

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

Engineering 285-287

**Academic Senate
November 2, 1998, 2:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

- I. The meeting was called to order shortly after 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken. All were present except Barba, Brent, Burak, Canziani, Gonzales, Katz, and McNeil.
- II. The Minutes of October 5, 1998 was approved with corrections.
- III. Communications and Questions
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate

The chair reviewed the projects the senate is currently working on, noting that the Joint Library has been discussed a great deal. The Senate Special Committee on the Joint Library project held Open Hearings on October 28 which resulted in over 3 hours of discussion on a series of questions and answers. The questions and answers, as well as the report of the open hearings will be made available to all senators for the Senate Retreat. For those who happen not to go to the senate retreat, you will also receive those materials. Senator Mary Jo Gorney-Moreno has established an agenda for the retreat, scheduled for November 16, 1998. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on a resolution on the Joint Library Project to be sent via campus mail prior to the November 30th senate meeting for its first reading with a final reading scheduled for the December 7th senate meeting.

Those of you who were members of the senate last year may recall that the Senate used last year's retreat to deal with Cornerstones. There was a fair amount of feedback from our campus, as well as other campuses, to give a sense of where we thought the guidelines to Cornerstones should go. Historically, Cornerstones has been an iterative process whereby there were task forces set up, which included administrators, faculty and students, charged with gathering specific background information about where the CSU, as a whole, should be going. The information was compiled into a shorter report which was not intended to be a read of what those task forces had been, but rather as guidelines about Cornerstones. That document was given to the various universities (<http://www.calstate.edu/cornerstones/>) and we gave our response back to them.

The latest version is now looking at the implementation of Cornerstones as opposed to just the guidelines. We were asked by Chancellor David Spence to provide feedback on the Implementation Plan by January 11th -- not particularly good timing in terms of the break.

The Executive Committee suggested that a Senate Special Committee be formed to work on the response to the implementations document that has been sent out by the CSU system. This committee will consist of the Chair of the Senate, the Vice-Chair of the Senate, the Chairs of Instruction and Student Affairs, Curriculum and Research, Professional Standards, and the Program Planning Committee -- Program Planning Committee deals considerably with assessment, and as you may recall, Cornerstones had a good deal of material on assessment -- as well as Bethany Shifflett, our statewide senator, and the Associated Students President, Heather Cook.

The notion is to provide for a special committee that can get feedback from the senators at large, as well as other colleagues, and put together a document that is our response. What we hope to do is link the implementation document to the responses we gave on Cornerstones last time so we may

do a check and balance in terms of what our suggestions were, how they have been incorporated into the implementation documents and/or where we can suggest changes. The Special Committee will then give that material to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will draft a resolution to the senate for additional comments. The first reading may be as early as November 30 but may well be December 7th. There are a fair number of items already starting for the November 30th meeting. I want to encourage you to think about the Special Committee just as a vehicle to communicate your concerns so that we have a smaller group of people who can work on the documentation, but we certainly want all available feedback.

The other issue is the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). You may be aware that BAC is the elected portion of the Executive Committee and it has been that committee that has been charged with working with the president and associated administrative heads to interact on priorities with respect to the budget process on our campus.

I want to note that the Academic Chair of Sacramento State has asked to meet with Ken Peter, the past chair, and myself because they were interested in budget advisory process. A lot of what makes the budget advisory process go forward is having an administration and an Academic Senate that is willing to work together. It's not clear to me whether or not the process would work if these two groups did not have a foundation of goodwill starting out.

You will have a report on the Budget today. At the end of that report are the comments BAC gave to this body last spring. You may note there are some very specific points we thought could be improved in terms of the process. Again, in terms of giving us feedback, I would really address your attention to those areas and if there are some specific ways we could incorporate some of those changes, we greatly appreciate hearing from you.

Those are the three major items still before us. Notice that today's report on the budget is going to be packed with discussions and we will again go through this process for the coming year. That will be our workload in the spring semester.

In addition to all of this, I want to reinforce what we have done in respect to the policies that come to this body. Mainly, last time having spoken to intellectual/creative properties, I believe that (the process of recommending policy) is a major step forward for this body in what it can do for this campus. We were silent on some of these issues previously. I believe that with a lot of changes that we are confronting with curricular issues, mainly pedagogical changes and methods of instruction, it is going to be particularly important for us to evaluate previous policies and see how we can accommodate changes as we see them occurring. I have seen, for instance, that there is a referral to the Curriculum & Research Committee to the Continuing Education Committee to give some thought to issues in regard to Long Distance Education and integration of Continuing Education with departmental oversight of the curriculum.

Thank you for the work you have been doing up to this point. I want to remind you that we have a fair number of other items confronting us. I appreciate your activities on this. Are there any questions at this time?

Senator Roth: Would it be possible for the Executive Committee to initially have a resolution saying very simply, "(K)nowing what we know, do we want this (the joint library) to go?", and then if the body votes yes, we could proceed with the set of conditions.

Since this is our last meeting before the first reading, it seems to me, that what hasn't happened is a

general vote whether or not we want the Joint Library Project implemented. As I understand it, the Executive Committee is going to give us a rather long document dealing with operations and so forth and we will be asked to vote up or down on that. What I'm concerned about is that the issue of whether or not we want the library in principle and the details of operations, if it is to be built, are going to be combined. And I think they should be separate. For example, I may vote against the library in principle.

Chair: In my role as facilitator, it is my sense from the previous two resolutions that the senate passed, I believe unanimously, giving permission to go forward, that there is a certain amount of interest in that respect. So I would take issue with the notion of whether or not if we ever had this up or down point. I don't think that counters your suggestion that for the final point that we segregate those issues is certainly open to interpretation. It is something I will take back to both the Executive Committee and Senate Special Committee on the Joint Library Project. We will have to see what those bodies recommend. Even given that, there can always be amendments from the floor. Thanks for alerting us to that possibility, and we will definitely keep it in mind. I cannot know at this point if the committees will want to go that route or not.

Senator Nuger offered a comment reporting that he had sent a survey to his colleagues to get feedback on the proposed joint library. He reported that less than half of his colleagues responded.

Chair Stacks: Thanks for your feedback. Perhaps what I could do at this point is to alert you to unfinished business. A resolution was submitted by Senator Roth at our last senate meeting that we were unable to get to. The resolution is regarding polls and we will have a chance to discuss some of these related issues. Perhaps we can have a conversation at that point.

B. From the President of the University

The president gave a couple of updates on the library, and reported that members of the administration have had face-to-face meetings with union representatives as had been promised, to discuss the specific workplace related issues *vis-à-vis* the particular project. We have had a number of additional forums on campus and continue to make members of the administration and others available to members of the campus community who want to discuss the library. I have been to a couple of town meetings, held each semester, and the Provost has done similarly; we participated in the open hearing that you all know about, sponsored by both the senate and Associated Students. We have had a number of meetings on relocation and parking, specifically as it relates to the project, and those dialogues continue. Those have been particularly fruitful in the last couple of face-to-face meetings that have been conducted.

Secondly, the CSU Board met last week to approve the budget for the next academic and fiscal year, 1999/2000. They have recommended an across-the-board 4% compensation pool with an additional 2% for faculty, which is a 6% pool for faculty for next year.

That coupled with the 5% pool that has been offered this year though not agreed upon is an 11% pool over two years. That is a strong statement on where the board stands as it relates to faculty compensation. There's a strong commitment to put as much money there as possible, and they will continue to do that.

Finally, I would urge you all, regardless of where you stand on the various candidates and issues, to get out and vote. There are a lot of important issues on the ballot and I think it is important that we all exercise our right to be there and make our positions known. I would be, again, more than willing to answer any questions you may have.

Senator Roth: At the risk of abusing the body's patience, may I ask two questions about the Joint Library Project? (The President responded in the affirmative.)

The first has to do with this newsletter I received about the roundtable; there is a report on the meeting at the convention center on the JLP. It says here " (I)f the Joint Library is such a great idea, why does no other city take the plunge?... " and it mentions the library in Geneva and Cologne. Now, I went to Geneva and looked at their library, and my understanding, although Senator Schmidt may disagree, are joint libraries in the administrative sense - they are not partnerships; they are run either by the city or the university or *vice versa*. So my question is, and I understand you didn't write this, will the university update material using the Geneva model or Cologne as an example continued to be used, if in my opinion, it's not appropriate.

Senator Caret: It's my understanding that we actually suggested you go to Geneva, so it's not like it was something we were trying to hide.

Senator Roth: Yes, Don Kassing asked me to go over there. I didn't sneak over there. In fact, you helped pay for it.

Senator Caret: I don't find (using the Geneva model as an example) that surprising. We initially utilized the model based on sources that were available and not by personal knowledge. There are a number of libraries in the country that are serving as joint libraries, and they typically are under one administrative control as you found in the Geneva library. It wasn't intent by anyone to mislead - it's simply a clarification. There is no problem making that clarification here and elsewhere and I'm sure my staff would agree. We're are not trying to hide anything; we're simply trying to find models that have worked.

Senator Roth: The second question is a little more serious, I think. At the meeting Wednesday (the Open Hearing on the Joint Library Project), the comment was made that at the very first meeting between the City and the University, everyone sort of set out their *sine qua non* as a deal breaker position. And one of the positions set out by the City was that they want access to the University collection, otherwise, they are not really interested. It seems to me that we debated this issue, all of last year and people continue to talk about whether or not the City will have access to our collection or not.

I'm asking if the administration knew this is the case, it might not be the case, that the City has made this statement at the very beginning and the senate didn't know that. I know that for myself, that if I have been told, on the MOU, we will go forward with the Joint Library under the provision that the City insists on sharing the collection, I would have voted no. I know that would have changed my vote. I know that may or may not change other votes. So I'm wondering, was that placed on the table at the very beginning, and if it was, why wasn't the senate informed about that?

Senator Caret: My recollection of the first meeting was that we brainstormed a great deal -- lots of statements were made. I don't think it's a surprise to anyone that it was suggested we should run the library as a shared facility. I don't think anyone insisted on anything as a deal breaker at that point. I don't think we knew enough about what we were doing to decide where we stood on various issues. I think that the political and philosophical stance on the City's side was that they wanted access if possible to all collections. That's been the stance from the beginning. I don't find it surprising. I didn't even find it problematic actually. I think it is appropriate stance for a joint, merged facility. What we need to do, if we do that, is to make sure the policies are in place to make sure that the sharing of resources does not hurt the academic programs from our perspective

and does serve the populations that we are serving on our side of the table.

From the question, the suggestion seems to be that there is some kind of collusion - we approached this as a giant project. Every time issues have come forward we have discussed them openly. We will continue to do so and report where we as individuals or as administrators stand on each issue.

Senator Bain: One quick addition - the discussions about operations that resulted in the MOU - the MOU which was presented to this group last year - stated that circulation would be shared. I would be happy to get a copy of that document for you.

Senator Caret: I've had my administration talk with a number of Presidents that are involved with libraries that are open to the general public in their communities because they serve as the community library. And let me reinforce that yes indeed they are the property of the university, and the university sets policy. With individuals we talked with, there has never been a complaint about the usage of the library. I recognize that this is a new model and therefore has potential for things to happen that have never happened before. But as I've said a number of times, you're not going to do anything new that has any kind of magnitude associated with it, unless you are willing to approach it from the perspective that it is a good idea, how can we make it work? If you approach the idea with what is wrong with it, what can fail, you will never make a change in what's going on in how we do business. There are a number of us who have spent our entire career in academe that feel we need to change in some ways the way we are doing business unless we want to continue to be mediocre for the next century.

Senator Desautel: Just quick questions outside the library itself - Can you give us as close to a bottom line on parking? Are we gaining 400 to 600 parking spaces because the city is building a public structure? Are our students going to be flooding it and use it? Is that going to happen?

Second, as I grossly understand it, Wahlquist would close -- that's a lot of offices, a lot of services. What is the bottom line, years from now, on where those offices are going to be located? Will this be the beginning of two or three other projects needed?

Senator Caret: My understanding, and Don or Linda may be able to expand, is that this project includes, and that assumes (1) that the bond is approved, and (2) we decide to do it. Assuming all that happens, if we were to demolish Wahlquist and build the library, part of the budget, part of the \$ 171 million is all of the relocation cost and renovation of Clark Library into a service building. So much, if not all, of what were in Wahlquist, other than the library contents, would move into Clark and/or the Administration Building, as a domino effect with administration. So we really end up with a new building, plus a completely renovated building, one library that houses all of our library resources and a service building that serves everyone on campus - a one stop shopping kind of arrangement. The City is at the moment, as I understand it, guaranteeing to provide the same number of parking spaces for the city population as they have now. So they will in their new garage across the street have spaces there for the city population and how they will control that, etc. I'm not sure. But they will have the same number of spaces over that. But, I believe, they are building five other parking garages over that same time frame -- three to four years -- between us and Santa Clara Street and between 4th, 5th and 6th streets, all of which would be open to the public including us and our students free in the evening, free on weekends and two hours free during the day for everyone. So those five or six garages, depending on how they all come to life, are part of the Civic Center Refurbishment and will also help, we believe. We also are beginning to develop plans for another parking facility of our own -- potentially, but decisions have not been made, where the administration building is located, on that entire footprint. So we have a number

of plans we have been looking at as options in terms of our own parking situation.

Senator Kassing: There are two other parts of the parking process. We have negotiated with the City that during construction that we would gain control of the perimeter parking around the campus providing us with seventy-five spaces. We are also negotiating for spaces in local neighborhood or several lots. We think we can pick up to 300 or 400 spaces.

Senator Norton: First, it's something important to me and may not be important to anyone else - Clark Library was named for former President Clark, a man who some of us still remember not only with respect but with affection. What will happen to the nameplate? Is it still Clark Library? Will it be the Robert Clark Administration Center or is the new parking structure going to be the Robert Clark?

Senator Bain: We have not made any official discussions but we have been operating under the assumption that Clark Library would become the Clark Building.

Senator Buzanski: Did I hear you say some of the departments would be moved from Wahlquist to the Administration Building and the Administration Building would become a parking garage?

Senator Caret: Not in the same week. There are potentially some functions that may domino into the Administration Building and there are some things in the Administration Building that we may move elsewhere, even off-campus-things that are self-supporting. But none of those are decisions. We are looking at all options.

Senator Kassing: If this project goes forward, we would move all of the functions of Wahlquist into Clark Library. What would become of Clark building? We would then anticipate moving all of the offices in the Administration Building into Clark which would then suggest all kinds of possibilities. This would include finding a temporary building for future use.

Senator Shifflett: Regarding Cornerstones, could you give us the timeline as far as the CSU is concerned, not just within our own campus, but how or when it gets to trustees?

Senator Caret: As I understand it, we are to respond as a campus by January 11 using the process that Chair Stacks mentioned earlier. As I understand it, that will result in another draft that we will have sometime in March. At which point there will be a third and final iteration and it is that May iteration, that will be the one to go to the board over the summer, once we agree upon it.

IV. Executive Committee Report

A. Minutes of Executive Committee

Chair Stacks: These are the minutes of the Executive Committee, I wanted to point out that for consideration, that on October 19th on the page the Executive Committee decided not to act on behalf of the senate and would rather have the resolution come to the body. But we also did discuss, in light of the points Senator Nuger brought out, our By-law 1.12 which addresses the issue of informing ourselves of what our colleagues think and then use our role as university citizens to make our decisions - just a point of clarification.

Are there any questions on anything in the Executive Committee minutes?

Senator Mesher: A comment - The reason I asked the Executive Committee to look into the Carl's Jr. issue, and the reason I feel compelled to comment on their very brief response in the minutes, is

because, in lieu of more substantive details and information, the university community is forced to depend for information on reports in the *Spartan Daily* and other even more suspect sources. The fact that the university chose not to issue immediate, full, and public report on the matter is, after all, one of the sore points in this episode; and the Executive Committee's apparent compliance with what looks like a cover-up only exacerbates the problem.

Those reports in the *Daily* quote Vice-President Kassing and others as claiming that they took action on the basis of the campus's non-discrimination policy, yet no discriminatory acts, policies, or procedures have been alleged against either Carl's Jr. or the individual board member under accusation. Instead, the allegation discussed in the reports has to do with that individual's political support and contributions for a ballot measure in another state twenty years ago.

What sort of precedent does this set? Should other companies wishing to do business with the university also expect that we will be examining the political views and contributions of their board members for the last two or three decades? If so, may I remind you that almost every American corporation has had some sort of discriminatory policies certainly in my lifetime, as has the State of California and, yes, San Jose State itself, whose discrimination against women athletes, for example, was affirmed in court only a few years ago.

And if this is a standard by which we are judging others, how much more important is it to apply that standard to ourselves, and to ensure that the campus remains free from all such discriminatory individuals. Are our administrators, as well as the executives and board of Spartan Shops, who came to a "mutual agreement" with Carl's Jr. on this matter (at what financial cost to the university or the Associated Students is never made clear) - are they themselves ready to stand and be judged on record of their own political activities and contributions for the last twenty years? Have the candidates for this year's decanal positions been informed that such disclosures are expected of them? Has the process already begun to write this into our RTP procedures?

I am certainly not opposed to the non-discrimination policy per se. But the application of it in this case if, indeed, that is what happened, and we simply don't know - that application, calls into question the judgment of those individuals involved in this action, and our own judgment if we do nothing to protest it.

Chair Stacks: As a point of information, the Executive Committee did hear the historical disclosure of the situation and we focused on procedures. If Senator Kassing would like to now or in his report reply to it. All I can say is that there were issues that were confidential so we could only deal with the procedural issues.

Senator Kassing: The Carl's Jr. franchise was part of a set of Spartan Shops' organization beginning with brand products from the campus. In that research it was found that a hamburger franchise was desirable. Spartan Shops then moved ahead with Sbarro's and a Market Cafe, which recently opened. As we moved into discussions with Carl's Jr., a contract was signed. Shortly afterwards, in the last issue of the *Spartan Daily* last spring, we discovered there was a strong reaction to the founder of Carl's Jr., Carl Karcher and that he had a history of supporting political issues and causes that discriminated in terms status particularly the gay and lesbian community. We learned this from a number of sources on campus. We also, at that time, looked carefully at our rights to own property and our ability to determine its use. We held extensive conversations on campus at the administrative levels. With that, we couldn't support discrimination based on status. At that point we had a series of conversations with Carl Karcher Enterprises (CKE) explaining to them our concerns about the reaction on campus and the principle involved. The corporation

agreed to sit down with us and we both mutually agreed not to pursue.

Senator Hegstrom: Senator Kassing, can you explain to us what the discriminatory behavior that Carl's Jr. was responsible for?

Senator Kassing: The discrimination is the function of the founder, Carl Karcher, not the corporation. The beliefs he holds and the actions he takes in his position.

Senator Hegstrom: So it is not discrimination per se but a matter of beliefs?

Senator Kassing: His beliefs, position, and status.

Senator Hegstrom: So in order to do business with this campus you have to pass a litmus test.

Senator Kassing: The university has a responsibility to create an appropriate social environment and the university has to be wary of corporate entities which support things that are counter to the university belief system.

Senator Mesher: But you are not saying the corporation supports the beliefs of the founder. Could he influence decisions. What is his share in the corporation he has.

Senator Kassing: I've heard different reports from 5% to 25%.

Senator Mesher: Could he influence the decisions of the corporation.

Senator Kassing: What he owns in stock could change from one day to day.

Senator Mesher: Are there more recent reports of action?

Senator Kassing: There are reports of other action.

Senator Mesher: And how about corporations that have discriminatory policies, will you stretch it back more than twenty years?

Senator Caret: Let me add something to this discussion. I understand the perspective that is being voiced here, but we went to a company -- I didn't go -- and we explained our stance on campus climate issues, discrimination issues, and what a large portion of our campus felt about the individual who started the company. The company didn't want to come here and put itself through any kind of test. You can ask why they didn't want to come here. You can ask them why they made the decision they made. We are telling you why the decision for this campus was made. But you are making it sound like we said you are not to cross our threshold. What happen instead was, when they understood the issue on our campus, they decided they did not want to be on this campus.

Senator Hegstrom: It was there decision and not ours?

Senator Caret: It was a mutual decision.

Senator Desautel: I have a lot of thoughts. . . I disagree with your comments, President Caret,

because I think that a corporation looked at itself as being picketed or otherwise persecuted if on campus. And I disagree that a large part of our campus would not want a corporation with that kind of background. You don't know that because you have not told us about it. I agree with Senator Mesher, it is a very dangerous precedent to look at an individual who has a vested interest in a corporation either in present tense or past tense.

Discussion continued with comments from Senators Desautel and Young, and Mesher. Senator Mesher mentioned that his suspicion was that we (SJSU) might have paid them not to come. Senator Cook commented on how the negotiations were suppose to have been confidential and the situation that we (SJSU) are in is a result of leaks to the *Spartan Daily* but those involved in the negotiations are at a unnecessary disadvantage, because both parties have agreed not to discuss the agreement. Senator Cook also thought that this discussion was out of line since that information leaked to the *Spartan Daily* was not public, and was disappointed that confidentiality is not happening. Senator Kassing reported that the agreement is confidential, but was able to tell the senate that there was no pay-off. Senator Stork was concerned that while it may have been confidential, we are now looking at a series of statements that they were encouraged to leave because they had a system of beliefs that we did not like. Senator Kassing reiterated that it was the system of beliefs held by the founder. Senator Stork questioned the ethics of "mutual agreements" made under certain circumstances. Senator Buzanski questions the notion of confidentiality with something as simple as having a burger franchise on campus. Senator Nuger made the comment that if we are going to make decisions on the personal beliefs or personal actions of major stock holders or founders that we will run into many different problems. Senator Kassing addressed the issue of confidentiality and explained how the initial agreement was not confidential. It was after awareness that there was a problem that confidential discussions took place. Senator Kassing also described the mechanism now being put in place to screen corporations who are seeking to do business in the university. Senator Peter mentioned that at the Executive Committee Senator Brent cited a law that made this discussion irrelevant and urged those who were interested to speak with him.

B. Consent Calendar

An additional list of Student Appointments was handed out, and several others were verbally presented to the senate. They are as follows: Margaret Tam is in the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee seat that belongs to the director of the PEP; Faculty-at-Large appointments, we have Ignacio Hernandez seating in Seat E for Affirmative Action. And Simon Diminguez is actually in a faculty-at-large seat. Under Information Items, June McCullough will be recommended for Seat G on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee. This was an appointment made by the president. With no dissent, the Consent Calendar was approved.

C. Budget Advisory Committee – State of the University Budget

Chair Stacks explained that the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) is a sub-committee of the Executive Committee and asked that first Senator Caret and then Senator Kassing to give us a state of the university budget that was included in your packet.

Senator Caret: As you recall, if you have been through this before, this is the final step in last years budget process where my staff and I meet to come up with a set of priorities and to some extent specific expenditures related to the upcoming budget. The Senate works with us to set a series of resolutions in place in terms of how to set those priorities. It is pretty general in conception. We did come back with specifics that we came up with within that framework, and BAC again works with us to give us their interpretation and you could see in the packet of material you have in pages 6,7,8,9, and 10 roughly there are the staff recommendations versus BAC's recommendations and

then the final decisions on what happened with the budget. This has been one of those years when things are much brighter than usual because the governor, having received a windfall of state tax revenue provided our system and our system to us, a significant number of new one-time dollars. So if you look on page 10, we were working with a pool of money that is roughly a little over five million dollars that we were trying to figure out in terms of one-time and recurring expenses how to use it best. As it turns out, if you look at the far right of 10, we wound up spending something on the order of 13 million dollars one-time in base budget because of the one-time money that came in from the state after the budget had been built. It would be wonderful if that could occur several years in a row. We are hoping that even though the economy has slowed a little, it is still a bright economy and we can experience similar kinds of outcomes this year. Having said that, I told Don I wanted to speak for a minute before I turn it over to him so I could announce the good things and he could do the rest. I do want to point out things that are at the heart of the academic enterprise that we were able to address in pretty good fashion this year. There are now somewhere between four and five sabbaticals that have been added to the base as has been promised in the last couple of years. I'm not sure if the fifth one has been funded yet -- I know there are four there. The Library budget has been improved significantly and something I consider an important step for the campus and I think either Roy or David mentioned it earlier -- we have achieved gender equity. All of our athletic programs, men's and women's, are fully in compliance with Title 9 at the federal level and the court case (Cal Now which we agreed to in terms of a settlement, I believe, in 1992). That is not an easy feat for a campus that has an 1A athletics program first of all, and secondly, a campus that has a higher proportion of women than men. Both of those issues caused us to have a very difficult time in achieving that type of ratio, and I'm very pleased we were able to get there. Let me ask Don to expand on that and then Linda is also going to talk.

Senator Kassing: I would like to try and highlight some parts of the budge for you. There's an awful lot of material there if you are not familiar with it could really be a challenge to get to. Senator Caret mentioned the one-time money. Historically, we have not presented the one-time dollars in the budget because there hasn't been very much of it. President Caret was able to persuade the system to give us \$700,000 a year that was not included in budget presentations we had given you. But this year it is right at six million dollars and is broken out so that you can see where those allocations were made. We also try to give you a sense of the whole budget process with the CSU and the state in a series of pages that start on page 1. We also included our campus process -- the process we go through with the Budget Advisory Committee. If I could draw your attention to page 6, I'll highlight. I'm in the matrix at the top of the Box on page 6. You will see a line there that says General Fund Support. That's base budget, the money that was given from the state of California, a substantial increase. The next line is Receipts -- a term our system uses, in any other part of the world it would be tuition or fees. You will notice that has only increased slightly and this is primarily due to the fact that tuition fees this last year were reduced. The One Time/Temporary Funding that we talked about a minute ago is almost 6 million. So you have total increase in the budget of over 18 million dollars. The budget is built on a FTE of 19,380, an increase of 634. The balance of that page gives you a whole set of details that support the matrix. If you have any questions about that, either here or off line, I'll be glad to go through it with you.

Let me move to the next page where the budget priorities are listed.

In summary, Senator Kassing then provided the senate with a extensive report highlighting sections of the budget report. Senator Norton asked a question regarding the fiscal impact of the break-up the WAC. Senator Kassing and Senator Caret described the substantial amount of NAACP money that would be available to the remaining teams (including SJSU) in the short term.

Senator Kassing also reviewed the Major Projects on page 24. The Budget Report contains all the information, so most of the Vice Presidents will not report because all the information is present in the Budget Report.

Senator Bain presented a report from Academic Affairs. That document gives you a summary of the overview of the various sources of funds that come to Academic Affairs and how the allocations came to be. She mentions a few things particularly the chart at the bottom of page one. The overall budget has gone up as had the FTE. One of the categories for added funding is enrollment growth. Senator Bain reported that one of the issues that was discussed was how to handle the issue of enrollment growth. There was joint a need to add sections for developmental English and developmental math and that is really part of our implementation of Executive Order 665 which requires first time freshmen, after they are admitted, before they enroll, to take the placement tests, then to enroll in remediation courses their very first semester. Many people have held off taking remedial courses and then dropped out without ever taking those courses. It really requires more exceptions to be able to accommodate those students. We knew we had a need, so we targeted those areas. The goal is to reduce the need for remediation to no more than 10% of the students by the year 2007. We were reluctant to take the enrollment growth money that was forwarded and add to base budget and let it kind of disappear into the base budget. We decided to handle that separately so you see one-time money targeted for remediation. That doesn't mean we won't do it on a one-time basis next year or several years after that. But it allows us to target exactly how much money is directed to remediation and hopefully begin to reduce that allocation.

Senator Bain continued to highlight and gave an extensive description of the report that came from her areas. Associate VP Edd Burton was available to answer questions and clarify aspects of the report. Senators Huebner, Desautel, Norton, Lessow-Hurley, Sree-Harsha, Peter, Vanniarajan, Hegstrom, Young, Mesher, Ego, Buzanski, Gorney-Moreno, and Shifflett, asked questions and made comments. Senator Kassing, Caret and Bain fielded questions and made clarifications. Senators Young and Buzanski expressed their appreciation of the Budget Reports. Senator Young praised the report as one of the best and easiest to understand.

Senator Caret, asked the senate to look on page 25 and add up all the capital projects the campus has received in the last five years, you will get a total of about \$47 million. Contrasting that to a \$170 - \$180 million project with the library project alone also gives a financial perspective of the library project. Senator Caret stated that the financial aspect should not drive the project, but to throw away \$170 million dollars when it takes us something like 20 -30 years to achieve that goal any other way on a smattering of small projects is not something to be done lightly.

V. Unfinished Business

Resolution from the floor on a Poll of the University Community regarding the proposed Joint Library Project, submitted by Jonathan Roth at the October 5, 1998 Senate Meeting

Senator Roth acknowledged that there were disagreements about the library project, but wanted to address a question of policy. There is no question that there are opportunities, and there's no question there are risks. People disagree about the proportion. Senator Roth was concerned that the planning of this library and the approval of this library has been going on simultaneously. Those that have objections, many times are not sure what they are objecting to and are not sure exactly what has been agreed upon. The unavoidability of some of this was recognized by Senator Roth. The issue of informing the group was brought out.

According to Senator Roth: My proposal speaks to another kind of information from the campus community to us. Senator Nuger has done us all a service by taking a survey, admitting it was

unscientific survey, and reported that there was a negative feeling there. Of course when you do that kind of survey, unscientific, asking people, a rally on campus, or what have you -- whether the rally is run by proponents for or against this project, people who are more interested in this project, either favorably or unfavorably, are more likely to give their opinions. I proposed that we survey the faculty, the staff, and the students separately. Even if that poll is organized together or separable, I don't suggest my own polling technique. I leave that to the Special Senate Committee - the form, the questions, maybe they will want more information. These three groups should be asked should this project, as you understand it, go forward. There's a problem there, because obviously, neither do understand. So part of this proposal is to encourage the communication to the campus community.

Senator Roth went on to explain that many members of the campus community are unaware of this project and explained that part of the reason for the poll is to make people aware of the project. He was specific that the joint library project should not be put to a vote by the campus, and stated that it was the Academic Senate that was charged with studying the project and looking into the benefits and the costs. Senator Roth did think that the opinions of the different members of the campus community was relevant and asked the Senate to pass his resolution.

Chair Stacks stated that questions will be asked first then move to debate. For the purposes for this discussion, Chair Stacks excused herself from Chairship and handed it over Chairship to Senator Gorney-Moreno.

Acting Chair Gorney-Moreno: The floor is open for questions. There is a speakers list.

Senator Sree Harsha: Most of my students don't like my exams, should I take a poll to see if they like it or not?

Senator Roth stated that this should not be a vote on the library, but that the information that would be gathered would have some value.

Senator Norton made the comment that a survey does not educate the respondents on the issues, so how would education take place.

Senator Roth thought that bringing new people into the debate would be a side affect.

Senator Young asked how many people participated in the open hearings, forums and the rallies? Some rough estimates were voiced indicating that participation at the various forums and rallies were limited. Senator Young questioned the interest.

Senator Roth stated that as very interested party he has not attended all of the forums because he doesn't have the time and felt that attendance was not an indicator of interest.

Senator Buzanski asked if Senator Roth would entertain a friendly amendment to include emeritus faculty. Senator Roth stated that he would be happy to accept such a friendly when it was offered.

Senator Van Hoof asked how reliable the results of a survey would be if the people don't know much about the issues. In order to poll individuals, they need to be informed. Senator Roth agreed that while the library is a very complicated project, there are some very basic things we can tell people -- We are getting a new building with more space but everyone in the city will be able to check books out assuming that by that time decisions on reference will be made. According to

Senator Roth, it can be explained.

Senator Nuger: Is it true we have to vote on this issue within the next two months? In principle I would be grateful for a survey to find out what people and more grateful more communication to people. Is it possible to do this poll quickly enough? Senator Roth suggested that it be left to the Special Senate Committee on the Joint Library Project to implement the policy if it passes. Senator Cook was wondering what kinds of questions would be appropriate for such a survey. Senator Roth stated that that would be up to the special committee except that people should be asked whether they support this or not.

Acting Chair Gorney-Moreno opened the floor for debate.

Senator Stacks spoke against the resolution on both practical issues and in principle. The workload of the special committee which is charged with creating a report for the senate, summarizing the open hearings, and draft a resolution for the senate. It was not clear how this poll could be accomplished so that the results would be meaningful for senators.

Senator Buzanski offered a friendly amendment to include emeritus faculty. It was accepted as friendly.

Senators Young, Norton, and Brown spoke in opposition to the resolution.

Senator Roth called the question. Calling the question was approved.

Senator Mesher asked if we still had a quorum. A count was taken and a quorum was found.

A voice vote was taken and the resolution was defeated.

VI. Policy Committee Action Items. In rotation.

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee

A.S. 1050 Class Scheduling

The Chair requested that AS 1050 not be presented at this time due to insufficient time available to present and discuss the proposal. The senate agreed.

A motion was made to adjourn. It was opposed by Senator Norton and a motion to present AS 1051 for Organization and Government Committee was offered. (It was seconded)

B. Organization and Government

Senator Norton introduced A.S. 1051 Staggered Terms for Committees (First Reading). Some committees have become badly unstaggered so in order to restagger, we introduce this resolution. There were no questions.

X. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded.

FINAL CONSENT CALENDAR PRESENTED**TO THE SENATE AND APPROVED****NOVEMBER 2, 1998**Policy Committees:

Suzanne Malloy Instruction and Student Affairs Seat H

Operating Committees:

Katrina Viesca (Student)	Affirmative Action Committee	Seat 1
Grant Blackburn (Student)	All University Teacher Educ. Committee	Seat 1
Vivian Lu (Student)	Campus Planning Board	Seat 2
Lorraine Leong	CIO Advisory Board	Seat H
Stefani Pearsall	CIO Advisory Board	Seat G
Grant Blackburn (Student)	Enrollment Committee	Seat 1
Denise Murray	Enrollment Committee	Seat E
Lynda Heiden	Graduate Studies and Research Committee	Seat C
Bill Fisher	Graduate Studies and Research Committee	EXO
Hania Melhem (Student)	International Programs Committee	Seat 2
Ly Tran (Student)	International Programs Committee	Seat 1
Kenneth Gonzales	Program Planning Committee	Seat C
Vivian Lu (Student)	Program Planning Board	Seat 1
David Cambra (Student)	Student Evaluation and Review Board	Seat 1
Wayne Wilson (Student)	Student Fairness Committee	Seat 1
Vivian Lu (Student)	Student Success Committee	Seat 1

Faculty-At-Large Appointments:

Marilyn Coach	Continuing Education	Seat F
Simon Dominguez	Program Planning Committee	Seat G
Josephine Mendez-Negrete	Improvement of Instruction	Seat J

Appointments -- Information Items

University Committee on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention

Connie Hernandez Associate Director University Housing Services

Robert Hernandez PEP Student Health Center

Richard Francisco Psychologist Counseling Services

*June McCullough Recommended for seat G (Presidential approval sought.)

Jerry Mimnaugh Executive Director Spartan Shops

Margaret Tam Coordinator of PEP Student Health Center

[[SJSU Academic Senate Main Page](#) | [Organization Chart of the Senate](#) | [Senate Officers](#)]
[[Senate Handbook](#) | [University Policies](#) | [Sense-of-the-Senate Resolutions](#) | [Minutes of Senate Meeting](#)]



[Back to the SJSU Home Page](#)

Send comments or questions regarding this Senate Web site to

[Lydia Rose](#)

Administrative Operations Analyst

Academic Senate Office

San José State University

One Washington Square

San José, CA 95192-0024

voice: (408) 924-2440

fax: (408) 924-2410