft does not currently allow a student that wants a red major to also identify a second closely related green major as an alternate, and wanted to know if this was going to change. VP Phillips commented that currently the CSU Mentor system only allows a single major. It is an issue that VP Phillips has had some discussions about, but has not decided how to handle yet. VP Phillips commented that if anyone had any suggestions, he was happy to hear them. One of the things Student Affairs has talked about is setting a time limit to transfer out of a major under which you applied for and were admitted. VP Phillips further commented that Student Affairs does expect students to try to game the system, especially the applicants. It will be very important, over this next year, to figure out what policies to put into effect to minimize the gaming.

D. Associated Students President –

AS President Baker commented that the AS Board of Directors began their terms on August 1, 2009. AS now has a complete board of 16 members. AS recently had a retreat where they learned Roberts Rules of Order. AS has been working on a Strategic Plan, and they recently met with the people they work with in the departments. As far as events, AS had the Spartan Squad Kickoff last Tuesday, and the event was very successful. AS also recently held its first free barbeque for students last Thursday. As far as the CSSA, they recently had their first meeting and all 23 campuses were represented. AS President Baker commented that she is pushing AS into work with “Students for Quality Education,” because AS is fighting for the same issues. AS President Baker feels this will be beneficial for both students and the university.

E. Vice President for University Advancement – Not present, no report.

F. Statewide Academic Senators –

Senator Van Selst provided the following report. At the CSU Statewide Senate they passed 4 resolutions at the first meeting this year. The first resolution expressed their concern over the delay in the appointment of the Faculty Trustee. In the past, the Faculty Trustee appointment lasted until a new Faculty Trustee was named. Now, the Faculty Trustee is appointed for a certain amount of time, and the Faculty Trustee’s appointment ended last May. Consequently, at the last couple of Board of Trustee’s meetings, there has not been a Faculty Trustee and this lack of presence has been felt. Right now the appointment is sitting in the Governor’s office waiting for approval.

Senator Van Selst commented that several people have asked him about the Lower Division Transfer Project. This project is extraordinarily expensive and was required by the legislature. At the current time, the Chancellor’s office has said, yes this is required legally, but we can’t afford to do it. We will do it when you give us money for it. There is an articulation component and a transfer component to it. The current goal is to keep the articulation component, and just abandon the transfer component. Senator Van Selst expects a detailed response to the CSU Statewide Senate at the November meeting.

The third resolution is the Mitigation of the Impact of Statewide Enrollment Management Policies on Graduate and Post Baccalaureate Credential programs. Senator Van Selst commented that we all need a little bit more information on this one.

The final resolution was the CSU Budget Request. Historically, this has been known as the CSU Budget Priorities. This year, the CSU Statewide Senate is just saying, please restore our funding.

There were also several first reading items at the meeting and they included Furlough Implementation and Faculty Rights, and Teaching and Service Responsibilities in Times of Budget Restraints.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.