
2001/2002 Academic Senate**MINUTES
December 10, 2001****I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was noted. Thirty-nine Senators were present.****Ex Officio:**Present: Caret, Brent, McNeil, Peter,
Shifflett, Martinez**CASA Representatives:**Present: Chen, Glogoski, Malloy
Absent: Lu**Administrative Representatives:**Present: Kassing, Rascoe,
Goodman, Dorosz**COB Representatives:**

Present: Donoho, Nellen

Deans:Present: Andrew, Breivik
Absent: Sigler**ED Represent:**Present: Rickford, Lessow-Hurley
Absent: Katz**Students:**Present: Khaghani, Tsai
Absent: Deveza, Anderson, Grotz, Lee**ENG Representatives:**Present: Pour, Singh
Absent: Hambaba**Alumni Representative:**

Absent: Hollands

H&A Representatives:Present: Williams, Sabalius, Vanniarajan, Manning
Absent: Van Hooff, Fink**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Hamill, Matthes, Stacks, Veregge, Garcia

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):Present: Norton
Absent: Young**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Nuger, Baba

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames, Main

SW Representative:

Present: Hines

II. Approval of Minutes

Review of the minutes of the December 3, 2001, Academic Senate meeting was suspended until the next Senate meeting (to give the Senators time to review the minutes) on February 25, 2002.

III. Communications**A. From the Chair of the Senate.**

Chair Brent thanked President Caret for hosting the holiday get-together at his home on Sunday. Everyone had a wonderful time.

B. From the President of the University

President Caret clarified that the hiring freeze applied to non-tenure track and staff permanent positions. It does not apply to tenure-track searches. Departments should give their Vice Presidents a list of searches in the process. They will then approve and forward to the President for review.

Questions for the President:

Senator Peter asked if Teaching Assistants and Graduate Assistants could be hired using AIM funds during the hiring freeze. President Caret said yes, that was his understanding.

IV. Executive Committee Report**A. Minutes of Executive Committee**

There were no Executive Committee minutes.

Budget Advisory Committee Minutes

Budget Advisory Committee Minutes of December 3, 2001

B. Consent Calendar was approved.**C. Executive Committee Action Items - None****V.****Unfinished Business -**

A. Senator Peter gave a report on the AIM Task Force. Senator Peter said that the AIM Task Force needed to have more consultation with the Council of Deans over the long term. The AIM Task Force has received 28 out of the 60 Letters of Intent back from the departments. The results of these 28 Letters of Intent show that departments would use \$78,000 for reassignment, \$135,000 for Teachings Assistants/Graduate Assistants, \$20,000 for Student Assistants to help with Research, and \$20,000 for unique proposals.

B. Senator Kassing gave the Annual Budget Report to the full senate. Senator Kassing gave a brief description of the budget process at the CSU level. Senator Rascoe is a member of the CSU System Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC). The CSU budget process starts in May and ends when the Governor officially signs the budget on June 30th of the following fiscal year (14 months later). In Fall, President Caret and senior staff begin discussing budget priorities for the following fiscal year. The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) also begins discussions regarding campus budget priorities in preparation of a Sense of the Senate Priorities Resolution draft for review by the full Senate. In 2001/02 we were initially budgeted \$201 million in the General Fund which includes State appropriations and student fees. Our Revenue Funds and Auxiliary Organizations -- International and Extended Studies (IES), Housing, Parking, the Student Health Center, Trust Financial Aid, Spartan Shops, Student Union, Foundation, and Associated Students represent an additional \$149 million, so our total campus 2001/2002 operating budget is \$350 million. We had an \$8.6 million increase in state General Fund appropriations over last year. We are expecting a \$2.8 million increase in student fee revenues, and the campus will be receiving \$3.7 million in one-time funding. With campus adjustments, this results in a total General Fund Budget of \$210 million, which represents a 5.7% increase over last fiscal year. For the 2000/2001 budget year, we were 769 below our targeted FTE of 19,920. For the 2001/2002 budget year, we are projecting 540 over our target for a total of 21,165 FTE. Some of the adjustments to our 2001/2002 base budget include health benefit increases of \$747,000, compensation increases of \$2.9 million, natural gas cost increases of \$2.4 million, new space (Moss Landing) increases of \$1 million, and \$65,000 for increased audit costs from the Chancellor's Office. Senator Kassing said that EEO 753 issued last year said if the general fund provides any services to an auxiliary it must charge them. This prompted a review of all our auxiliaries and resulted in charges to them for services which generated \$1.5 million in new revenue. Senator Kassing said the majority of our budget is fixed, and new projects we want to fund come out of discretionary funds. Last year it looked like we might have a hard time meeting our

mandatory obligations. We had to pay for CMS/Peoplesoft, EEO 665, the Joint Library, University Advancement Office rental, CSU Risk Management Pool (property insurance), Auditors, ADA Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program, Business Classroom Renovation, and an utility shortfall of .5 million. However, we finished the year with one of the largest budget roll-forwards in SJSU history, \$2.7 million. Student revenue accounted for an additional \$185,242, the summer YRO session brought in \$1.8 million, and we received \$1.4 million from the auxiliaries due to EEO 753. This roll-forward was applied to 2001/2002 continuing budget obligations resulting in an overall reserve of discretionary funds of \$781,297.

Questions for Senator Kassing:

Senator Peter inquired about President Caret's promise to maintain the athletics budget at 2.4% of the overall budget. Specifically, Senator Peter said that he was under the impression that the President had originally promised that the athletics budget would not exceed 2.4% of the *general fund* budget, but that it now appears that the athletic budget is being compared to the *entire* university budget. Senator Peter asked if his recollection and characterization are correct. Senator Kassing agreed that Senator Peter's statements were indeed correct, but that it is more appropriate to focus on the overall university budget because athletics produces revenue that accrues to many different parts of the university.

Senator Donoho asked where are the reserve funds shown from the previous year? Cynthia Haliasz said last year's reserve is shown on page 12.

Senator Sabalius said it appears that only 30% of the total budget went to instruction. Senator Sabalius said this seems like a very low amount, and asked if this amount was in line with other universities. Senator Kassing said that 30% seemed low; he was unclear how Senator Sabalius arrived at the 30% figure. Senator Sabalius asked if there were goals to increase this percentage. Senator Kassing said no, because other units in the university need funds to help instructors do their job.

Senator Buzanski asked if the student fees were lower due to summer YRO, where did the \$1.8 million in fees come from? Senator Kassing said this money is a result of the difference in the FTE we budgeted for, compared to the actual FTE/fees we received.

Senator Kassing said that the Athletics department had a \$361,686 deficit last year. The Athletics department was given a loan that it must pay back over the next three years. Senator Buzanski asked if the 1st loan installment is included in this year's Athletic budget deficit. Senator Kassing said yes.

Senator Shifflett asked if continuing to increase our enrollment is wise due to the projected limited funding for next year. Senator Kassing said that we are resistant to stopping enrollment growth, however, we can't let enrollment go too high. The key is to strike a balance between growth and funding. This is a real challenge, Senator Kassing said.

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

A. Professional Standards Committee - None

- B. Curriculum and Research Committee** - Senator Donoho presented a final reading of AS 1164, Policy Recommendation: Teaching Associate Fee Waivers. Senator Donoho said that the name of the committee has been added to the top left side of the first page, and the names and votes of the members of the committee have been added to the bottom of the second page. In addition, a reference has been added to S99-2.

Questions:

Senator Stacks asked about the safeguards built into the policy. Senator Donoho said that there are two safeguards built into the policy. First, the Senate can review it every two years. Next, there is a cap of 3% built in to protect the budget.

Senator Manning asked what the difference is between the first and second whereas clauses. Senator Donoho said that they distinguish the different levels of Teaching Assistants and Graduate Assistants.

Senator Malloy asked if International Teaching Assistants would be getting a fee waiver at the California Resident rate, or at the International Student tuition rate. Senator Donoho said the fee waiver would be at the California Resident tuition fee waiver rate.

Debate:

Senator Hamill urged passage of AS 1164.

Senator Peter said he supports AS 1164 but has mixed feelings about it. He supports the proposal because it is "the right thing to do," but believes it sets a bad precedent. Senator Peter would like to have seen this fee waiver program considered for funding with all other proposals submitted to the BAC. By passing a university policy, we are establishing mandatory funding for this program, without having it compete with other programs that need funding.

Senator Buzanski urged support of AS 1164. Senator Buzanski said that Senator Peter is considering this from the budget priority point of view. He considers this to be a Curriculum issue, not a budget issue.

Senator Manning presented an amendment to waive fees for all Teaching Assistants at the same level, regardless of how many units they teach. Senator Manning did not feel AS 1164 is generous enough. The Manning amendment died due to lack of a second.

The Senate voted and AS 1164 was passed with no opposition and three abstentions.

- C. Organization and Government Committee – None**

- D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee – None**

- E. University Library Board** – Chair Heisch said that she had distributed the library's Journal Management policy via email, but she also brought hard copies that were passed out earlier to all Senators. The University Library Board voted unanimously for this policy. The policy is titled "Principles of Journal Management." Chair Heisch said

that currently, 70% of the Library's collection budget is committed to printed and electronic subscriptions, leaving very limited flexibility even to meet priority academic needs in times of budget reductions. Senator Manning asked if Chair Heisch was suggesting that the Library do what the departments now do in deciding which subscriptions to get. Chair Heisch said no, this refers only to the method of viewing/collecting journals. Senator Shifflett said that departments might want to review the journals each year. Chair Heisch agreed.

VII.

Special Committee Reports -

A. Senator Manning presented a final reading of *AS 1167 - Sense of the Senate Resolution: Budget Priorities Resolution*. Senator Dorosz said that some departments might think enhancing academic programs means that they can bring forward new degrees/concentrations. Senator Manning said that Senator Dorosz might want to suggest an amendment to change the language of the policy so it is clearer. Senator Glogoski asked who determines the ranking of the budget priorities if they aren't in any specific order on the policy. Chair Brent said that the President and Vice Presidents (VPs) make this determination. Chair Brent said that the budget priorities are used by the VPs and the BAC when an individual submits a proposal. The proposal must point to one of the priorities. Senator Lessow-Hurley said that the fourth paragraph in the Appendix to AS 1167 did not make sense. She asked if someone couldn't make this paragraph clearer. Senator Stacks said we need to develop a mechanism where the 5-year-plan is built into the priorities. Senator Buzanski said that the fourth paragraph of the Appendix to AS 1167 "endorsed for enhancement" did not make sense. Senator Stacks said we could amend the policy during debate. Senator Dorosz asked if the Program Planning Committee had been consulted. Senator Dorosz said he would be reluctant to vote on AS 1167. **Senator Peter made a motion to refer AS 1167 back to the BAC to revise it. The Senate voted and passed the motion to refer AS 1167 back to the BAC, with one abstention.**

B. Senator Nellen presented a **first reading** of *AS 1166 - Policy Resolution: Revisions to the Budget Process at SJSU*. Senator Buzanski asked when the BAC informs the Senate of its annual recommendations. Senator Buzanski expressed concern that if the budget recommendations are sent to the President in May, the Senate will not have enough time to review them first. Senator Buzanski asked if the BAC could inform the Senate of their recommendations in April, instead of the end of May.

Senator Norton said that he did not believe that the BAC ever actually reports their recommendations to the Senate. Their budget recommendations go directly to the President. Senator Norton said that the language in item 6.4 (need not be consulted) was confusing.

Senator Stacks said that we needed better relations between the BAC and the Senate. She asked how do we get the Senate involved in the budget input to the President. Senator Nellen said that they had added one representative from each college to the BAC last year. This should allow for better communication. Senator Nellen said maybe the minutes of the BAC meetings could be reported back to the Senate.

Senator Shifflett said that the Senate does see the minutes, but has too many proposals to review at the meetings. However, Senator Shifflett thinks the Senate could be involved in the final process.

Senator Buzanski said that the last sentence in item 1.0.2.2 was needless and was an insult to Senators.

Senator Peter said that the budget priorities should apply to cuts as well as expenditures. Section 3.2 should be modified so the Senate has a voice in the cuts as well as expenditures. Senator Peter believes this was a mistake in phrasing in the original policy.

Senator Kassing said when the policy was first constructed they didn't spend much time on budget cuts.

Senator Shifflett said that she thought the Senate should carefully consider whether the BAC should be given the authority to suspend solicitation of budget priorities proposals as described in item 9.2.

VIII.

New Business - None

IX.

State of the University Announcements. Questions in rotation.

A. Provost - AVP Sandy Dewitz gave a brief presentation of the Academic Affairs budget for the Provost. Senator Peter asked if the hiring freeze would affect AIM funding. Provost Goodman said he was working with Human Resources to ensure it did not. Senator Shifflett asked why 60% of instructionally-related activities (IRA) money was going to Athletics. AVP Dewitz said that we have a contract with the Athletics department that says \$10 of the approved \$15 increase must go to Athletics. The Athletics department provides free game tickets to students; other IRA-funded organizations, such as Music and Dance, also provide students free tickets to their events. Senator Shifflett asked how she could challenge that agreement. AVP Dewitz said that it was a provision agreed to by students in a student election, and therefore could only be undone in the same manner. Senator Peter said the Campus Fee Advisory Committee could look into it. AVP Dewitz said there is a special committee that looks at IRA. Senator Peter said it looks like campuses that exceed their target enrollment are being penalized this year. AVP Dewitz said not this year. This year we will get approximately \$1.2 million for excess enrollments beyond our budgeted target of 20,625 FTES. However, next year we will not get any money if we exceed our budgeted target of 21,500 FTES. Provost Goodman said the trick is to "meet" and not "exceed" our target. Senator Peter asked what was the purpose of increasing enrollment if we can't get the money for it. Provost Goodman said that we need students in certain areas and not others. We don't want to recruit out of state or international students that would displace California resident students.

B. Vice President for Administration- None

C. Vice President for Student Affairs- None

D. Associated Students President- AS President, Maribel Martinez said that the computer lab is up and running. There are over 100 computer workstations in the lab. President Martinez encouraged all Senators to stop by the new DD building and see her new office. President Martinez said that a recent article in the Spartan Daily talked about three different individuals leaving Associated Students. President Martinez said there was no connection between these three people leaving. President Martinez said students could reserve rooms in the Building DD for meetings. Senator Sabalius asked for specific information on how they reserve the rooms. Senator Veregge asked if students could checkout laptops. President Martinez said yes they could.

E. Statewide Academic Senate- Senator Peter gave a brief report on the recent Diversity Retreat at the CSU. Senator Peter said it was a good meeting, and the student projects were very interesting.

X. The meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.