

2003/2004 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 27, 2003**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was taken. Thirty-nine Senators were present.****Ex Officio:**

Present: Nellen, Brent, McNeil
Crowley, Van Selst
Absent: Shokouh, Sabalius

CASA Representatives:

Present: David
Absent: Palakurthi, Gonzales

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Kassing, Goodman, Lee
Absent: Rascoe

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, El-Shaieb, Donoho

Deans:

Present: Breivik, Gorney-Moreno,
Meyers, Andrew

ED Represent:

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz

Students:

Present: Lam
Absent: Tran, Gadamsetty, Sherman,
Torres, Paat

ENG Representatives:

Present: Singh, Pour, Choo

H&A Representatives:

Present: Van Hooff, Desalvo, Vanniarajan, Heisch

Alumni Representative:

Present: Guerra

SCI Representatives:

Present: Hyde, Veregge, Bros, Branz
Absent: Kellum

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Baba, Von Till
Absent: Ogaz

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

SW Representative:

Present: Coach

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Liu, Thames, Yi

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –

Senate minutes of September 29, 2003 were approved as is.

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

Chair Nellen said that it would not be necessary to do a verbal roll call since Eva knows everyone and can record attendance without it. Chair Nellen said that we have a time certain at 2:05 p.m., so her remarks will be short. Chair Nellen introduced our two new Senators, Hyon Chu Yi from the General Unit, and Beth Von Till from the College of Social Sciences, who is the first lecturer to join the Senate after the recent constitutional change. Chair Nellen said she wanted to extend her congratulations and thanks to Senator Veregge, who

was elected the Chair of the Organization and Government Committee at the last meeting, but was unable to attend due to illness. Chair Nellen said that Interim President Joe Crowley would be giving a report on Athletics called for by our Sense of the Senate Resolution, SS-S02-4, where we endorsed the Knight Commission Report. This resolution calls for a report from the President's Office as well as the Executive Committee. Chair Nellen stated that the Senate also has two guests visiting us today, Kathy Kaiser, CSU Faculty Trustee, and Bob Cherney, CSU Statewide Senate Chair. They will be giving a brief presentation at 2:30 p.m. "We also have another time certain presentation at 3:30 p.m., and at least one resolution (AS 1191 on the Budget Cutting Principles) to get through," Chair Nellen said.

Chair Nellen said that there are some upcoming forums she wanted to announce. On this Wednesday, October 29th, from 11 a.m. to noon, there is an Educated Citizen's Forum. Also, on Wednesday, October 29th, from noon – 1:30 p.m., in BC 32, there is the first WASC Forum. And, then there is a Budget Forum on Thursday, October 30th from 2-3:30 p.m., in MLK Library, Lecture Room 255.

Chair Nellen announced that the week of November 10th, the Presidential candidates will be visiting the campus, and they will be holding open forums from 10:15 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. We will let you know more information when we have confirmed dates.

Chair Nellen announced that the Academic Senate has a Foundation account that donations can be made to. Chair Nellen said the Senate has a small budget and if we would like to have speakers visit, we have to get someone else to pay for it. Senators are encouraged to contact Eva Joice, in the Senate Office, if they would like to donate to the account.

Some items that Chair Nellen said she has been working on include: WASC reports; meeting with Operating Committee Chairs; looking at the committee rosters to see where we are missing key people; and meeting with past Senate Chairs. Chair Nellen said that the Organization and Government Committee has several issues before them this year including a referral on whether we are we missing key people on the committees and the Senate.

Chair Nellen said some things she has been doing include: looking into structures of other CSU senates and looking at where we might be missing people from divisions and units who have input relative to the charge of our senate committees. VPs are looking at this too, as is the Organization and Government Committee.

Chair Nellen said she has met with former senate chairs to talk about senate role and structure including role of BAC. Chair Nellen stated, "We don't have a mission statement and I think having one would be useful to us and the campus community. It would help us to be clear on the role we play in shared governance. We are an "academic senate" rather than a "faculty senate" or "university senate". What is the significance? We have voices beyond a faculty senate in that we have voting administrators, students and an alumni representative. But, unlike many CSU academic senates, we don't have the CFA rep here and we have no staff representation. Yet, we passed a campus smoking policy earlier this year that applies to everyone at SJSU even though some of those people are not represented by a senator. Should we have done that?"

Chair Nellen said, "Shared governance means collegiality. There are matters that are very clearly within the purview of faculty and that has been the case at universities even before 1857 – and that is - academic matters. How broad is “academic matters?” Certainly, curriculum – what all goes into any degree program? But, of course, at a state university, that is also influenced by the legislature and the trustees. Academic matters would also include protecting academic freedom, professional responsibility, academic integrity, grading standards, add/drop policies, review and selection of certain administrators, faculty recruitment-retention-promotion-tenure, understanding of what is teaching effectiveness, some financial matters, student affairs and services related to students’ studies, campus management as related to instruction (such as the academic calendar, availability of suitable facilities, a campus climate conducive to learning), and relationships with constituencies that also serve or interact with the campus. We do all of this, but I think we tend to focus on some of these areas more than others such that we might be missing issues and opportunities or leaving some for others on campus to address."

Chair Nellen said, "the Organization and Government Committee has a few referrals before it on senate structure, and some of these matters will come up in the WASC work we’re engaged in now. I’d also like all of you to think about our structure this year and ask yourself is any voice missing from our work in the senate? Are we missing or avoiding any campus issues? Are we addressing academic matters as well as we want to be?"

Chair Nellen stated, "Despite my questions we are quite effective. I expect we’ll have a resolution from the Organization and Government Committee this year to make some incremental improvements to our senate. Be sure they have any ideas you have. As the campus soon engages in strategic planning and works to improve the current approach that makes everything a priority – work in which the senate must be an active participant and driver, that we’ll have additional improvements to implement that are also informed by the WASC preparatory work and review."

B. From the President of the University – No Report.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

- A. Executive Committee Minutes –**
September 29, 2003 – No questions.
October 13, 2003 – No questions.

Budget Advisory Committee Minutes –
October 20, 2003 – Senator Buzanski said that under item #1, the apostrophe should be removed.

B. Consent Calendar – Approved as is.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Budget Advisory Committee –

Senator Brent presented *AS 1191, Principles and Strategies to be Observed and Utilized during Times of Budget Cuts (Final Reading)*. Senator McNeil presented an amendment to change the 7th bullet of the "Principles to Be Observed While Cutting Budgets" to remove "in making budget cuts." and replace it with "**, including the California Legislature's Supplemental Report Language, endorsed by the California Faculty Association and the CSU administration, that would give "priority to funding core classroom instructional needs, student services, and libraries" and would apportion reductions "to mitigate their impact on the quality and availability of [CSU] class offerings, student services and libraries."** The Senate voted and the amendment passed. Senator Thames presented an amendment to the 8th bullet of the "Principles to Be Observed While Cutting Budgets" to add "**student services personnel and librarians**" after "tenure-track faculty," in the 2nd line. The Senate voted and the amendment passed. Senator Campsey presented an amendment to change the 3rd bullet of the "Longer-term Budget-Cutting Strategies" to add "All units are encouraged to" before "Increase the proportion of the." The Senate voted and the amendment failed. **The Senate then voted on AS 1191 as amended, and it passed.**

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee –

Senator Pour said they are working on the "Mandatory Email" referral and a few others at this time.

C. University Library Board –

Senator Branz gave a handout that gave information on the usage of the new library. Senator Branz said the volume of use is much higher than anticipated. This is going to require more resources, or they are going to need to plan for journal cuts, due to the fact that they did not receive any lottery funds this year, and had no increase in operational funds.

D. Professional Standards Committee –

Senator Katz said that the Affirmative Action Committee is in the process of changing their name and charge to be more in line with what they do. The Professional Standards Committee is also starting to look at RTP Standards. Senator Katz said that forums would be held regarding this issue by the subcommittee working on RTP, of which Senator El-Shaieb is a member. Senator Katz will setup a forum for the Senate on RTP policy modifications.

E. Curriculum and Research Committee –

Senator Lessow-Hurley said that the committee has been hard at work reviewing proposals from the Undergraduate/Graduate Studies areas. There are a few new degrees being considered including the Ed.D. The committee will also be bringing a policy to the Senate for review at the next meeting that will "somewhat streamline the program planning process." The committee is also looking at creating a policy that would create governing structures for interdisciplinary degrees.

F. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Veregge said that the committee is looking at the Senate and Senate committees' structures. Anyone that thinks certain committees should have additional members should email Senator Veregge.

VII. Special Committee Reports – None

VIII. New Business –

A. Presentation of a Report on Athletics:

Interim President Crowley said that he had copies of the Athletics report to be distributed after he is done with his presentation. Interim President Crowley said that Irene Miura did the actual work on the Athletics report, he will just be giving a summary of the report today. Interim President Crowley apologized for having to leave before 3 p.m. He has to attend a meeting at city hall put together by the Mayor of San José to "look at enhanced avenues and vehicles for collaboration between the city and the university, among other things."

Interim President Crowley said, "The event that led to this Athletics report was a report by the second Knight Commission that enjoyed some support for a couple of weeks, and then by and large disappeared into the mist. The report from the second Knight Commission was almost the opposite of the first Knight Commission Report. Nothing much has come of the report. There may be another or 3rd Knight Commission Report and this may be a better environment for it," Interim President Crowley said.

Interim President Crowley stated, "The President's Athletic Report covers the Athletics certification process, which is sponsored by the NCAA as part of the reform effort that came to fruition in the early 1990's." Interim President Crowley said, "It is, if you are not familiar with it, an accreditation program for Athletics at the Division 1 level. This would be the second time that SJSU has gone through this process. We have received the report of the visiting committee, and subsequently the report of the NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification. The way this committee does its business now is to notify the institutions that have been visited of the results of the visit and the work that needs to be done, and then give the institution approximately one year to get the work done before reaching a decision as to whether the institution will continue to be certified, certified with conditions/without conditions, or not certified. The university came out reasonably well with only five categories of work that needs to be done at the time of the report. Some work needed to be done in the area of the Gender/Equity component certification and the minority plan, those two assignments have been completed. There was also a need to have a rules compliance evaluation by someone outside of Athletics and SJSU, and this requirement will be satisfied by an evaluation by an official from the WAC in March. Also an external audit issue arose simply having to do with the absence of management letters for the years 1999 and 2000. We have completed this requirement. There was an issue of the Academic Support Services areas being in need of additional information, this requirement has also been completed. When the certification process began in 1993, it called for recertification every five years. Recertification will now be done every ten years. There is also a movement afoot to change some of the standards used in certification. These standards have become more

burdensome than they ought to be, requiring a greater degree of specific kinds of activities. I'm not sure where this will go, but that is what is currently happening. Some people feel that the certification should just be put out of business. I don't think that will happen, but we will see."

Interim President Crowley continued, "There is a discussion in the report also emanating from NCAA legislation of the meetings and results of a group called "Spartans First." This group included people from the university as well as the local community that looked at new requirements for remaining in the Division 1A classification. This report lays out in broad terms what might need to be done in order for the institution to continue to be classified as a Division 1A institution. This is where the well-known requirement of an average attendance of 15,000 comes from. We must also have five home games against a Division 1A institution. In addition, we need six conference sports for men, eight for women. Interim President Crowley said he is almost certain that this requirement will be dropped. There is proposed legislation in front of Division 1A to drop this requirement right now."

"Regarding scholarships, 90% of the 85 Division 1A football allowance needs to be met. And, the big issue at SJSU, and probably for 25 other Division 1A institutions, is meeting the attendance requirements. Right now there is a protest movement going on, particularly among those Division 1A universities that are not part of the Bowl Championship Series," Interim President Crowley stated. "We are looking at these new requirements, specifically the issue of whether the NCAA is on legal ground to implement the 15,000 attendance requirement as a way of determining whether an institution remains a Division 1A member or not, and looking at the division of the spoils of the obscene amount of money that is now attached to the Bowl championship series games. Some of that money might be spent among about 53 of the 117 Division 1A institutes. SJSU is a member of this protest movement," Interim President Crowley said. "There is also a conference realignment that is now sweeping the country. This may affect the WAC. It is also difficult to say what the future of WAC may be if this happens. If the WAC were to disappear, then SJSU would have to decide where to go, what to do about our Athletics program from there. I don't believe the WAC will disappear, but that is one of the possibilities," Interim President Crowley stated.

Interim President Crowley stated, "The Athletics report lays out detailed information that was requested by the Senate regarding staff, administrative staff, coaching staff, salary data, responsibilities of these positions, and so on. Scholarships are listed by sport in the report. Every coach, with just a few exceptions, is provided the maximum allowance of scholarships. The exceptions are men and women's cross-country, and golf. Coaches are not required to use all those dollars for scholarships. The coaches are allowed to make the decision on what to use them for such as additional equipment, or recruitment. This is pretty standard across the country. There is also student athlete graduation information in the report overall and by sport. Some information is asterisked, this is because of what you can and can't due in accordance with privacy statutes (FERPA)."

Interim President Crowley said, "Graduation rates for Athletes are 56% v. 36% for SJSU overall. These rates are based on 6-year cohorts. Graduation rates are the single most reported artifact in Athletics. Women athletes do better than men in graduation rates at this university. A series of reforms are likely to become legislation in the future. The number of core courses for initial

eligibility has increased from 13 to 14 and will go up to 16. The continuing eligibility requirements have been significantly strengthened by an increased percentage of credits and grade point average required of second/third/fourth year student athletes to be able to continue their eligibility to compete. What is happening now is a proposal that may result in a much improved and more revealing way of communicating information about the academic performance of student athletes at the institutional level. The proposal is a continuing examination year-by-year of the progress of each student athlete, at least each one receiving a scholarship, and for those institutions that don't provide athletic scholarships, then a review of their athletes' generally. You look at things like if a student was in good standing academically in the fall, what about that student athlete's performance in the spring. All of these things are going to be examined for each student athlete, not recorded by me, but collectively by the institution. So that you can see if you have student athletes that are not meeting the eligibility requirements on a yearly basis, that will be reported publicly. Furthermore, a package of incentives/disincentives is in the works so that if the institution is fairing poorly, it will lose scholarships. The impact could be considerable. If a particular sport is doing well they might gain scholarships, but that package is still in the works. This is pretty much the material that is in the report," Interim President Crowley stated.

Chair Nellen said since Senators have not yet had an opportunity to see the report, we should pass it out at the end of this meeting and have time for questions about the report for Interim President Crowley at the next meeting.

Questions:

Senator Brent said, "Interim President Crowley you have been quoted in the Spartan Daily and elsewhere saying that if the university were going to consider leaving Division 1A, that should only occur after broad consultation and I agree, but my question relates to the fact that over the past ten years decisions that have been made to increase funding and increase the profile of Athletics that have not happened after broad consultation. For example, the decision to enter into the WAC was made unilaterally, and the decision this past summer to shield Athletics from the General Fund budget cut was done without consultation. So, I have two questions. Do you feel broad consultation across campus is necessary when decisions are made to increase funds for Athletics, or only when we consider cuts to Athletics? And, how can you assure us that faculty opinion will be taken into consideration in the future?"

Interim President Crowley said, "If you were talking about a large scale increase in the Athletics budget say from \$12.5 million last year to let's say \$18 million this year, yes, you certainly would. I think it is magnitude of change. At the place where I used to hang out, when we had a major decision about either classification or conference, we did it on the basis of widespread consultation. We went through the Senate, the Alumni Association, and our community friends who looked carefully at the financial situation before the decision was made. We did this process when we decided to go into the Division 1AA conference, and when we went from Division 1AA to Division 1A. Joining the WAC was a little different, and I suspect the same thing happened at SJSU. We were given something like 24 hours to decide if we wanted to go into the WAC, and it is very difficult to do a campus-wide consultation in that kind of situation," Interim President Crowley stated.

Interim President Crowley said he would like to "just make one footnote on the budget side. Although as you say the Athletics Department was not required to participate in the General Fund budget reduction this year, the department nevertheless is operating at a figure \$1 million dollars less than last year. So, it went down from \$12.5 million last year to \$11.5 million this year." Interim President Crowley said, "if it comes to the point where the institution needs to seriously examine the question of the future of the program as a Division 1A institution, that is what I meant when I said that is a decision that ought not be made without major, major consultation inside and outside the institution. That is a big decision affecting a lot of people."

Senator Singh said that one of the questions missing on the Athletics report is what the advantages and disadvantages are. Senator Singh said the report should also include how many tutors above the amount normally used for students, are used for student athletes. Interim President Crowley said he "would take these observations under advisement."

B. Remarks from Trustee Kathy Kaiser and CSU Senate Chair Bob Cherny:

Chair Nellen introduced and welcomed Kathy Kaiser from CSU Chico, who is a new CSU Faculty Trustee, and Bob Cherny from SFSU, who is the CSU Statewide Senate Chair. Trustee Kaiser said that this is their first "Bob and Kathy" show. Trustee Kaiser said that she "is the newest member appointed to the Board of Trustees, and the first woman appointed. This role is very much in the current budget crisis. It is like being told you have an Army, but only half of them can take the field due to budget cuts. Some issues that have been raised in front of the Board of Trustees include a white paper on SJSU's Athletic program." Trustee Kaiser said she "strongly states that this is strictly a campus-based issue. The Board of Trustees does not ask a campus to make this decision. The campus makes this decision and then asks the Board of Trustees to in effect support it or not." Trustee Kaiser said that "it is true that she comes from large institutions such as Florida State and Duke. Only about 50 of the Division 1A football schools break even, so when you look at the landscape of financial aspects that is a fact. What she and Bob would like to do is give brief introductions and then answer questions."

Trustee Kaiser said, "One of the things that many people are interested in is what impact she will have on the Board of Trustees in the name of faculty issues. One of the first things you learn on the Board is that it is a legal entity of one, so I can make you all kinds of promises but they wouldn't hold water unless the Board, as a unit, decided that. However, certainly I can promise you to bring issues that are raised to me that I believe need to have a hearing in front of the Board," Trustee Kaiser stated. "Chico is in the midst of a Presidential selection process and that is a very hot topic. This is a very sensitive issue for the Board. The other major issue is the budget. The Board will meet on October 30th, 2003, to decide the Chico President. We will meet on October 31, 2003 to decide the budget. This is normally done by a conference call, but it will be done in person this year. That tells you how much weight is put behind this. Bob is really our expert on the Budget. I'll let him speak more on that. We are in a framework of playing chicken. We don't believe we can follow the legislative mandates and survive at our current level of serving students, and that is a very serious challenge. The other aspect is as we look at managing enrollment targets with eight impacted campuses in the system and many

others approaching that; the UC system under terrible enrollment pressures; with very little space left in the private universities, the real question is what happens to California, not just the CSU, as we face the impending surge of students and a lack of state funding," Trustee Kaiser stated.

Trustee Kaiser then turned the floor over to CSU Statewide Senate Chair, Bob Cherny. Chair Cherny said this is his first semester as CSU Statewide Senate Chair. Chair Cherny said that they "deal with broad curricular guidelines at the CSU Statewide Senate level as opposed to the specific issues at the campus level. They have ended up spending far more time dealing with events in Sacramento than" Chair Cherny could have imagined. Chair Cherny said, "Some issues on the November agenda for the CSU Statewide Senate include: implementing new legislation for teacher education; enrollment pressures at overcrowded campuses; implementing the joint doctoral programs; YRO; and remedial classes." Chair Cherny then said that "this was actually the November 1963 agenda for the CSU Statewide Senate. The CSU Statewide Senate is celebrating its 40th Anniversary this semester," Chair Cherny said. Chair Cherny then said that "the actual November agenda this year includes implementing new legislation for teacher education, and enrollment pressures at overcrowded campuses just like the agenda in 1963. There are some things that are not on our agenda this month from the November 1963 agenda, but they remain on our yearly agenda of issues." Chair Cherny stated that they have "had a special task force working since July on the issue of teacher preparation called the Integrated Teacher Preparation Task force. This task force came out of the convergence of two things. About a year and a half ago there was some legislation in Sacramento designed to create a separate teacher education major for elementary school teachers. That legislation failed. However, within the CSU Statewide Senate our Teacher Education K-12 Relations Committee began to look seriously at that full set of issues. They spent the past Academic Year in a series of investigations to find out why are we doing things the way we are; do other California institutions that fall under the same legislation prepare teachers in the same way that we do; and can we be more efficient in terms of the amount of time that is spent educating teachers. That committee recommended the creation of a task force to address some of these issues. At the same time, as many of you may be aware, during the Spring the state legislature did consider new legislation SB81 that required an integrated approach to teacher education. It requires that general education, a major, the subject matter preparation for a teaching credential, and the professional teacher education courses all be a part of an integrated program that can be completed in 135 units or less. This would be about 4 1/2 years, or maybe 4 years and some summers. In the end, SB81 proved to be a powerful force driving our Integrated Teacher Preparation taskforce, because we are under obligation to do something. We were successful in getting a lot of specific curricular material out of SB81. The bill that was finally passed has a lot less specific information about curriculum than the earlier versions did. Part of the price for that was to put some of those curricular provisions into Title V. However, we have a bit more influence over Title V than we do legislation. Keeping it in Title V at least gives us some control over the curriculum."

Another issue that Chair Cherny said the CSU Statewide Senate has been dealing with is the related issues of budget and enrollment. "As state funding declines, and we find we have ever increasing numbers of students that want to get into the CSU, we're facing this crunch where we can't handle the numbers. The CSU made the decision that we will respond to this by limiting

enrollment on a scale that has never been done before since the master plan. The CSU Statewide Senate is involved in this in a couple of ways. The CSU Statewide Senate has representation on the system-wide Budget Advisory Committee," Chair Cherny stated. Chair Cherny said he sits on this committee as well as an alternate, and the CSU Statewide Senate has managed to get two observers on the committee as well. "Other members on the committee include: alumni representatives, student representatives, CFA representatives, other union representatives, some Presidents, some Provosts, and some Vice Presidents for Finance."

Chair Cherny said, "The committee has met a couple of times and approved a budget approach that will be presented to the Trustees on October 31, 2003. This budget ignores what the legislature said last year, that there will be no increases for compensation, and no increases for enrollment. The budget that is proposed recommends both of those things. The budget proposal goes back to the last Governor's partnership where the CSU was to get a 4% increase each year, and that increase would fall into four categories: mandated costs, compensation, enrollment increases, and deferred maintenance. The package that will be submitted will include a request for money for mandated costs such as insurance, etc.; a request for an increase in compensation for all CSU employees; a request for money to cover enrollment increases; and a request for money for deferred maintenance. Beyond that 4%, there will be a request for money to implement the first stage of ACR 73."

Chair Cherny stated, "In some ways this is sort of a fantasy world, since we are quite certain the Department of Finance won't give us this kind of a budget. On the other hand, this budget is a way of educating the legislature. We are telling them that we desperately need this kind of funding, and if you are not going to give it to us, you at least need to know that this is what we need to have at the bare minimum to meet our obligations to our current students and future students." Chair Cherny said he feels this is an improvement over the way the CSU has dealt with some of these budget issues in the past financial crises. Chair Cherny stated, "Last Spring the CSU Statewide Senate passed a resolution that said if they don't give us the money to fund enrollment then we can't take the increased enrollment. That is the position that the Trustees took in July as well. We have our Faculty Affairs Committee working on a project called "Investing in the Faculty." What we are trying to do is put together a financial analysis of what faculty need, i.e. salary and a whole range of other support. We know this isn't going to go into this year's budget, but we want to have our package all ready, because we assume eventually the state's economy will turn around and we want to have our package ready to give to the Trustees. For those of you that have a long memory, you may remember the Cornerstones. One of the ten Cornerstones was "Investing in the Faculty." A lot of those Cornerstones got implemented over the last ten years, but "Investing in the Faculty" wasn't one of them. We want to draw upon that and be ready to tell the Trustees what we need.

"We are also spending a lot of time this year looking at transfers. The legislature, and especially Senator Scott, who is the Chair of the Senate Committee on Higher Education, has raised concerns about impediments to transfer. There are some problems with transfers. Most transferring students don't have problems. The big threat is legislation that would mandate that all CSU majors have the same lower division requirements as a way of expediting transfer from the community colleges. We think that it is very troublesome to have this kind of a curricular mandate from the legislature. We have been working very hard to demonstrate that we, the

faculty, recognize we need to do everything we can to ensure a smooth transfer between the community college and CSU. We created a project several years ago at the CSU Statewide Academic Senate called "Lower Division Requirements in Majors." This project is funded by the Chancellor's Office, and they've assigned staff to assist with it. However, control rests with the CSU Academic Senate. Senator David McNeil is one of the members of the oversight committee for this project. This project brings together department chairs throughout the CSU to determine if they can find consensus about the lower division requirements in their majors. The goal is to be able to demonstrate to the legislature that there is consensus about the lower division requirements. This way we may be able to convince them that legislation is not necessary. Finally, the Assembly Committee on Higher Education is holding a series of hearings this Fall, I have attended the first two. What they are doing is looking at policy implications of alternative ways of funding higher education. They started out by reviewing a long list of other ways of funding higher education. They have discarded some of the ideas and are going to look further at others. The list included almost every scheme that had been tried in the world. One method they looked at was the Australian approach called "learn, earn, reimburse." In this method the state pays for the education, and then the cost of it is attached to their income taxes for the rest of their lives. They also looked at a system considered in Colorado. Colorado considered using a system of vouchers where savings accounts were setup and students could draw from that money up to a certain total amount, so that you funded students and not universities and then the students could go to whatever university they wanted. These ideas were discarded. They also looked at the British system of funding the number of students that finish their degree rather than the number of students that enroll. What they are left with is a list of five that they are continuing to explore. One of these is to look at fees in general, and to try and figure out other approaches to student fees. One model is the East Coast/New Jersey Model of Fees, where students are required to pay a high amount of their fees. Accompanying the high fees, would be higher student aid. A second area is the restructuring of student aid programs, especially the Cal Grant Program so that more of our students are eligible. A third one is differential funding by level. This means different funding based on class level, i.e. lower division, upper division, and graduate levels. Another approach is using technology to increase student learning and reduce costs. This is part of this continuing fantasy that if we make use of technology we will significantly reduce the cost of instruction. I think most of us that have used various forms of mediated instruction, know how time-intensive it is for the instructor. If anything you need to have fewer students in these classes. However, a Pew Foundation study indicated that you could make a 40% savings on the cost of instruction by properly structuring your large lower division survey classes using technology. The final method is incentive funding. The idea here is that the state will establish certain priorities that they want higher education to accomplish, and then give rewards to those institutions that do the best job of accomplishing them. It is not clear whether this would be additional money or they would just redirect existing money, but since all of this is based on the fact that there is not enough money, it seems unlikely there would be any additional money available. There are two more hearings in this series yet to come. One of these hearings will be focused on community college funding," Chair Cherny stated.

Questions:

Senator Thames asked if there was "any rumble in their part of the woods about how the change in our state leadership will be affecting us?" Trustee Kaiser said that there "really is nothing but rumbling, because nobody knows for sure. Governor-elect Schwarzenegger has promised tax cuts and there have been some articles that have said that the auditor that he is bringing in has claimed that she can find fat anywhere. However, that is hard to imagine considering the large staff of auditors and their expertise that are currently used." Trustee Kaiser said, "The Board of Trustees recognizes that we have a \$54+ million dollar mandatory cost increase, so even if the legislature were to say no more students, and no more pay increases, we would not be at that point. \$54 million dollar mandatory costs mean that something has to give." Chair Cherny said, "There are some people in Sacramento that believe that the Governor-elect is in the process of asking for a tax increase. And if you remember, the two biggest tax increases in our history have been under Reagan and Wilson."

Senator Campsey asked about the lack of funding for YRO. Trustee Kaiser said that it has been funded, because the state now pays for students to attend. Trustee Kaiser said, "There was an assumption that you could conduct business for less cost in the summer. Some of that assumption was based on having less expensive people teach in the summer, and some of that was based on using utilities and buildings on a year-round basis." Trustee Kaiser said that she "believes you are going to see a lot more pressure on us to use our buildings more efficiently."

Senator Buzanski said that we have a couple of joint doctoral programs here that "will not abide by the requirement that if you are going to get a doctorate, you should have a foreign language requirement." Senator Buzanski asked if Trustee Kaiser or Chair Cherny "had formed an opinion on that issue, and if not would they consider doing something about it." Trustee Kaiser said, "The curriculum belongs to the institutions that are putting together the programs. The Board of Trustees is concerned with the number of people applying for the programs compared to the number accepted. The Board's concern is whether our faculty are getting equal status and equal play with the UC Faculty." Trustee Kaiser said she "does not see the Board of Trustees having any interest in trying to dictate the curriculum for a particular shared doctorate program, or EDD program." Chair Cherny said, "The Ed.D is not a research degree, it is an applied doctorate. The Ed.D is seen as being different from the Ph.D. in that respect. The idea being that with a Ph.D. you have to do research, so you would need to know a foreign language to be able to do research in foreign language sources." Senator Buzanski said, "this degree is meant for Principals, and they are in areas where they have many students that speak a different language. How can they effectively communicate with these students or the parents?"

Senator Choo asked if it was possible to get some kind of funding from local governments. Trustee Kaiser said that she hoped that we would take a different approach. She said, "If you talk to local officials, you are going to see how incensed they are because they have been stripped of their money and face unfunded mandates from the state right and left. Losses to us multiply about three times in the community immediately, however, losses over time and earnings power multiply about eight times in the community." Trustee Kaiser said she believes that we "shouldn't be asking the local community for money, but for political clout. The local community can be a powerful ally." Chair Cherny said that local communities are even more

hard-pressed than the state when it comes to the tax-base, because so much of their tax base has been restricted. And, if the car tax is taken away, Chair Cherny said he isn't sure how they are going to pay for police and fire protection.

C. Recommendations from the 2002-2003 Teacher-Scholars Study of Faculty Views on Student Writing Competency:

Professor David Mesher gave a presentation on Student Writing Competency based on research done by the Teacher Scholar Group last year. Professor Mesher thanked all Senators for taking time to listen to the presentation. David said the group "decided to study faculty attitudes toward student writing composition competency on campus, and then to think of some ways we can address the problems." Professor Mesher said, "Freshman entering SJSU or the bay area generally, almost 60% at SJSU, require remediation in English composition. The CSU average is 49%, so there is a significant difference. The way it works is that students take some sort of exam coming out of high school SAT/EPT. If they receive a very high mark they are tested out of English 1A, maybe out of English 1B. If they receive average marks they go into English 1A. This is the only campus that requires two semesters of Freshman English in the CSU. If they fail the exam, they go into LLD or Academic English I and II. They are also supposed to complete English 1A and English 1B. This is their lower division requirement. Their upper division requirement is the 100W. All students must pass the WST and then enroll in 100W. There is a high failure rate for the WST, particularly for transfer students and students with English as a second language. If they fail the WST twice they can enroll in LLD 98 and 99. If they fail LLD 98 and 99, they can repeat them as many times as they want. Many students think of this as kind of a game and retake the WST 8 or 10 times, without ever enrolling in the LLD class hoping to get lucky. These problems can be high stakes. There was an Executive Order that required us to cut the number of students needing remediation by 90% in 2000."

Professor Mesher stated, "The group sent out the survey to 400 faculty members throughout the colleges, they got 140 back. This is a survey of faculty attitudes. The reason they surveyed this is that the group felt that nothing would change unless the faculty got behind it. Two-thirds of the faculty disagreed that the quality of student writing meets college-level expectations. These are students from all their classes, not just Freshman. This is particularly true not in Humanities and Social Sciences, but in CASA, Business, Engineering and Science. The faculty are aware of the problems. Half of the faculty believe the quality of student writing affects the content of the course. If faculty don't think their students are up to it, they offer fewer essays or they offer multiple-choice exams. Faculty overwhelmingly think bad student composition skills require them to work a lot harder by spending more time correcting work and dealing with students. Most faculty feel that the level of writing skills that students exiting from SJSU has a significant impact on the opinion businesses form of the quality of the education the student received at SJSU. This is also one of the reasons it takes students so long to graduate from SJSU. Most faculty accept their part of the blame for this, but also feel that part of the problem is with transferring students."

Professor Mesher said, "There were some suggestions about what could be done about this. One suggestion was a campus-wide standard for the 100W. This provoked quite a bit of negative response campus-wide. Another suggestion was for workshops or assistance at the college level

that is discipline specific. If the Deans were to buy into it, it could possibly play into the RTP process." Professor Mesher said the group talked about "the possibility of publishing these kind of results so that they could tell parents of high school kids that come out with a "B" in English from high school, what that translates to in years toward a degree at SJSU."

Questions:

Senator Singh said that he believes "the quality of writing is very poor for both native and foreign-born students." Senator Singh asked, "What happened with the High School Exit Exam that students were supposed to be taking?" Professor Mesher said that they "started that exit exam, but he didn't believe they were counting the results right now because they were so low the first year." Senator Lessow-Hurley confirmed that the results of the first year were so low that they suspended it. Senator Lessow-Hurley said that they are considering giving the test to 11th graders so that they can see where they stand. Professor Mesher said that "the students coming here straight out of high school aren't the biggest problem, because they are the brightest of their schools. The test is a great idea, but it targets the wrong group. The most problems come from students that transfer from the community colleges, that didn't do that well in English in high school to begin with, then they come here and flounder for years." Senator Singh said he believes the 100W should have some uniform standard writing requirements. Senator Singh asked, "Can you implement this?" Mesher said that would be the Writing Requirements Committee. Senator Katz said, "There is a certain intractability to having such a large number of English as a 2nd language students coming to the campus that have certain academic skills, but among them is not a well-honed sense of linguistic intuition." Senator Katz said, he "worked for years with people one-on-one and we would need a broad based campus commitment for faculty to work very systemic and systematically with people and give them a lot of support." Senator Katz said, he "sat on BOGs for years and saw lots of GE courses that are supposed to have serious writing requirements, look for every way possible to seemingly avoid this." Senator Katz asked, "How do you see us bringing about a change in faculty commitment?" Senator Katz then said, "There is no way to bring 59% down to 10%." Professor Mesher said, According to the results of the survey, faculty feel they are committed to that goal. They think they are working hard at it." Professor Mesher said he "sees no reason to disagree with that." Professor Mesher said, "It does seem like a great time to do something about it. Faculty are aware of the problems, and would like to do something about it. They are willing to commit time to achieve that end. The question is what to do about it. Faculty would rather keep it at the lower level, but are so frustrated that 50% would even take a campus-wide exam," Professor Mesher said.

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

A. Vice President for Student Affairs –

AVP Sharon Willey was recognized by Chair Nellen and said that Student Affairs is accepting applications from students, faculty, and staff interested in participating in a leadership retreat. The deadline to apply is November 3, 2003. AVP Willey also announced that they had held a fundraiser to benefit the Emergency Fund and raised over \$3,000.

B. Associated Students President – Not in attendance today.

C. Statewide Senate –

Senator McNeil said there is a meeting in two weeks. They are working on a Student Success Conference that will include people from all campuses including himself, Chair Nellen, Senator Lessow-Hurley, and Susan McClory, who is the Chair of the Student Success Committee, on December 5, 2003.

D. Provost –

Senator Goodman said enrollment for Spring seems to be very strong. Spring admissions are up 230% over last spring. However, that's because we were light in Fall admissions. Senator Goodman said that they are "very busy planning for the Academic Success Center to move into Clark Hall. There will also be about 170 offices, and a number of high tech classrooms in Clark Hall. In terms of Academic Technology, we continue to make progress. We now have 50 smart classrooms. On the research front, we are doing great. Last year we hit \$41 million in research grants, we submitted over \$140 million in proposals. This year for the first 3 months of the fiscal year, we are running at \$5 million per month in research grants. One thing that distinguishes us from our peers, is that at SJSU undergraduates are very involved with the research," Senator Goodman stated.

E. Vice President for Student Affairs –

Senator Kassing said that by the end of the week they should have the budget report done, and copies will be handed out at the November Senate meeting and at the Budget Forum on Thursday, October 30, 2003.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.