2001/2002 Academic Senate

MINUTES
May 6, 2002

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:17 p.m. and attendance was noted. Thirty-five Senators were present.

Ex-Officio:
Present: Caret, Brent, Peter, Steffen, Martin
Absent: McNiel

Administrative Representative:
Present: Kazanjian, Havens, Daniel, Lee
Absent: Goodman

Dean:
Present: Andrew
Absent: Boulvick, Sigler

Student:
Absent: Anderson, Desouza, Grotz, Khajaviti, Lou, Tani

Alumni Representative:
Absent: Hollando

Emeritus Representative:
Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):
Present: None
Absent: Young

General Unit Representative:
Present: Thomas, Main

CASA Representatives:
Present: Malloy, Klugowski
Absent: La, Chen

COB Representatives:
Present: DeBito, Nelles

ED Representative:
Present: Louwer-Harley, Katz, Rickeford

ENG Representative:
Present: Park, Singh
Absent: Hamilton

H&A Representative:
Present: Williams, Sabol, Manning, Van Hoef, Vannianjan
Absent: Finn

SCI Representatives:
Present: Hamill, Steuck, Matthews, Garcia
Absent: Yang

SOS Representatives:
Present: Nagel, Bohn

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes - None
Chair Brent said that the minutes from the April 22, 2002, meeting are being handed out today. All Senators should review these minutes and bring the minutes with them to the next meeting.

III. Communications

A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair Brent reminded Senators that next week we have the final meeting of the 2001-2002 Academic Senate, and the first meeting of the 2002-2003 Academic Senate.

There are two Academic Senate Packets being handed out for the next meeting. All Senators should bring these packets with them to next week's meetings. Senators will not be receiving packets in the mail for these meetings.

Chair Brent announced that there are six policies to be considered at today's meeting. Therefore, he will be limiting the time spent on each individual policy to about a half-hour. Chair Brent announced that several of the policies are first readings, and he will be asking the presenter at the end of the reading if they would like to proceed to a final reading. If the presenter does want to make the resolution a final reading, it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

B. From the President of the University –
President Caret gave a brief update on enrollment. President Caret said we have negotiated for 850 FTE students in growth this year. However, we now expect to have at least 500 to 1,000 above that figure. It looks like at the end of the year we will have about 1,000 FTE not funded. All categories of student enrollments have increased (from Freshmen to Seniors.) If we look at graduate students in particular, applications are up almost 400% over last year. President Caret hopes this increase will taper off. If the increase in applicants continues, he is urging the colleges to really scrutinize their applicants. It is not likely that there will be any additional enrollment money for colleges this year. Colleges will most likely have to handle the additional students without additional resources.

Questions for the President:
Senator Buzanski said that a recent San Jose Mercury Newspaper article criticized the Peoplesoft project, and compared it to the Oracle disaster. Senator Buzanski said he has heard that Peoplesoft is so inefficient that some of the colleges are backing away from it. Senator Buzanski asked if President Caret had any comments about this. President Caret said his perception is that we had to get some kind of system, and that the cost of any system was going to be significant. Peoplesoft is one of the more expensive and more complex systems, however, we are supposed to be able to do much more with it over the long run. President Caret said he had spoken with the Presidents of several other colleges (SMU, Ohio State, and Santa Clara) that now have Peoplesoft. They indicated that they really liked it once it was implemented. The problems seemed to arise from underestimating the amount of human capital necessary to implement it. In our system, the only negative so far is that it appears that Peoplesoft is not as compatible with Apple workstations as the descriptions would allow you to believe. This is slowing down the implementation process on several campuses such as Sonoma. Fresno will probably be the first campus to go live with the Student module this fall and then Sonoma sometime after that. San
Jose State will follow after these two campuses.

Senator Shifflett said that he understands that the implementation of the Human Resources module of Peoplesoft went well on our campus, and yet that is not what she has heard at the CSU Statewide Academic Senate meetings from other campuses. President Caret said that he too has heard from our people that implementation of the Human Resources and Finance modules have gone quite well. President Caret said one of the problems that you encounter is with changing environments. For example, we've all had to go through this when we've gotten new computers. You don't like some of the bells and whistles, because you just aren't familiar with them. President Caret said that Oracle was our first choice for SJISU, not Peoplesoft. However, President Caret thinks Peoplesoft is going to work well for us.

IV.

Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes of April 22, 2002 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar - None

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

The next item on the agenda was the final reading of AS 1179 – Sense of the Senate Resolution: Endorsing Membership in the Worker's Rights Consortium. Chair Brent said there was a mistake in the copy of AS 1179 that Senators received in their packet for today's meeting. In the top resolved clause on the second page, there was an amendment that was approved by the Executive Committee, but was accidentally omitted. The sentence should read, "The San Jose State Academic Senate endorses the concept of SJISU joining the Worker's Rights Consortium and continuing its membership in the Fair Labor Association." Senator Martinez presented the final reading of AS 1179. Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to delete the last resolved clause. The Senate voted on the Sabalius amendment. Twenty Senators voted for the amendment, and six voted against the amendment. The Sabalius amendment passed. Senator Buzanski presented a friendly amendment to strike the word "although" in the first line of the fifth Whereas clause, and add the word "and" after the comma in the second sentence of the fifth Whereas clause. The Senate then voted on the main motion. Fifteen Senators voted for AS 1179, twelve Senators voted against, and two Senators abstained from voting. AS 1179 passed.

Senator Rascoe presented AS 1180, Policy Recommendation, Alcohol Policy (First Reading). Chair Brent asked Senator Rascoe if she would like to move AS 1180 to a final reading. Senator Rascoe indicated that she would like the policy moved to a final reading. The Senate voted and the move to a final reading was approved unanimously. Senator Stacks presented an amendment to the last sentence of number 3, on page 5. The sentence would be changed to read that, "limited patron rentry may be allowed for special circumstances on a case-by-case basis, including evaluation of the person's behavioral state." Senator Donoho presented a friendly amendment to the Stacks amendment to remove the word "limited." The Stacks amendment, as changed by the Donoho friendly amendment, passed with one abstention. Senator Garcia presented an amendment to strike the last sentence of the second paragraph on the first page. The sentence reads, "Alcohol abuse by anyone will not be tolerated." The Senate voted and the Garcia amendment passed unanimously. Senator Garcia presented an amendment to change the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 4 that currently reads, "by anyone will not be tolerated," to read, "is subject to prosecution under state and federal laws." Senator Buzanski presented a friendly amendment to the Garcia amendment to change it to read, "is subject to university sanctions and/or in some cases prosecution under state and federal law." Senator Hamill presented a substitute amendment to the Garcia amendment to drop the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 4 entirely. The Senate voted and the Hamill substitute amendment passed unanimously.

Senator Peter presented a friendly amendment to insert on page 3, number 4, after the word and, "(if the student is under 21)". Senator Thames presented a friendly amendment to change page 5, number 4 to add a sentence after the first sentence that reads, "The reporting system developed shall ensure confidentiality of individuals." Senator Shifflett presented a friendly amendment to the Thames amendment to drop "of individuals" from the sentence. The question was called. The Senate voted. AS 1180 passed with one no vote, and no abstentions.

V.

Unfinished Business – None

VI.

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee –

Senator Nuger and Senator Donoho presented AS 1181, Sense of the Senate Resolution: The Academic Calendar under Year-Round Operations (First Reading).

Questions:

Senator Stacks said that she has concerns about what students are being promised by the state legislature under YRO, versus how we're funded and what we can deliver. The students are not going to be complaining to the state legislature about these issues, they will be going to the departments. Senator Nuger said that he believes it will be difficult to offer more classes in the summer without more funding to pay faculty. Without the
additional funds the faculty won't want to teach, and we won't be able to offer enough courses to generate a substantial increase in student interest in summer classes. Senator Stacks asked if there was a way the committee could section out responses to the survey by colleges. Senator Nuger said they could break it down by college. Senator Nuger said he would really like another year to redo the survey and improve it.

Senator Hamill asked if the 14/14/14 model was legal? In other words, are there enough class days according to the contract? Senator Donoho said that this is one of the issues that has to be worked out. We may have to have an occasional weekend day, or other teaching days. Senator Donoho said another option would be to renegotiate the contract. Senator Donoho said that each campus has the right to pick their calendar.

Senator Singh said if we go for the 14/14/14 model, and the faculty only teach two out of the three 14-week sessions, will they still get the same salary? Senator Donoho said that is the idea. Senator Singh also asked if we go to a trimester system, will students transferring in still be awarded semester units? Senator Donoho said yes.

Senator Malloy said that in some colleges, certain classes are offered only certain times of the year based on demand, and that we would have to have a huge amount of students enrolled in the summer session to be able to offer these classes. Senator Malloy said that the current payment system we have takes away from a department during the regular year by offering classes during the summer.

President Caret made a few comments. President Caret said we will have to come up with a calendar that has beginning and end dates that will allow students to transfer between campuses. President Caret also said that year-round financial aid was possible. President Caret noted that the fees for summer are now lower than they were before. And, President Caret stated that one of the key issues here is entitlement versus availability.

Senator Shifflett said she concurs with Senator Hamill's input. Senator Shifflett asked if the committees had considered last summer's data in making their recommendation. Senator Donoho asked what specific data Senator Shifflett was referring to. Senator Shifflett said, specifically she was referring to the uneven growth in summer session programs that has a monumental impact on whether a department can even consider a trimester calendar. Senator Shifflett also said that data on enrollment patterns, and faculty full-time versus part-time teaching in the summer should be included. Senator Shifflett said that smaller departments would not be able to afford to offer classes year-round. Senators Donoho and Nuger said that smaller departments would have the option of not offering classes during the summer trimester.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked why we have a one-week spring break when we don't have a one-week fall break. Senator Nuger said that he is more concerned with the possibility of losing the winter break than the spring break. Senator Lessow-Hurley said if there is a strong inclination towards the symmetric calendar, why not have split sessions in fall and spring.

Senator Katz said it was his understanding that right now we don't give departments FTES credit for summer classes, is that correct? Senator Caret said that departments were given credit for last summer. Senator Katz said if we move to a 14/14/14 model, we could have a three-week break between each trimester. Senator Donoho said this wasn't a very popular scenario with the faculty in the survey. The most popular scenario was 8 months on, then 8 months off, then 8 months on again. Senator Katz asked how this could possibly work? Senator Donoho said they did it in Canada.

Senator Glogoski asked if something could be distributed in writing showing faculty how the various models worked at other campuses. Senator Donoho said that it could. Senator Glogoski asked in terms of Senator Donoho's data, what is the breakdown on this campus of male versus female instructors, and then in terms of the survey, what was the breakdown of male versus female instructors in the response rate? Senator Donoho said that there was not a significant difference in the responses of male versus female instructors.

Senator Thames said she had a question about how the campus could keep up with information regarding YRO as it unfolds. Senator Thames asked if the committees could put something in their recommendation about how the campus will be kept informed.

B. University Library Board – None
C. Professional Standards Committee – None

D. Curriculum and Research Committee –

Senator Donoho presented AS 1182, Policy Recommendation: Metropolitan University Scholars Experience (First Reading). Chair Brent asked Senator Donoho if she would like to move AS 1182 to a final reading. Senator Donoho said yes. The Senate voted and AS 1182 was moved to a final reading. Senator Stacks presented an amendment to add a second resolved clause which reads, "Resolved: That approximately 10% of the MUSE courses in each core GE area (B, C, D, and E) be reviewed by the Board of General Studies whose report, including the individual course evaluations and a summary of the overall process, will be submitted to Curriculum and Research; and be it further". The current second resolved clause would then become the third resolved clause and would
read, "Resolved: That the MUSE Advisory Committee work with the Curriculum and Research Committee to analyze the peer review process used to approve the MUSE courses to determine if the peer review process is equivalent to the process provided in S98-11; and be it further". Senator Donoho presented a friendly amendment to the Stacks amendment to add "be randomly selected" after "MUSE courses" in the second resolved clause. Senator Doroz presented a friendly amendment to the Stacks amendment to change "10%" in the first resolved clause to read, "two MUSE courses randomly selected in each of the eight core GE categories addressed by MUSE". Senator Nellen presented a friendly amendment to the Stacks amendment to add to the second resolved clause after "submitted to Curriculum and Research" the following, "and the Chair of the MUSE Advisory Committee". The Senate then voted and passed the Stacks Amendment as amended by Senator Donoho, Senator Doroz, and Senator Nellen. Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to change the last resolved clause to read "that the Curriculum and Research Committee will report to the Senate on such student success measures of the MUSE program as are evidenced by one year retention relative to non-MUSE students and previous student retention statistics." The Senate voted on the main motion and passed AS 1182.

E. Organization and Government Committee –
Senator Stacks presented AS 1178, Policy Recommendation: Modifications to S96-9: Composition and Selection Process for the Board of General Studies (First Reading).
Chair Brent said that AS 1177 and AS 1178 had been combined into AS 1178, and Senator Stacks would be presenting it as a first reading today. Senator Stacks gave a summary of the policy recommendation. Senator Stacks said that they would like to change the composition of the Board of General Studies (BOGS) to have one faculty representative from each college. This would ensure that BOGS had expertise from each college. The selection process would be changed so that interested faculty would submit a letter to their department. The department would then nominate a faculty member to the college. The college Curriculum Committee would then reduce these nominees to not more than three. These three nominees would then be voted on by the college-at-large. The candidate elected by the college, from these three nominees, would then be appointed to BOGS. The final composition of BOGS would then be 8 faculty members, 2 Student Representatives, and 2 Administrators (the AVP for Undergraduate Studies, and the Associate Dean for Curriculum and Assessment.) Senator Stacks said the committee still needs to work on how vacancies will be dealt with.

Questions:
Senator Sabulius asked why the student appointment had been changed from two years to one year in item II.A.10. Senator Norton said most student appointments are only one year now.

VII. Special Committee Reports - None
VIII. New Business – None
IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.
   A. Vice President for Administration – None
   B. Vice President for Student Affairs – None
   C. Associated Students President – None
   D. Statewide Academic Senate – None
   E. Provost – None
X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.