

2004/2005 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
October 25, 2004**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-seven Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Nellen, McNeil, Greathouse
Van Selst, Sabalius

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Gonzales, Fee, Hooper

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Rascoe, Kassing, Lee, Ashton
Absent: Goodman

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, El-Shaieb, Donoho

Deans:

Present: Breivik, Stacks, Sigler
Absent: Meyers

ED Represent:

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Maldonado-Colon, Parsons

Students:

Present: Gadamsetty, Kelly, Lam,
Nguyen, Stillman
Absent: Bjerkek

ENG Representatives:

Present: Choo
Absent: Singh, Pour

H&A Representatives:

Present: Van Hooff, Desalvo, Heisch,
Hilliard, Vanniarajan, Williams

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Guerra

SCI Representatives:

Present: Veregge, Bros, Kellum, Branz, McClory

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Von Till, Propas, Hebert

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

SW Representative:

Present: Wilson

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames, Matoush
Absent: Yi

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –

The Senate minutes of September 27, 2004 were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Nellen said, "I do have a few announcements and reminders. The agenda includes some information items, be sure to read them and email me if you have any questions. As far as what is going on with the task forces that are listed in the information items, you have seen the operation of the WASC Steering Committee because your Senate committees all

gave input to them. As for the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) task force, Dr. Bill Fisher, the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), will be giving us an update today. We also have the Chair of the Athletics Board, Bob Kumamoto, with Bill.”

Chair Nellen stated, “Deans, and the equivalent, should have received information regarding the Lottery Professional Development Grants. If you haven’t gotten any information let me know. The deadline to submit the proposals to your Dean is November 8, 2004. There is a total of \$500,000 out there for Professional Development Grants this year.”

Chair Nellen said, “Please mark this down, the First Annual Academic Freedom forum will be held Friday, February 11, 2005, from 10:00 a.m. to Noon, sponsored by the Senate and hopefully co-sponsored by the CFA and Associated Students. We will hear from campus speakers as well as from Marcus Harvey who is a local representative for the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).”

Chair Nellen said, “The Senate office sent out invitations to new faculty members to invite them to attend one or more of our Senate meetings. Please follow-up with the new faculty members in your colleges.”

Chair Nellen said, “I sent out information to the campus on applying to be a Faculty Trustee. The current faculty trustee is Kathy Kaiser from CSU Chico. She is eligible to reapply for the position and is going to do so. All Senates have been asked to endorse her, please think about this.”

Chair Nellen said, “At the next Senate meeting there will be a presentation about our General Education (GE) program so that we will be ready to review and consider the recommendations for change that the Curriculum and Research (C&R) Committee will get from the Board of General Studies (BOGS) in March 2005. We will also have a presentation on the Graduate Writing Requirements, based on a CSU study.”

Chair Nellen stated, “If you haven’t joined the Educated Persons Listserv which is looking at how our GE might be enhanced to better enable our students to become educated persons, please send me an email. We also have twice a month brown bags, and one is coming up this Wednesday. We have some interesting discussions, and everyone is welcome. Please stop by.”

Chair Nellen said, “At the last Senate meeting when questions were directed to Interim President Kassing, a question came up about the cost of the Morgan State game that occurred on September 18th, 2004. We learned that there was a loss on that game, and that it was something they hadn’t expected, but it did happen. We learned the loss would be covered by university funds in some way. This information got picked up in the Spartan Daily the next day, and also in the San José Mercury News that same week. I know that I, as well as other faculty and staff, am very concerned about learning about it in that setting, especially when we do have a Resource Planning Board (RPB). I have pursued conversations to learn more about that with Interim President Kassing, and we will continue to discuss it at the Executive Committee meetings. We had a discussion at today’s Executive Committee meeting as well.

We want to see what improvements can be made. This was a significant amount of money, and I don't think many people would doubt that. Considering the efforts we will be undergoing to make the RPB permanent as well as putting in some structure to feed into the RPB about the university's priorities and goals, we want to have a good discussion about this. I just want to make you all aware that that discussion has begun. It started with today's Executive Committee meeting, and I believe some discussions will take place with the RPB. I feel that in every way the Interim President and Vice President did buy into budget transparency. I think it is still a learning process for all of us as to what mechanism and what activities come to the RPB, which serves as an advisory board to the President. I think our conversations have been very productive, and I thank Interim President Kassing for being so open about this. We have had several conversations and exchanged emails regarding this."

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Kassing said, "A couple of things I need to share with you today first, I need to leave about 3:00 p.m. Next, I mentioned the WASC Self Study, and we had an excellent exit interview with the WASC team. The Academic Senate did a super job. Bill Delouter just couldn't say enough good things about this campus, especially considering everything we had been through. It was year where we had Bob Caret leave, an Interim President come and go, a new President here for only two weeks, and then an Acting President/Interim President appointed again. You left a very good impression on him as far as the health, spirit, and strength of the institution. I think you should feel very good. The WASC team's written report should be out in about six or seven weeks. Their recommendations tend to revolve around SJSU needing to do some planning, pay attention to enrollment management, campus life, and to the new housing village. There were some other components, but these were the primary ones."

Interim President Kassing said, "We've setup three or four sessions where I asked Annette to help out the WASC leadership team which I'll identify as including, Bethany Shifflett, Bob Cooper, Pam Stacks, and Dorothy Poole. Each was in charge of a WASC portfolio. We want to get a discussion going about how would we plan. How would we organize to plan, how would we structure to plan, and what processes and tools would we use for our campus. The Senate brought in the planning officer from SLO and from Long Beach at the Senate Retreat about three weeks ago. In addition, we've had several discussions of our own. I think we are starting to get a picture of how we could structure that, and we'll bring that back to another Senate meeting."

Interim President Kassing said, "What I would like to do today is announce that I have reassigned Dorothy Poole from the Director of Quality Improvement in the Finance and Administration Division, to the position of Assistant to the President for Institutional Planning. She comes to us with a strong background. She was a member of the WASC team last year, and she has a strong planning background. Dorothy is serious, she is smart, and she finishes what she starts."

Interim President Kassing said, "Chair Nellen made a reference a few minutes ago about the Morgan State game. I think it would be fair to say that I gave an incomplete answer at the last Senate meeting. I'd like to spend a few minutes on it this afternoon, because it seems

that my answer to Senator Sabalius' question has generated even more questions. It might be useful to talk a little bit about the history of that game, and what we were trying to do. First, we do think the expenses exceeded the revenue by a little under \$500,000. I'd like to tell you a little bit about where I was coming from in relation to that game. I felt it was something important to do. The idea had surfaced about two years ago, when our head football coach, Fitz Hill, approached me. I had worked in Kentucky for a couple of years, and our basketball and football schedules included some real well known historical black colleges. Coach Fitz Hill came forward with the idea of playing a historical black college, and bringing the drum line and pageantry with it. Coach Fitz Hill is one of only four African-American head football coaches in America. Considering all this, and our diversity on campus, I thought the idea showed great promise. We had also had the Grambling game. The institution (San José State University) had decided against taking the risk on that game, and two non-profit groups from the community took the risk in terms of the guarantee on the game, which was about \$400,000. That game was a great success. The stadium sold out, and we had a lot of positive publicity. We had a side benefit of having enough attendance that we met the NCAA attendance requirement for that year, which was 15,000 a game. We hadn't met this requirement before. When the question came up about doing this for a second year, and we couldn't get Grambling and some of the other colleges we looked at, we decided on Morgan State out of Baltimore.

I recommended to Joe Crowley last January/February that we bring the game inside San José State University, and that we take the risk. We were confident of getting the same kind of turnout we had gotten the year before. And, Coach Fitz Hill brought to the discussion a new dimension. He had worked with COMCAST, and they had indicated a very strong interest in being a sponsor for the game. COMCAST did become a sponsor, and their promotion of the game on cable television channels was probably worth \$250,000 to \$300,000. City Lights, a magazine directed primarily at the African-American community, also came in with a sponsorship package worth about \$75,000. We didn't have this kind of sponsorship the year before. We felt pretty good about the decision. Unfortunately, it wasn't the same equation. We didn't sell 28,000 to 30,000 tickets, we only sold about 10,000. There were a combination of reasons for that I think we talked about.

A question came up in the Executive Committee meeting today about why this wasn't brought before the RPB before the risk was taken. We made the decision last January or February, and if you remember the first RPB meeting was in February. We didn't see this decision, which I would label as an event decision, as a RPB decision at that time. The RPB was working on the whole budget for the university. This was a subset of the budget. There has been a question about transparency which troubles me, because I think it is important that we have that trust among us. The RPB had their last meeting in June 2004, and we didn't put tickets on sale until late July or early August. We actually didn't know where we were until the first week of September, when we started recognizing we had problems. Even at that late date, we have two people come in from the community that said they could sell 10,000 tickets. They didn't sell 10,000, they only sold 400. The point I'm trying to make is that I don't want you mixed up on the RPB's role in this, at least not in the last cycle. That would be a very serious misunderstanding about the RPB's role in its first cycle or run of being engaged in the university's budget process. These decisions on the game were

occurring in August and September, and the game was September 18, 2004. I think Senator Sabalius asked me the question about the game on September 25, 2004, and we explained what happened. I would argue we were transparent. We told you as soon as we had a pretty good idea about it. We didn't try to hide it or camouflage it in any manner. There is a perception that the loss on the game will create budget cuts, that's not the case. When we made the decision to bring the game inside, we made sure we had enough in the reserves to cover it. You might wonder where this money comes from, well it comes from a number of sources. An example of where that money comes from is that all the trust fund money for the university is invested in central treasury functions. We shared this at the BAC meetings over the last few years at least. This money earns interest. In a fiscal year this can be as much as \$300,000, \$400,000, or \$800,000 depending on the interest rate and how much money we invested. I knew when I made the decision about the game, that the reserve funds would be there the next year. I had a backup plan in case the game went sideways. We had a discussion about these kind of decisions in the Executive Committee meeting today, and the confusion related to questions about it. I think if we explore an event like this again, we'd find a way to bring it into the cycle of the RPB. We weren't trying to keep it from people. I hope that helps answer some of the questions you might have."

Questions:

Senator Norton asked, "Can you give an example how big a contingent liability the university, should they choose to accept one, would guarantee? How big an amount does it have to be before you bring it before the RPB?" Interim President Kassing said, "One this size, this was big. I can't think of anything else we guarantee that would involve this amount."

Senator Sabalius said, "I believe you explained that since it was an Administrative Division decision, the Athletics Division wouldn't have to cover the losses. Let's say you did the game again next year and it was a big success, would it stand to reason that the profits would be put back into the general fund, or would the Athletics Division get that money?" Interim President Kassing said, "That's fair. We made the decision to take the risk on the game, I don't think the Athletics Division would have taken the risk. If we had a good year on a game like that, I don't know. I don't want to commit that I would give a surplus in Athletics back right now. I haven't seen one in a long time."

Interim President Kassing said, "We have a trustees meeting on Thursday where I think the trustees will be given the budget recommendation from the staff for the next cycle. I shared that with the RPB about a week or so ago. It should be about a 9% increase over last year. It is a good budget. It depends on how the economic cycle is, and the strength of the compact."

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

September 27, 2004 – Senator Norton said, "Item number four, referenced university policy F98-2, and if my recollection serves me right, that was a presidential directive that established those procedures. The President is supposed to send his

recommendations to the Senate, the Senate reviews them, then the Senate sends it back to the President to make the final decision. There is also a Senate Management Resolution.

October 11, 2004 – No questions.

B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None

C. Consent Calendar – Approved as is.

D. Executive Committee Action Items –

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1260, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Endorsing Activities to Build a Culture of Reading at SJSU* for the Executive Committee. **The Senate voted and AS 1260 passed unanimously.**

Senator Bros presented *AS 1262, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing our Appreciation of Peter C. Lee, AVP for Faculty Affairs and Sorrow for his Death* for the Executive Committee. Senator Branz made a friendly amendment to change “San José State” in the resolved clauses to read “San José State University.” Senator Lee made a friendly amendment to add “C.” to “Peter Lee” in the first whereas clause. **The Senate voted and AS 1262 passed unanimously.**

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Curriculum and Research Committee - None

B. Organization and Government Committee – None

C. Budget Advisory Committee – None

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee – None

E. University Library Board –

A handout on Advancing Together 21st Century Strategies for CSU Libraries was passed out in the Senate packet. Senator Breivik said, “CSU Deans and Directors of the Libraries have been working together for a long time to get money for the databases and electronic journals that we have. We have been able to do a number of things with information literacy and provide grants for faculty. Part of the reason we have been so successful is that we have planned together. The CSU is ready to do a major revision. What they are thinking about focusing on this time is the primary mission of the campus, which is teaching and learning, scholarly activities, and service. What we’ve been asked to do this month is to find out if you think these three things cover what libraries should be focusing there limited resources on. If you see something that you feel is missing please contact me”.

Senator Williams asked about material being stolen from the library. Senator Breivik said, “Most of the thefts are of public library CDs. Our campus security people are working very hard on this. We now have security at both doors.”

Senator Stacks asked where we were in terms of sharing information. Senator Breivik said,

“We have been doing this with our core electronic journals. This has worked very well.”
Senators may email Senator Breivik at pbreivik@sjsu.edu.

F. Professional Standards Committee –

Senator Bros presented *AS 1261, Policy on Distribution of SOTE Interpretation Guide* for the Professional Standards Committee. Senator Bros, Branz, and Stacks made friendly amendments to the 2nd to the last line to read “SOLATE instruments to the faculty, Chairs, Deans, Provost and University Retention and Tenure Committee. Deans and Chairs will be.” **The Senate voted and AS 1261 passed unanimously.**

VII. Special Committee Reports – None

VIII. New Business –

A. Report from the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), and Chair of the Athletics Board, Bob Kumamoto

Dr. Bill Fisher said, “Good Afternoon, it’s a pleasure to be here. I’m Bill Fisher, and I’m the Faculty Athletics Representative. I thought what I would do is go over some of the coalition’s (COIA) framework. I don’t know if this group has looked at it piece-by-piece. There was a task force that met throughout this summer. A few of the members are in this room. What we did was look over some of the main issues this coalition is trying to oversee. I’d like to specifically address the issues dealing with Academic Integrity and to ensure you that San José State University is pretty much in compliance with most of the major things that this group is actually trying to do. Under the area of Academic Integrity, they talk first about initial eligibility in admissions, then they talk specifically about football, basketball, and then all sports. At San José State University admissions for student athletes are pretty much the same as for any other student. We do have special admits, and some of them are student athletes. This past summer we put together a group that goes by the acronym AAFAC, which stands for Academic Affairs Final Appeals Committee, as a final step in admitting special admit students. I served on this committee, we denied about a third of the files we looked at. Of the two-thirds that we admitted, about half were student athletes. There doesn’t seem to be any real preference given to student athletes regarding preference in admission. In fact, at least one of those student athletes that was admitted by the final appeals committee, is in fact not eligible. She was admitted based on the strength of her academic record. We looked at test scores, and letters of recommendation. We didn’t know if this was a student athlete until the decision had been made.”

Dr. Fisher said, “The next thing they are looking at is continuing eligibility based on progress toward degree requirements. The NCAA has many progress toward degree requirements. We ask for waivers occasionally. Waivers happen when there are continuing circumstances, or when someone is just short of making the requirements for continuing eligibility. For example, I found out last week we have a student we are going to have to ask for a waiver for. The student was short on units (there is a certain number of units they have to take each year). This student was just short at 21 units, and the magic number of units is 24. The student took a 4-unit course at a community college that was on a quarter system. This caused the problem. He is now at 23.66 units, and he is not eligible. So we are going to have to go to the NCAA, and get a waiver for .34 units. At this point, we haven’t had any serious violations in regard to this. Some of you

may be aware of what happened before the Stanford game. What didn't come out, was that we didn't put a player out on that field that wasn't eligible. We avoided any major penalties because of that."

Dr. Fisher said, "The third thing they are looking at is grading and program integrity. That happens at the departmental level. There isn't a great deal I can tell you about that."

Dr. Fisher said, "The last area deals with academic advising and related services. They recommend that there not be separate advising for athletics. In fact, last year all of that was brought into Academic Services under Marshall Rose and Wallace Southerland's group. Counselor's there have been appointed to various teams, but that is not the only thing they do. They have other assignments in addition to that."

Dr. Fisher said, "Regarding their four big areas, I think we are in good shape with regard to Academic Integrity. The other area is with regard to specific things dealing with the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR). First of all, why have a FAR? We have a FAR because the NCAA mandates that we have one. They want a written job description. There is, in fact, a written job description for the FAR at San José State University, and it is fairly comprehensive. The one thing with regard to the FAR that we are not doing is related to how the FAR is selected. On this campus, the Academic Senate has absolutely nothing to do with the selection of the FAR. The way things work at San José State University is that I report directly to the President's office. About a year or so ago, Bob Caret and Irene Miura sent out a notice to the campus saying there was a vacancy for a FAR. Charlie Whitcomb had had the position until he became an Administrator. I indicated that I was interested in the position. Then, I interviewed with Bob and Irene, and I met with Chuck Bell. After that, they offered me the position and I took it."

Dr. Fisher said, "The coalition wants the governing body to have some input into the selection of the FAR. In our conversations this summer with the task force, having some sort of consultative role with the Academic Senate would probably not be a serious concern. It certainly wouldn't be a serious concern from my side of things. I guess that would depend on the President at the time that would need to make that change."

Dr. Fisher said, "Whether we join the coalition or not, I just attended a meeting in Dallas and they are proposing legislation that would go into the NCAA manual that would mandate some sort of dealings between the President's office and the Academic Senate, or whatever that governing board might be. Interestingly enough, there are 117 Division 1A schools and five of them don't have Academic Senates. I wonder how they function. My main function at San José State University is to signoff on academic eligibility--to make sure before our students go out and compete on our behalf, that they are in fact following the regulations in the NCAA manual. These regulations are different for those that started school prior to August 2003 vs. those that started school after August 2003. These regulations are going to change again in another year, and every one of these changes is ratcheting up the requirements to the extent that it will be extremely difficult to be a student athlete for four or five years and not graduate. You would have to literally decide you don't want to get a degree, and walk away from the campus less than a dozen units away from obtaining a degree."

Dr. Robert Kumamoto said, “I’ve been asked to come here and explain the role of the Athletics’ Board, and then to make comments regarding the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) guidelines as they relate to the Athletics Board. I’ve been on the board now for ten or eleven years, and I’ve been the Chair now for the last five or six years. We are an advisory board in that we make recommendations to the President’s office. We have basically three primary areas of responsibility. We provide support to the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics (DIA). We do that through a variety of ways. We provide some oversight of financial issues and eligibility issues. We make recommendations to the DIA regarding hiring and retention of coaches, and we make other recommendations to the President’s office that we feel might be supportive of the DIA. Secondly, we have a responsibility to our student athletes. We monitor their progress towards graduation. We make sure they have access to academic services. We make sure that our DIA is in full compliance with gender-equity issues. We also are a hearing board for grievances that athletes might want to lodge concerning the DIA. Our third responsibility is to protect the integrity of the university at large. We do this through monitoring NCAA compliance. We oversee a number of other issues. We are also a link to the community as well. We are in many ways the eyes and ears for the President’s office as it relates to Intercollegiate Athletics at San José State University.”

Dr. Kumamoto said, “The Athletics Board had a chance to look over the COIA guidelines, specifically the guidelines that relate to an Athletics Board. It has been the census of the board for some time now that we don’t feel the COIA guidelines are necessarily appropriate for San José State University, and we believe those guidelines were intended for institutions whose athletics programs were out of control. We don’t believe this is the situation at San José State University. We’ve taken a close look at the 27 specific guidelines that relate to the Athletics Boards, and we have determined that we are either in full compliance, or at least in partial compliance, with at least 19 of them already. The other guidelines that we are not in compliance with have to do with COIA requirements that say an Athletics Board should have legislative functions. We don’t have legislative functions, nor do we wish to have legislative functions. For the most part, joining COIA would not have a huge impact on what the Athletics Board does, given that we are already in compliance with most of the guidelines. We don’t feel it is necessary for us to join this group. Some of these guidelines are probably going to be instituted by the NCAA anyway, as Dr. Fisher pointed out.”

Questions:

Senator Sabalius asked, “Is the FAR involved in the evaluation of Coaches? I understand the Coaches are faculty, however, they are not evaluated the way other faculty are. I’d like to know more about how this is done. Also, when we had the problem before the Stanford game about whether the players were eligible or not, the San José Mercury News seemed to indicate this is not a new problem or first-time problem, that this occurs year after year. I wondered why this happens every year at the beginning of the season?” Dr. Kumamoto said, “The Athletics Board reviews recommendations made by the Athletic Director regarding the retention of coaches that are then forwarded to the President. We do not, however, review the contracts or performance of the Management Personnel Plan (MPP) coaches. When we do these recommendations we are given packets and we review them in the same way normal faculty have their dossiers examined

by department and college Retention Tenure Promotion (RTP) Committees. We look at overall performance. We look at the graduation rate of their student athletes. We look at the gender-diversity of their rosters. We look to see whether or not they are in full compliance with NCAA regulations. We look at their fundraising capabilities, and we look at win-loss records as well. We look at the total package. We also look at evaluations conducted by the student athletes of their coaches, and we try to make that process as parallel as possible to what the normal faculty go through. It's not perfect because they have different responsibilities and different ways they are evaluated." Chair Nellen said, "The Student Opinion Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) equivalent for the coaches has gone to the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) for them to look at."

Senator Sabalius asked, "MPPs, what are they?" Dr. Kumamoto said, "Those are coaches that are actually administrators, they have assistant coaches that they monitor. These would be the head football coach, the head baseball coach, and the two head basketball coaches." Dr. Fisher said, "With regard to the Stanford situation, what happened this fall was different than what happened in the past. This fall we actually decertified five football players. This was as a result of finding out that miscalculations had been made with regard to the units they could use in progress toward their degree. It happened to each of the five for different reasons. Every student athlete, after their fourth semester here, has to declare a major and has to submit a major form to ensure they are making progress toward the degree. We had one student that changed their major mentally, but hadn't done the proper paperwork. He had more than enough units and a great GPA, but we couldn't use the units he had taken. We didn't find out in time to get him to do the proper paperwork. That person is now eligible, and was very instrumental in us winning the Rice game. Several of the others were ineligible because their units had been miscounted in the Peoplesoft system due to an error that didn't allow me to see that the units couldn't be used toward degree credit. In the past this has happened partly because of the major form, and partly because some departments only list the units being taken towards the major that year. In this case, student athletes have to go back each year with a new major form. The other big problem is our transfer students. If they have to take a summer class to graduate with their Associate's degree, we don't get their transcripts processed in time. In a lot of instances it isn't that they aren't eligible, but they just aren't ready by that first game. At last year's Grambling game, we didn't clear the place kicker until 6 p.m. the Friday night before the game. We didn't get the paperwork until then. Transfer students are always going to be a problem, and we just need to be aware of that."

Senator Wilson asked, "Did you say that the number of athletes that appealed and came before the Academic Standards Committee that were admitted was equal to the number of non-athletes that were admitted, and that it did not appear that any favoritism was being shown to the athletes?" Dr. Fisher said, "That is correct. We didn't know whether we were looking at athletes or not. All of those people that were admitted were given a list of standards they had to meet by the end of this semester or the end of Spring, and if they do not meet these standards, they will be disenrolled." Senator Wilson said, "I don't understand how you can ascertain that there was no difference between the athletes and non-athletes? It would seem that you would have a higher number of non-athletes being admitted." Dr. Fisher said, "This is true, but we are talking about people that didn't make the first or second cut, and we were like the final cut. And, this group for whatever reason, usually contains a higher percentage of athletes."

Dr. Kumamoto said, "One of the COIA guidelines is that the Athletics Board should have a closer relationship with the Academic Senate. Our Athletics Board has elected me to be their designated representative to the Academic Senate. Should you as a body have questions regarding our function, I would be the person to represent the board in those discussions."

Senator Buzanski said, "Does the Athletics Board have any information on graduation rates for our football players?" Dr. Fischer said, "I don't have football statistics, but the data I got just before this meeting shows that our 1997-1998 cohort was in the 40% group. Our campus-wide numbers are still in the high 30's. As a group, our student athletes at San José State University are graduating at a higher ratio than students campus-wide. However, both our student athletes and non-athletes are graduating below the 50% mark. As a faculty member, this gives me some concern. However, with the new requirements that are being put in place, by the time a student athlete finishes a fifth year of eligibility, they will have completed 80-90% of their degree requirements." Senator Ashton said, "The NCAA website shows that the overall graduation rate for football players at San José State University is 36%, the year before it was 21%, and the year before that it was 17%. We are on the right trend. The football player graduation rate is about the same rate as the graduation rate for the rest of the university as a whole."

Senator Branz, "How does a name get on the special admit request list? Does the student ask to be placed on the list, or does the coach ask for it?" Dr. Fisher said, "There is a Special Admit Committee and I don't deal very much with the committee, so I'm not sure whether it is an automatic referral or you have to ask to be referred. Anyone who is denied by the Enrollment Admissions Committee (EAC), we took a look at. This is because this committee was new, and EAC has some fairly strict standards where they work up a numerical score, and you either hit that score or you are out. For example, a lot of the people we admitted were one point short of their score, but they had their score and that was it."

Senator Branz said, "I'm not questioning the integrity of the process, I think it is very good. However, who has to initiate the process?" Dr. Fisher said, "The student has to initiate the paperwork. Some of the coaches help them prepare the paperwork. Starting next year, the student has to provide an academic plan of what they are going to do to compensate for their deficiencies." Senator Branz asked, "How do the students know what they need to do?" Dr. Fisher said, "It is conveyed to them in their denial letter."

Senator Hebert asked, "How many students come before the Special Admits Committee?" Dr. Fisher said, "This was my first year on the committee, and I honestly don't remember the numbers. However, I think it was somewhere around 30 or so. We met pretty much every week from the middle of July to the week classes started. Some weeks we only looked at one or two, and some weeks we looked at five or six."

Senator Norton said, "The Athletics Board is classified as a Special Agency, and the Executive Committee can request a report at any time."

Chair Nellen said, "Thank you. Actually there is a referral to the Organization and Government Committee to look at whether those Special Agencies that don't report to a policy committee

should. That way we would have a better structure, and also I think it would make those groups feel more a part of the Senate.”

Senator Heisch said, “I wanted to ask Bob Kumamoto a question. I didn’t understand one of the items on your year-end report and wanted to ask you about it. You say in the section “items of new business,” that you need to “report to the new president on ways to improve negative campus culture that hinders a more successful DIA.” What did you mean by this?” Dr. Kumamoto said, “As I mentioned in my introduction, part of our responsibility is to provide support for the DIA. One of the things that we have noticed over the years is that among the many obstacles that our DIA confronts in its attempt to be successful, is a culture on this campus that tends to be very unsupportive of Intercollegiate Athletics. Not that they are picking on Intercollegiate Athletics specifically, but there are a variety of logistical issues that have to do with the function of the university that sometimes pose obstacles for a more successful DIA. One of those issues happens to be accessibility to our facilities. The Event Center is run by the Student Union and the Stadium is run by Spartan Shops. Our teams have difficulty practicing in these facilities before games, and teams from other universities are denied practice time as well. This tends not only to provide an unsupportive environment at the university, but it is also an embarrassment to our DIA when we have to say to visiting teams that they can’t go to our gymnasium and practice, because something else is going on there. The logistical issue is just one of many obstacles on this campus that tends to obstruct what the DIA wants to do. What we did on the Athletics Board was to go to the Athletics Director and suggest that he poll his coaches, administrators, and student athletes, and then come back to the board with a list of grievances or things that needed to be changed in order to create a more supportive environment. Then we went through a year process of reviewing those items, and we eventually put together a report to the President in which we recommended certain structural changes, and certain philosophical changes that in our minds would create a more supportive environment on this campus. It largely had to do with accessibility to facilities. We just don’t have the accessibility that programs should have. In other words, for the longest period of time, some of our assistant basketball coaches didn’t even have keys to the gymnasium at the Event Center. If they brought a student on campus and wanted to show off our Event Center, they couldn’t do it because they didn’t have keys.”

Chair Nellen asked, “Is the problem with the Event Center a funding issue?” Dr. Kumamoto said, “I can’t speak on behalf of the Event Center or Spartan Shops, but what I do know is that they have bills to pay while maximizing their profits. If they have a choice between opening their facility to a campus group that will pay to use the facility vs. letting one of our teams practice there, they are going to go where the money is.” Chair Nellen said, “Yes, but is that interpreted as being anti-athletics?” Dr. Kumamoto said, “No, and that’s why I qualified my comments. Many of these obstacles are not directed specifically at Intercollegiate Athletics, they are just part of the logistical environment here on campus.” Chair Nellen said, “If it truly isn’t an anti-athletics culture, I’d hate to be saying so on the year-end report on file in the Senate office for everyone to see.” Dr. Kumamoto said, “I never said an anti-athletics culture, I said a culture that tends to obstruct Intercollegiate Athletics.” Senator Heisch said, “It says here on the year-end report, “A negative campus culture that hinders a more successful DIA.” Chair Nellen said, “What you are describing to me is that it is a funding matter. If the Event Center needs to take in whoever is bringing them money, then maybe the RPB needs to be looking at that.

Maybe there is a bigger cost for athletics than they need to be paying for that, and there needs to be a different structure. I am concerned with your report now, because I don't think it's helping to create a more positive culture by referring to it as a negative culture on campus. Maybe the Athletics Board should consider modifying their year-end report." Dr. Kumamoto said, "Well, in all due honesty and due respect, part of that culture is created by the Academic Senate." Chair Nellen said, "That was also a question, is that what you were getting at in the report too? Your answer was that it was more a facilities issue." Dr. Kumamoto said, "The facilities issue is just one among many issues." Chair Nellen said, "I think we need to have that dialogue, so maybe we can follow-up on how we can improve those statements that maybe aren't functional."

Senator Heisch said, "The Event Center is owned by the students, and they are paying it off." "Senator Lee said, "Student fees cannot pay for the Event Center themselves, they need the income from events. They rely on several million dollars worth of revenue." Chair Nellen said, "I am going to make a note that we will follow-up with some group as to how we can make sure we've gotten more ideal language, more appropriate language, as to what's going on here." Senator Rascoe said, "Just as a point of clarification, at the construction of the Event Center it was necessary for them to generate a profit in order to operate a sound fiscal operation. In other words, they must generate a profit to operate in the black. Also, we have a demand campus-wide that far exceeds our facilities. This isn't necessarily a negative athletics culture; it is just an unfortunate situation." Senator Hebert said, "Why don't you rent the Event Center for practices?" Dr. Kumamoto said, "They do." Senator Hebert said, "Do other groups bump you out, is that what I'm hearing?" Dr. Kumamoto said, "On occasion, yes." Senator Hebert said, "Even if you could book it all year?" Dr. Kumamoto said, "I don't think it is possible for us to book it all year."

B. Writing Research (Dr. Thalia Anagnos, and Dr. Kenneth Peter)

Dr. Anagnos said, "As Chair Nellen mentioned, Dr. Peter and I are going to represent the Teacher's Scholar group from the 2003/2004 academic year. The project that we worked on is called, "Helping Students Write Better, Campus Services and Practices." We had a wonderful group of people we worked with. For those of you that are new and don't know about the Teacher's Scholar Program, let me just tell you what it is. The year 2003/2004 was the twelfth year of the program. It used to be run out of the Center for Faculty Development, and now it is being run out of Academic Technology. The colleges each nominate a representative from their college on the basis of teaching excellence and commitment to student learning, and then we meet biweekly throughout the academic year in small roundtable meetings. We discuss a variety of things, and we visit one another's classes. We discuss our teaching styles, and then we do a research project on teaching and learning on the campus. What we decided to do this year was to follow-up on the 2002/2003 study of writing, and look at the writing resources available at San José State University. At the retreat for Teacher's Scholars this year, we started discussing what the resources were on campus for our students. What we found out is that most of us had either incomplete or incorrect knowledge. When we started writing down what resources we had on our campus, we found that a lot of the information we had was conflicting. We decided to see if we could put together some information we could share with faculty, so that faculty and administrators could respond to the needs of students. They could then redirect students to resources in a consistent way and know what was available to them. Originally, we were going to look at all the resources on campus available to students, and then we realized it was too big

an area so we decided to limit it to writing resources. We decided to start by identifying the writing resources on campus, and describing what those resources are and what kind of services they have to offer. We then summarized what the best practices were for faculty to improve student writing, and better utilize these resources. Finally, we developed some recommendations for using these resources.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “The reason we focused in on writing was because a number of other studies on campus indicated that San José State University students needed to improve their communication skills. We are also getting that feedback from people that employ our students. Many of the faculty members on campus are not aware of the resources available, or they are not aware of how good these resources are, and the kinds of services they can provide their students. Also, in the earlier study prepared by the team before ours, many of the faculty were overwhelmed by this problem with writing. They were doing things like reduce the number of writing assignments in their course because they were so difficult for the instructor to grade (due to the students’ poor writing skills), or they had such large classes that grading the assignments was such a large task. The faculty also didn’t feel qualified to deal with students that had really limited writing skills, and didn’t know how to get them to the level of writing they needed to be at.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “These are some statistics about some of the students here at San José State University. Fifty-eight percent of all students are native English speakers, 42% are not. A very high percentage of our students do not report English as their first language. The number of students that do not pass the English Placement Test (EPT) has been as high as 60%, but is currently about 55%. A very high percentage of our students are placed into the LLD 1 and LLD 2 courses because of their inability to pass the EPT. After they’ve taken the English 1A and English 1B, we still have 20% of our students that fail the Writing Skills Test (WST) in their junior year in the first attempt. We do have a significant number of students that are really struggling with their writing. The statistics show that 5% of native English speakers fail the WST the first time, 18% fail where English is their primary language but not their native language, and 52% fail where English is not their primary language. The statistics on the failure of the WST are driven quite a bit by people that don’t report English as their primary language.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “We asked several research questions such as, what are the writing resources on campus, how are they currently used, and how can we best support the faculty in helping their students improve their writing. We made several assumptions. One, writing is a very important vehicle for learning in all disciplines. We must do writing across the curriculum. Secondly, all faculty must participate in improving writing. This is not something that just applies to the English Department. All of us need to participate in helping our students.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “There are a number of ways we try to help students improve their writing on campus. We can have specific writing intensive courses, where the students know as part of the curriculum they are going to have to write a number of large reports. We also have honors projects, theses, and those type of things. We have campus writing labs, and there are a number of online writing resources. There are a variety of these not only from San José State University, but from all over the country.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “We did was figure out what was actually available on campus. As I said, we had some misinformation. It was an important learning experience for us. We went to six different writing resources on campus to interview coordinators, staff, and students. These six included, the Learning Assistance Resources Center (LARC), the Peer Mentor Center, the Athletic Academic Support Center (STAR), the Writing Center in the English Department, the Library, and the Language Development Center which supports LLD 1-98/99 courses. We met with directors and tutors in each of these centers. We provided questions in advance to them, and then we sat down and talked with them for at least an hour. The types of interview questions we asked included, “What is your background? How did you get where you are? How much background do you have teaching writing? What is the program? How is the program used? Who is it available to? When is it open? What is its budget?” We also asked what kind of problems did they usually see when students came into the center, and how did they address these problems. We then asked how familiar they felt the faculty were with the resources they had to offer. Finally, we asked what kinds of evaluation and assessment they made of their center, and what kind of recommendations would they make for the future.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “I won’t go through all those interviews with you, but I’ll just summarize some of the themes from the interviews that we conducted. The first one is that the staff members in these centers are very high quality. Many have master’s degrees in writing, or teaching writing, and have many, many years of experience. And, when the centers have tutors, the tutors go through an intensive training program to learn what they need to do to be effective in helping our students learn to write better. We were really impressed with the quality of the human resources in these centers. They use student-centered pedagogy. One of our favorite quotes was, “The pen is always in the student’s hand.” When a student comes in and says I’m having trouble with my paper, they don’t take the paper and start marking it up. They have the student start writing and then say, “What were you really trying to say here? Where did you get this information? Have you cited your resources correctly?” They get the student to think about what they are doing. They also have them read it out loud so they can hear the grammatical errors. They use a lot of strategies like this.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “One of the things that we found was that the eligibility for most of these resources was somewhat restricted. You either had to be in a class, or you had to be an athlete, etc. They weren’t all open to everybody. That is a limitation because we have a lot of students that need these resources. Several of the centers said that they were at full capacity. They really couldn’t do more with the resources they have. They are serving as many students as they possibly can.”

Dr. Anagnos said, “The sense was that the faculty knew the services were there, but they really didn’t understand the extent to which the centers and services were using student-centered pedagogy. There was a little bit of skepticism that if the faculty member sent a student to the center, they would rewrite the paper for the student and they wouldn’t get original work. What we got from interviewing the centers is that if a student goes there for help, they are still going to come back with their own paper, but with improved skills for next time. I think this was a really important misperception among the faculty about what types of help the student was going to get if he/she went to the center. The quality of the faculty interaction with the centers could be improved. For example, a student might come over with an assignment and ask for help. The

assignment might not be really clear to the tutor, or the student. The tutor is then in a situation where they are trying to help the student, but they really don't have enough information to understand what the student needs. And, there might not be really good communication with the faculty member such as, not being able to reach them during their office hours, etc. There is a problem there. There needs to be a better way of helping the tutors understand the assignments so they can help the students."

Dr. Anagnos said, "Finally, there are some structural issues. There are a number of centers, and they are probably not well coordinated. The centers are all funded from different sources. If we are really going to look at writing on our campus, we really need to look at this holistically. We need to figure out, do we want to look at this as one large center, or seven small separately funded centers. They are each coming from a different place, and each center was developed at a different time, for a different purpose. It creates some problems. Faculty really don't understand when to send a student to one center or the other."

Dr. Anagnos said, "We found that there are a lot of benefits to having the Writing Centers on campus. The centers can improve faculty management of writing assignments. If you can have a tutor work with your student on grammatical problems, then when you get the paper back you can concentrate on the content. Students develop writing skills in a non-evaluative supportive environment. Students might go to a tutor and say something they really don't want to say to you such as, "I really don't know how to do this?" They might feel like if they told you that you might evaluate them differently on their paper. This gives them an opportunity to go ask someone they feel is a neutral party. If we have good resources to support our students, then we have better retention. This is what we want to do. We want to graduate our students and make sure they can go out and be productive. These are really important resources for our student body. These resources have a lot of benefits both to the faculty and to the students."

Dr. Peter said, "Thank you, and I appreciate having the chance to be here today. I'd also like to point out that Senator Hilliard is one of the campus experts on writing, and I am sure she will correct us for all the little errors we've made in our presentation. We drew up these recommendations last spring before the full magnitude of the budget cuts from last year were known. However, it makes them all the more relevant. Writing services are part of the learning that goes on at the campus. It's true that they aren't done in a conventional way in the classroom, but they are a vital part of instruction. They are essential given the demographics of our students and their writing skills. All of the centers we spoke with last year were at their limit. I understand the English Department has closed their center. The LARC took a 28% cut last year, followed by an additional 10% cut with what is estimated to be at least another 5% cut this year. This resource that was already stretched to the absolute breaking point, is now a little more than half of what it once was. No, I don't think that we can claim that we are adequately supporting and funding these services, but there is more we can do besides just funding the services. We need to do a better job of disseminating information about these centers to our faculty. I've been on campus for many years and knew relatively little about them until I got involved with the Teacher's Scholar Program last year. Had I been more aware of the various services that are available, I would have encouraged many students to take advantage of them. In a way it's a bit of a "Catch 22," if all faculty knew the services were available, the services would collapse because they would be so overburdened. We also feel that all services should be

made available to all students that seek them. It should not be a privilege or punishment to seek help to learn how to improve your writing. All students should have this available to them equally. Finally, I think there are certain things faculty can do to help the tutors do their job better. One thing faculty can do is when you give a writing assignment, whether it's in your green sheet, or on a sheet of paper you hand out, try to be as specific as you can about the nature of the assignment. This way if that student should seek help, they can show the written assignment to the tutor. Communication between the writing centers and faculty is helpful, useful, and ought to happen. If I could just say one last thing, I know all of you are deeply aware how seriously the university has been hurt by the recent budget cuts. The writing services are one prime example. For those outsiders who may think the university has skated by without too much pain, I think we can point to services like this that have literally been cut in half. We can also look at the Teacher's Scholar program itself. That program is also about half what it was, down from eight scholars to four. Let's not be too glum about it, but let's also be aware that the university really is suffering very deeply in some important ways as a result of the last round of cuts."

Questions:

Senator Sabalius said, "Obviously, we have a fundamental problem at a university if we are not happy with the way our students write. I understand the English Department's Writing Center is closed for this year because they couldn't come up with the money, which was less than \$100,000 to run it for the year. I don't know how many students that could have served, but when I have to hear at the same Senate meeting that the "Read to Lead" Football Classic lost \$500,000, I wonder whether I shouldn't be proud when the Academic Senate is accused of having a negative culture towards the DIA, or more specifically towards Division 1A Football."

Senator Sigler said, "Last year when we were looking at how we were going to cut the College budget by 2.5 million dollars, all the departments had to submit a proposal of what they could cut. We later found out that we would probably have more money than we thought, but it was too late to open the English Writing Center for the fall, because we had already reassigned the faculty and it was too late to hire tutors. We are having conversations about opening the center in the spring. However, it is really a limited service. We can only serve students enrolled in English 1A, and it is always by referral. The Language Development Center in LLD is also connected to specific courses." Senator Sigler invited Senators to come and talk with the Writing Requirements Committee.

Senator Buzanski asked, "I was wondering whether there weren't some possibilities for some philanthropic organization donating money for these programs, and who would be the source for making a proposal for this? This is the kind of activity that a CSU institution desperately needs. This would be in the best interest of the nation at large to have more literate personnel."

Senator Ashton said, "I would welcome a strong proposal for something like that. In the development office we don't design academic programs. However, I would welcome a well thought out proposal that would go through the Dean's and Provost's offices. We could then look for funding sources for that."

Dr. Anagnos said, "I'd just like to reiterate that writing is not just part of general education, it is part of all of our responsibilities in the major as well as general education. One of the issues that comes up in conjunction with this is that we need some faculty development. There are some colleges on campus where the faculty members are not completely comfortable helping the students with their writing, e.g. Engineering. Faculty development is an essential part of helping us improve writing on this campus."

Senator Stacks said, "Graduate Students are also required to have English writing proficiency before they can graduate. There are a number of ways they can demonstrate this. One way is by taking the WST. However, a number of our graduate students are international students and English is not their primary language. Currently, the LARC does help our Graduate Students." Dr. Anagnos said, "The issue of graduate students came up quite a bit, because there are only two facilities that assist graduate students, LARC and the Peer Mentor Center. This is a large population that isn't very well served."

Senator Vanniarajan said, "The College of Humanities and the Arts is committed to raising the level of writing of our students."

Senator Wilson asked, "How many students seek services each year from the writing centers, and how many staff members are there? Dr. Peter said, "We got almost all of that information from Senator Hilliard, so maybe she could tell you. It was an enormous amount. I believe they had about 50 tutors at one time." Senator Hilliard said, "We do have approximately 50 tutors in LARC. We are very picky about the people we hire. They must have at least a 2.75 GPA. We also have College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) training. Our tutors are all certified to tutor English. We had 10,000 visitors to LARC last year. We hire a lot of graduate students. We are also constantly in contact with the faculty member."

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

A. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Rascoe said, "One major focus this year for Student Affairs is the state of campus/student life. There is a need to improve campus life on campus. SJSU is seen as a commuter campus. We want students to have the ultimate campus experience."

B. Associated Students President –

Associated Students' (AS) President Rachel Greathouse passed out brochures about upcoming Carnival and Halloween activities. AS President Greathouse said, "We registered 10,000 students to vote, and held a pizza and politics forum hosted by Professor Strickler. We will also be holding a "Rock the Vote" concert. AS will be looking at three resolutions in the near future. One is a resolution supporting the Academic Freedom Forum. Another resolution has to do with Aviation Students and their concerns. The last resolution is regarding a Staff Recognition Award. AS recognizes that there are a lot of faculty awards on campus, but the staff tend to be overlooked. Senators are encouraged to attend the AS meetings."

Senator Buzanski asked, "How are you going to be sure the students you registered to vote actually vote on November 2, 2004?" AS President Greathouse said, "We kept a database of all

the students we registered, and we will be phoning them. We will also be providing rides for students.”

C. Statewide Academic Senate –

Senator Van Selst said, “Most of what I’m doing right now is forwarding the newsletter that comes from the CSU Academic Senate along with additional comments that highlight the vital things. One of the main activities in the CSU Academic Senate involves the lower division transfer program. Senator McNeil said, “This is a piece of what they call the “Graduation Initiative.” It is a system to increase access in a CSU system that really can’t afford to build more campuses. It is designed to get people through faster, and more efficiently. That’s what the transfer program is about. This week the board is going to pass a budget for the next academic year. It is a little like one step forward and two steps back, because while there is a 3.5% increase according to the Compact, that isn’t nearly enough. The 3.5% increase doesn’t begin to meet the 12% salary lag that faculty have (20% for full professors). However, these are all steps in the right direction. There will even be a little more money for the library.”

Senator Sabalius said, “The Chair of the Board of Trustees said their highest priority is compensation. John Travis, CFA President, reported that relationships between the CFA and the Chancellor are better than they have ever been. This is partly because there are too little funds to distribute. Although, we are in a tight situation, the top priority for everyone is compensation. The Chancellor singled out San José State University by saying that in his entire career he has never had so much difficulty recruiting a President for a campus.”

D. Provost – Not Present

E. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No report

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.