

2009/2010 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
November 16, 2009**

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

Ex Officio:

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

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Phillips, Selter
Absent: Lee, Najjar

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Roldan
Absent: Jiang

Deans:

Present: Parrish, Merdinger
Absent: Bullock, Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Smith
Absent: Kimbarow

Students:

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

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Backer, Du

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Ferguson

H&A Representatives:

Present: Van Hooff, Butler, Brown, Brada-Williams, Fleck
Absent: Desalvo

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

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

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Fujimoto, Sivertsen, Lin

SOS Representatives:

Present: Ng, Heiden, Lee
Absent: Von Till

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 12, 2009. The Senate voted and the minutes were approved as written with 1 abstention.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kaufman made the following announcements:

Sadly, Ann Lucas, past chair of the Justice Studies Department, passed away after a brief battle with cancer.

A Senate Blog has been created, and is currently in the testing mode. Chair Kaufman is the only person that can post to it at the moment. However, you can submit comments, and you can send items for posting either to the blog, or to Chair Kaufman's email address.

B. From the President of the University –

President Whitmore was not present and no report was given.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Minutes of October 12, 2009 – no questions.

Minutes of October 26, 2009 – no questions.

B. Consent Calendar – A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar. The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as written.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: A motion was made to approve the Election Calendar for 2010. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Election Calendar was approved as written.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

Senator Heiden presented *AS 1426, Senate Management Resolution, Revision to Admissions and Standards Committee Title (First Reading)*. The O&G Committee was given a referral to change the title of the Admissions and Standards Committee to better reflect the function of the committee.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski asked whether the name change would result in the committee being removed from the "other" committees. Senator Heiden and Senator Norton responded that it would not. Senator Buzanski then commented that there was no point in the rationale if there were no changes. Senator Heiden responded that the change was to the title and they needed a rationale for changing the title of the committee.

Senator Heiden presented *AS 1427, Senate Management Resolution, Change to the Composition of the Admissions and Standards Committee (First Reading)*. O&G is changing the membership of this committee, because the membership in the committee descriptions section of the Senate Handbook does not match the actual membership on the committee.

Questions: There were no questions.

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

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1424, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Opposition to the Reduction in State Support to the CSU System (First Reading)*. The PS Committee is bringing this resolution back to the Senate for another first reading due to the number of changes recommended at the last Senate meeting.

Questions:

Senator Parrish commented that the fourth whereas clause states that the Board of Trustees was voting on another student fee increase of 10%, and that they were actually asking the state to fund the equivalent of a 10% fee increase.

Senator Backer commented that the resolved clause wasn't in the standard format for resolved clauses. There should be many resolved clauses, and not one long resolved clause. Senator Gleixner commented it was a good point.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if the committee would consider that some of the resolved clauses could be part of the rationale, e.g. the second resolved clause. Senator Gleixner made a note, and said the committee would consider it. This was also brought up in the Executive Committee meeting.

Senator Van Selst wanted to know what the cost would be to send a letter on the implications of the current budget crisis on the CSU to all SJSU alumni, employees, and their families. Senator Gleixner responded that this was a Sense of the Senate Resolution and it didn't require a financial impact statement, but that she had no idea what the actual cost would be. Senator Heiden commented that she remembered a discussion about this, and that it could only be sent via email due to the costs. Chair Kaufman agreed, and noted that Senator Najjar had said there were about 100,000 emails in the database that could be used for this purpose.

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1428, Policy Recommendation, Policy on Late and Retroactive Enrollment (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner commented that this policy recommendation is broken down into two parts. The first part concerns student initiated petitions for adding a class between the add date and the census date. The second part concerns retroactive enrollment which is a department chair initiated petition.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski commented that there should be a time frame in which the registrar is required to forward the petition to the department chairs.

Senator Ng wanted to know why it said that petitions to add a class or enroll after the census date would be "rarely approved" in the last paragraph of the "Post-census date petition for late enrollment" section. Senator Gleixner responded that I&SA did not want to say that there were no instances when this could be approved, but I&SA did not have a specific list of instances where it would be approved.

Senator Lessow-Hurley wanted to know if I&SA would consider changing the language to say something like, “would only be approved in extenuating circumstances.” Senator Lessow-Hurley asked for clarification as to what was meant by the statement, “Students will only be allowed to add a class or enroll after the census date for one semester.” Did I&SA mean in one semester during their time at SJSU? Senator Gleixner explained that currently students are allowed to add a class for a semester 3-years ago, I&SA is saying they will now only be allowed to do this once. Senator Lessow-Hurley wanted to know if I&SA would consider saying, “applicable to one semester.” Senator Buzanski inquired as to whether I&SA meant the current semester. Senator Gleixner responded that it didn’t necessarily have to be the current semester. What I&SA is trying to say is that students can only do this once. Students can only add classes after the census date to one semester, whether it is the current semester or the prior semester. Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested the committee be that explicit in their language in the policy.

Senator Buzanski wanted to know what happens if a similar situation occurs the following semester to the same student. Senator Gleixner responded that they would be out of luck. This policy is trying to make it a lot harder for students to add classes after the census date. If there is some kind of extenuating circumstance that comes up once, the policy will allow a student to add after the census date, but it shouldn’t keep coming up over and over again. Senator Buzanski wanted to know what would happen if the student’s mother died in semester one, and then the student’s father died in semester three. Senator Gleixner responded, “Why would that make someone enroll late, that might make them withdraw late.” Senator Buzanski suggested that a situation might occur where the mother or father could have been in hospice care before that.

Senator Ng wanted to know what would happen if you had a student with a chronic medical condition that prevented them from being on campus, such as being hospitalized. Senator Gleixner responded that she still didn’t see where that would require the student to add late, because how could they be attending classes if they were in the hospital.

Senator McGee suggested replacing “for one semester” with “one.”

Chair Kaufman asked for clarification as to whether students were only being allowed to late add one class, or as many classes as occurred in that semester, but only once. Senator Gleixner responded that the student could have to add multiple classes for that one semester.

Senator Van Hooff asked for clarification as to whether they were being allowed to do this once without a valid excuse. Senator Gleixner commented that this would be initiated by the department chair, so they would have to have a very good reason and it would also have to be approved by the Associate Dean of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies.

Senator Fee wanted to know if the term “one occurrence” would be clearer than “one.” Senator Gleixner responded that she preferred Senator Lessow-Hurley’s suggestion, but that she would rework it.

Senator Smith suggested that it might be made clearer by adding “during their tenure at SJSU.”

Senator Butler commented that the second line points out that exceptions will be considered by the Associate Deans of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies, and that this should be enough.

Senator James Lee commented that we don't want students waiting until their fourth or fifth year and then wanting to add classes to five semesters. It needs to be clear that it is one semester, and one time only.

Senator Heiden asked for clarification as to whether it was only one class for one semester, or could it be multiple classes for one semester. Senator Gleixner responded that it could be the entire semester's courses.

Senator Campsey wanted to know if this policy would supersede a department's policy that prohibited adding after the census date. Senator Gleixner commented that a department would still be allowed to prohibit adding after the census date.

Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that a university policy would override department policy and that this should be addressed before the policy is brought back to the Senate for a final reading.

Senator Meldal commented that the department chair has to initiate the late enrollment petition, and that if the department chair doesn't initiate it, then it can't happen. Therefore, the department policy would be covered by this sentence in the 2nd paragraph of the "Post-census date" section.

Senator Gleixner responded that Senator Campsey's question applied to adds between the add date and the census date as well, because some departments don't allow late adds between the add date and the census date. Senator Gleixner suggested that maybe they could get departments to allow late adds between the add date and the census date.

Senator Pulu wanted to know if disenrollment for non-payment was an accepted reason for late enrollment. Senator Gleixner responded that it is. The I&SA Committee discussed this and they wanted a student to be able to late add due to disenrollment for non-payment once, but not every semester.

Senator Butler wanted to know if this also covers students that are disenrolled through no fault of their own, where it is the registrar's fault. For instance, the last day to add this semester fell on a staff furlough day. Senator Gleixner suggested that that particular case was an exception, and that the Senate could debate whose fault that was because students also knew that was a furlough day. However, in general, if the bursar makes an error they provide paperwork for the student to get back into the class and that procedure will continue.

Senator Van Selst commented that in his experience a lot of the late adds were as a result of some sort of failure to communicate between the bursar and the financial aid office. Senator Van Selst would not want to see a one semester only restriction for this reason. Senator Van Selst suggested he would prefer language that said, "from which they were

disenrolled from” and then “on a space available basis,” so the spot isn’t actually held open and given to another student, and we don’t exceed the enrollment cap as a result of this policy. Senator Gleixner responded that this is all taking place after the add date, so there shouldn’t be any holding of spots for students at this point, but their approval would be based on a space availability.

Senator Gleixner commented that the registrar tracks the reasons given on the add petitions, and there are some valid reasons. However, the vast majority of them are self-reported student errors such as the student forgot, or didn’t pay their credit card. The students that have valid reasons for adding late are a very small percentage of total late adds.

Senator Silber commented that if the students are disenrolled due to error, this could happen more than once and this should be an exception. Senator Gleixner responded that these are a very small percentage of the cases, and that the vast majority are student imposed errors.

Senator Meldal asked if the committee would consider adding a clause that stated that errors made by the university during enrollment would not be counted against the student. Senator Gleixner responded that this was a good idea.

Senator Pulu wanted to know if the furlough day scheduled on the last day to add would be considered university error. Senator Gleixner responded that both the bursar and the registrar felt that the furlough date was well advertised in advance, and that these kind of exceptions should not come up often.

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1429, Policy Recommendation, Two-Year Suspension of Selected Senate Policies in Response to Budget Crisis, Reduced Enrollment Capacity, and Reduced Course Offerings (First Reading)*. Issues have come up with classes being cut due to the budget, therefore this policy suspends certain other policies for two years at which time they will be reviewed to see if they need to be permanently rescinded, or reinstated. Senator Gleixner said that number 3 is missing part of the sentence and should read, “S09-2 item 5: the requirement of successful completion of English 1B with a C or better in order to take the WST and 100W.”

Questions:

Senator Kao wanted to know with regard to number 3, item 5, if the committee was talking about waiving the prerequisite for just transfer students, or for all students. Senator Gleixner responded that it applied to all students.

Senator Lessow-Hurley wanted to know why do we have policies that we don’t need. Senator Gleixner responded that these policies would be looked into again in 2 years, when the suspension is up, to see if they are still needed. An example of the problem is the 100W. The 100W is a prerequisite to many of the upper division GE courses. Consequently, students are prevented from enrolling in other GE courses due to this requirement, but at the same time there aren’t enough 100W classes to meet student needs.

Senator Backer expressed concern that this policy would allow English 1B to be passed with a D-, instead of a C. Typically, students that have problems with English 1B barely pass the WST, and they have repeated problems in their other courses no matter which courses they are. Senator Backer also expressed concern that this policy removes the requirement that students take English 1B prior to taking the 100W, and noted that many problems that are currently found and dealt with in English 1B, will be passed on to the upper division course instructors. Senator Gleixner explained that although the policy is removing the requirement, they are not assuming that most students will try and take 100W before English 1B. Senator Backer noted that in her experience if you remove the requirement, students will wait until their senior year to take it.

Senator Gleixner noted that going from A, B, C, C/NC to A, B, C, D, F grading was strongly recommended by the English Department. The English Department faculty feel that students that are failing midway through English 1B, simply take NC and then retake the class the next semester. I&SA will consider making a requirement, such as passing English 1A with a C or better, a prerequisite for taking English 1B.

Senator Buzanski expressed concern that students will be admitted to upper division courses that require writing skills without having these skills, and suggested that if the 100W classes are too crowded we should deal with that issue rather than using this policy as an alternative.

Senator Kao asked if a student that had not taken English 1B could take R, S, and V classes. Senator Gleixner will add the passage that the WST is still a requirement for both English 1B and R, S, and V classes.

Senator Van Selst expressed concern that we will be pushing students into advanced writing courses that they are not prepared for and suggested that maybe there is a middle ground, e.g. if you fail the WST, you must take 3 units of English, or take English 1B over again, etc.

Senator Brada-Williams highly suggested that I&SA keep English 1B at a “C” or better. Senator Brada-Williams noted that even in her upper division English courses she ends up teaching some of the basic skills again, but it is not at the English 1B level, and she is usually building on what students already have.

Associate Dean Steve Branz was recognized by Chair Kaufman. Associate Dean Branz announced that he had asked the Chair of the English Department specifically about whether the English Department wanted passage of English 1B to be with a D- or better, and the Chair said that they had discussed it both in the writing committee and the department, and they wanted it to be a D- or better. This is mainly to free up space from repeaters. The real hurdle in the entire English sequence is passing the WST. Passing the WST is harder for students than passing English 1B or 100W. The Undergraduate Studies Department is going to go back and look at this and there is going to be an alternative course being offered that as a substitute for the WST. This way students won't be taking the WST into the double digits.

Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that the discussion of the proposal had uncovered some real problems with the sequence of our English and writing classes, and that these problems should

be sorted out in the committee before going any further with this proposal. Senator Gleixner responded that part of the immediate pressure is that some of these courses are not being offered at all right now, or not at the level that students need them. That is why the temporary suspension was written in until 2012. Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that while she agrees we need to address the issue of student needs in the face of the budget cuts, this may not make any more sense in 2012 than it does right now.

Senator Backer wanted to know why all of these issues were tied to one policy recommendation. There appear to be many different categories here. If the immediate issue is the LLD issue, Senator Backer suggested that could be dealt with separately. This would allow some of these other issues to be dealt with later. Senator Gleixner commented that it seemed easier to put it together as one policy, but there was no reason it couldn't be 5 policies.

Senator Pulu wanted to know if the committee had considered that this policy might be seen as favoring quantity of seats over quality of education. Senator Gleixner responded that the committee is trying to support students by getting them the classes that they need, and helping them graduate on time.

Senator Fee wanted to know if the committee was aware that CASA is offering 2 sections of 100W, and couldn't this help the situation. Senator Gleixner commented that the number of students needing 100W was much higher than what could be accommodated in these 2 sections.

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

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Backer presented *AS 1425, Policy Recommendation, Appointment and Evaluation Policy for Temporary Faculty (First Reading)*. This proposal is to align our current appointment and evaluation policy, F99-6, with the current California Faculty Association (CFA) contract. PS met with Jonathan Karpf of the CFA and got his recommendations. One suggestion he had was that all lecturers complete a summary of achievement. PS took his advice and put this into the proposal. This proposal should also reduce the workload for department chairs and those that evaluate part-time faculty. The CFA contract only requires that part-time faculty on 3-year appointments be evaluated once during that 3-year period. Our current policy, F99-6, dictates that they be evaluated every year. The chairs and the deans have all reviewed and approved this proposal.

Questions:

Senator Van Selst wanted to know what was meant by the assessment. Senator Backer responded that Solates and SOTES were independent of this policy. This is the formal evaluation that takes place every spring for temporary faculty whether they are 1-year, or 3-year faculty. Senator Van Selst wanted to know if it was clear that this new policy could not be used to argue against the current Solates and SOTES policy if it is part of the evaluation process. Senator Backer commented that PS did not change that part. The only part that was changed was the cycle. Senator Van Selst wanted to know if there was any way that this

revision could be used to change the Solate and SOTES policy. Senator Backer responded that it could not, and that the current policy does not leave it totally up to the departments. The departments must follow the current CFA contract. Individual departments may choose to vote to assess every class every semester, but that is not the policy under discussion.

Senator Van Hooff wanted to know if this meant temporary faculty could only be evaluated once during the 3-year period. Senator Backer commented that temporary faculty must be evaluated once during the 3-year period, but that they could be evaluated more often if the department, or the employee wanted it.

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

VII. Special Committee Reports – No reports

VIII. New Business –

Professor David Mesher and Mr. Dave Rudel gave a short presentation on International Programs.

Professor Mesher is the Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP) representative to the CSU. Professor Mesher informed the Senate that if an international program lasts a year or longer, it is from the CSU, and falls under the Office of International Programs. If the program is less than a year, it falls under Study Abroad.

Professor Mesher passed out a flyer on the Wang Family Award, and the Resident Directorship in China, France, Italy, Japan, and Spain for 2011-2012. The Wang Family Award has not been won by a faculty member at SJSU during the 7 years that the award has been offered, and it is only funded for 10 years. This is primarily because no one has applied. Professor Mesher would like Senators to get the word out to their colleagues. The deadline for applications for both the Resident Director and Wang Award is December 1, 2009.

Resident Directors usually do not teach, except for Japan where they teach 1 class. There is also very little time for research. The Resident Director's time is mainly used to advise students. The faculty members selected as Resident Directors get their regular salary plus 10%. The faculty member's department doesn't just get vacancy rate in return, they get a fee equivalent to the average pay for an Associate Professor, so the department has money to hire someone to replace the recipient. The Resident Director Handbook is an excellent resource for information on the program, and Professor Mesher will forward a copy to anyone that is interested.

Professor Mesher asked the Senate to keep in mind when making policy that some students finish their studies in their major, and then work on their minors abroad. Senator Gleixner noted that the Senate had passed a Priority and Advanced Registration Policy at the October Senate meeting that was directed specifically at the problems of international students. Professor Mesher responded that the problem with priority registration is that international students often do not arrive here until right before the semester begins, and what they really need is the same status for enrollment as graduating seniors.

Mr. Rudel clarified that there are degree-seeking international students and then there are exchange students. The exchange students are under reciprocal exchange agreements that we have signed with institutions abroad. These students do not represent an increase in our enrollment. Our student pays the fees here and they go abroad, and the exchange student pays the fees abroad and comes here. The exchange programs allow our students to go to very expensive institutions abroad while paying state rates. The one program that has been suspended for at least a year or two is exchanges with Australia and New Zealand. Although we have many students that want to go there, there aren't many students from Australia and New Zealand that want to come here.

The Office of International Programs (OIP) is moving ahead with a 3rd program in Spain for students with very little knowledge of Spanish (1 semester) that want to learn Spanish. The programs offered right now in Spain are for people that have intermediate to advanced knowledge of Spanish. France already has a beginner program, and it has been very successful.

Mr. Rudel presented a video prepared by San Francisco State University in which students were interviewed before and after they went abroad. The video shows the profound impact the experience had on these students. Senators can contact Mr. Rudel if they would like to borrow a copy of the video.

Mr. Rudel manages all the Study Abroad and Exchange programs. SJSU also has a number of bilateral exchange programs with individual universities, and is part of a non-profit consortium called ISEP, International Student Exchange Program. There are also a number of faculty-led programs in the winter and summer in which faculty take students abroad. Mr. Rudel's office is currently in the process of hiring a coordinator for these summer and winter programs.

Senator Van Hooff had the following comments. Foreign Languages and Study Abroad go hand-in-hand. If the student has some knowledge of the language and is well prepared, he/she will have a much better experience. Another benefit of going abroad is that the student comes back understanding their own culture much better. It is a very maturing experience. The Foreign Languages Department also offers scholarships for students that want to study abroad.

Questions:

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked for clarification regarding the Resident Director applications. Professor Mesher confirmed that the applications due on December 1, 2009, are for the 2011-2012 academic year, and not the 2010-2011 academic year. The Resident Directors for 2010-2011 have already been selected. Senator Lessow-Hurley also wanted to know if the Resident Director for 2010-2011 would be in charge of the new Spanish program. Professor Mesher responded that he/she would not. A location for the program has not yet been decided, but is in the process. There are 13 sites under consideration. Mr. Rudel will provide the list to Senator Lessow-Hurley.

Senator Butler asked Professor Mesher if he had a list of the institutions to be contacted to get the invitation that the Resident Director for China and Taiwan must have. Professor Mesher noted that the invitation could be from anyone in China and Taiwan.

Senator Van Selst wanted to know where a student coming here from abroad would get his/her transcripts evaluated. Mr. Rudel commented that the evaluators in Enrollment and Academic Services evaluate the transcripts. Senator Van Hooff commented that they often receive requests from the evaluators in Admissions and Records to assist in translating transcripts.

Senator Butler asked for clarification about the restriction on exchange students coming and going to/from Australia and New Zealand. Professor Mesher noted that students from Australia and New Zealand can still come here, but our students cannot go there until we get in balance. This will probably take 2 years.

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

A. Vice President for University Advancement – No report.

B. CSU Statewide Senators –

CSU Statewide Senators Lessow-Hurley and Van Selst gave the following report. Senator Van Selst will send out the written report on the CSU Statewide Senate meeting last week as soon as he gets it. Several resolutions/issues were discussed at that meeting as follows:

- The Faculty Trustee still has not been appointed.
- The Lower Division Transfer Project is permanently on hold because it is an unfunded mandate and the CSU can't fund it any longer.
- The CSU Statewide Senate passed a resolution, "A Day without Education," supporting a CSU Systemwide Furlough Day on March 2nd.
- The CSU Statewide Senate passed a resolution, "Teaching and Service Responsibilities in Times of Budget Crisis," that encourages Senates to take action in designating specific tasks that shouldn't be done, e.g. accreditation reviews that are not required.
- A policy resolution was presented that encourages outreach among faculty before programs are suspended due to budget cuts. SJSU has several policies relating to this, but some of the campuses do not.
- There was a policy passed on Furlough Implementation and Faculty Rights. Our calendar was put together in compliance with the CFA contract, but this was not the case on several of the other campuses.
- The CSU Statewide Senate is supporting legislation authorizing a doctorate in Physical Therapy, because the accrediting agencies are requiring a doctorate as the basis for certification in that field.
- Trustee Jeff Bleich was recently appointed as the Ambassador to Australia.

C. Provost –

Provost Selter gave a brief presentation on the Academic Affairs Division budget. Highlights of the presentation are as follows:

The CSU Provosts met last week and the issue of the Faculty Trustee was on their agenda. The Trustees and the Chancellor's Office have repeatedly contacted the Governor's Office to find out when we will have an appointment, but they have not been able to get a reply.

Within a few weeks of Provost Selter taking over the Office of the Provost this summer, it was determined that there would be a 20% fee increase for students, there would be employee furloughs in all the bargaining units except for one, and the university would receive a base budget reduction of \$42 million, plus another \$2 million in mandated health care costs. We received a \$7 million base budget reduction. This translated into a \$4.06 million base budget reduction for the Academic Affairs Division.

Approximately half of the \$35 million shortfall that remained was mitigated by the increase in student fees. Another \$17 million was taken from the salary savings from the furlough program. In the Academic Affairs Division, we have enough money to operate this year.

Another part of the situation is our enrollment target. For the first time the Provost can remember, we had a cap put on our enrollment. Our California resident target was 22,460 FTES. The Provost was told in no uncertain terms, that we were not to go over that target. We were also given a target of 1,239 FTES for non-resident students by the Chancellor's Office.

Next year, 2010-2011, we do not anticipate any additional cuts in state funding, but we will lose about \$5.5 million in Academic Affairs as a result of a decrease in our resident enrollment target to 20,027 FTES. There is also an assumption that there will not be any furloughs next year. And, the Trustee's have requested that the State of California underwrite the equivalent of a 10% fee increase for students. If the state does not approve the request, then there is an assumption that the Trustees will ask for a student fee increase of 10%. The best case scenario for Academic Affairs is that we will get the student fee increase to offset the enrollment losses and we will be short about \$12 million. The worst case scenario is that we will be short about \$17 million. It turns out that \$17 million is just about the amount of money we have to hire temporary faculty.

The Provost wanted to do two things this year knowing that he would only be here for a short time. The first was to setup the budget to ensure Academic Affairs was going to survive the year. The second was to put a plan in place for next year that would be available to the incoming Provost if she/he chose to use it.

The Provost is in the process of finalizing data on FTES for this year. He now knows how many FTES are generated by tenure/tenure-track faculty and lecturers in each college. This semester, 46% of the enrollment was garnered by tenure/tenure track faculty, and 54% was from temporary faculty, teaching assistants, etc. This is very foreboding for next year, if we don't have any money for temporary faculty. This is why the Provost asked the deans and chairs to go through an exercise this semester where they assumed that next year they would only have tenure/tenure-track, and the 3-year, 1.0,

temporary faculty. They were then asked to try to determine what sections would be offered in this scenario, and how many FTES would be generated. The Provost promised to report on this at the last Senate meeting. However, not all the data was reported in the same way. The best the Provost can do is estimate that about 50% of our enrollment could be taught. This is, of course, unacceptable.

For this year, since we know the amount of money that it costs per FTE to pay our regular faculty and temporary faculty per college, we can estimate how much it is going to cost us for spring to come in on target. We are going to have that amount of money in the Academic Affairs Division. The deans have been allocated the same base funding levels that they were last year, minus the reduction we took of \$4 million. The Provost is going to pay for instruction on a per FTES basis for spring. Once the costs are calculated, the Provost will pay the colleges that amount for instruction. The real challenge is that in the fall we came in at 100.8% of our enrollment target for the university. We came in at 99.4% of our resident target, but there was a 26% increase in non-resident enrollment. Broken down by colleges, 3 of the colleges came in significantly over-enrolled, 3 came in significantly under-enrolled, and 1 came in on target. The Provost has discussed with the deans and chairs how to manage our enrollment cap per section to come in right on target. This is quite a challenge when dealing with 22,000 FTE. It is critical that we come in on target, not only because we need to learn how to do it, but also because this will give us the credibility we need at the CSU. If we want to have more of a self-determination in what we do in managing our enrollment, e.g. we have programs that really need to have admissions for the spring semester, we need to prove our credibility.

Another part of the budget is the \$77 million in stimulus money that the Chancellor's Office just received. The Provost is unsure if this is \$77 million that was actually received, or \$77 million that just doesn't have to be paid back. Either way, the Chancellor is allocating \$25 million to the campuses "to increase course sections and enhance students' educational experiences." The rest of the money is being kept by the Chancellor to cover any additional mid-year reductions to the CSU budget by the state.

What the President's staff and the Provost have decided to do with the stimulus money is to first increase our internal non-resident enrollment target by 289 FTES. That is because we had 1,560 non-resident FTES for Fall, and we were budgeted for 1,239. The Provost is expecting at least 80% to 90% of those students to continue in the spring. This will provide us with about \$550,000 more in stimulus money that we can use to open more sections. About \$450,000, plus another \$36,600 that we received as part of a settlement of a grievance between the CFA and the CSU (the grievance was over insufficient hiring of lecturers), will be used to open sections. However, while we are opening additional sections, we cannot increase our enrollment. The way we are doing this is to target writing and large GE courses, and have chairs and deans lower the enrollment caps and open more sections. More lecturers will be hired for spring and students will have smaller classes. Another \$320,000 is going to Student Affairs to hire staff to evaluate "Super Seniors" and help graduate them. An additional \$150,000 will be used to hire more advisers.

Next year there will be no stimulus money, and assuming there are no furloughs, we won't have enough money to hire the number of temporary faculty we need. That is what we are working on now.

There is another issue that has come out of the Chancellor's Office. The CSU has set a goal that all campuses increase their graduation rate for first-time freshmen by 6 percentage points for those campuses that are already in the top quartile of graduation rates relative to their peer group. Our campus, because we are not in the top quartile, will have to raise graduation rates about 9 percentage points by 2015. In addition, we will eventually have to increase graduation rates for transfer students as well. Finally, the goal is to reduce the achievement gap between represented and non-represented groups by half by 2015. The Provost believes the Chancellor is going to monitor this initiative carefully. The Provosts and Presidents are being required to report on a monthly basis what goals they have set to achieve these graduation rates, and the way they will assess progress. The Provost has put a committee together to begin working on a plan. An initial plan must be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by December 25, 2009.

Questions:

Senator Van Selst wanted to know if the 14 unit limit was here to stay considering the conflict between increasing graduation rates and monetary limits. Provost Selter responded that this was not necessarily the case. It will be reviewed each year. If we can downsize so that our enrollment matches the number of students, it will no longer be needed. Senator Van Selst then asked if we were considering reducing students in high cost programs. Provost Selter responded that the idea would be to reduce the number of high cost programs rather than the number of students in high cost programs. The Provost has not discussed any plans with the deans or chairs about eliminating any programs. However, in the spring, some consideration will have to be given to that in terms of next year. This year we will be fine, but next year is more of a problem. We will have to put a lot of things on the table to see how we can survive and keep operating next year.

Senator Silber commented that he had done some calculations and when the budget was cut \$584 million, SJSU's cut was \$42 million or 7%, and now the CSU is going to get \$25 million, and our share of that is about \$1.5 million or roughly 6%. Senator Silber wanted to know why are we cut a higher percentage than what we receive back. Provost Selter responded that budget cuts to the smaller campuses are much more devastating than the cuts to the larger campuses, and larger cuts were given to larger campuses. However, the Provost suggested that Senator Silber ask the Chancellor that question. Chair Kaufman noted that we had one of the highest over-enrollments in the CSU, and that when our enrollment numbers went down our funding went down quite a bit also.

Senator Heiden commented that we keep talking about increasing graduation rates, but she has not heard any talk about increasing admission standards. This might be very helpful for impacted programs. Provost Selter responded that he had not had any

discussions yet about how we are going to increase our graduation rates. However, most of the Provosts would agree that the first place to focus on is improving advising. None of the Provosts were against the initiative to increase graduation rates. However, there is widespread concern about how we are going to fund this. The Provost commented that this is yet another unfunded mandate, which is very troublesome. It doesn't make sense to have to consider reducing the work force, while at the same time being given a mandate to increase graduation rates. However, there was a hint at the last Provost meeting that the CSU may be considering some type of funding for this initiative. Chair Kaufman commented that given the 2015 deadline, and the fact that the class of 2015 will be starting this fall, we had better get money fast. Provost Selter agreed this was a problem. However, the Provost suggested that if we do nothing else but remain impacted for the next 6 years, and manage our enrollment correctly, we will probably see a significant increase in our graduation rates. Other CSU Universities that have been impacted for years, such as SLO and San Diego State, have graduation rates way above anybody else in the CSU system. However, the Provost cautioned, that doesn't mean we don't have to improve things here.

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

E. Vice President for Student Affairs – No report.

E. Associated Students (AS) President –

AS President Baker gave the following report. The AS 55 Awards Banquet is in the final planning stages. This award honors students that excel in education as well as leadership. AS recently published their 2008-2009 annual report. AS is also currently promoting International Week and participated in a kickoff parade through campus today (11/16/09). AS has been working on a website that outlines both student rights and the grievance process. In addition, AS held a town hall meeting last week that was very successful.

F. Vice President for Advancement – No report.

X. Adjournment – A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion was approved. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.