

2005/2006 Academic Senate

MINUTES
December 5, 2005

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Veregge, Nellen, Van Selst,
Sabalius, Gutierrez, McNeil
Kassing

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Phillips, Sigler, Ashton, Lee

Deans:

Present: Stacks, Merdinger, Wei
Absent: Hegstom

Students:

Present: Fithian, Glover, Balderas,
Bridgeman
Absent: Estrada, Le

Alumni Representative:

Present: Thompson

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Griffith, Moriarty, Thames

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Fee
Absent: Perry, Butler

COB Representatives:

Present: Osland
Absent: Campsey, El-Shaieb

ED Represent:

Present: Maldonado-Colon, Parsons, Lessow-Hurley

ENG Representatives:

Present: Singh, Meldal
Absent: Gao

H&A Representatives:

Present: Belet, Fleck, Desalvo, Hilliard
Absent: Leddy, Van Hooff

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Kaufman, Messina, Bros
Absent: Kellum

SOS Representatives:

Present: Von Till, Hebert
Absent: Peter

SW Representative:

Present: Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –
Minutes of November 21, 2005, were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Veregge said, "It has been a wonderful semester, and we have been getting a lot of work done in the committees, the Senate, and the Resource Planning Board (RPB). I'd like to thank everyone for their hard work. As many of you know, we will have twice as much work in the Spring. We will also be having our annual elections in the Spring. Please let your colleagues know if you will be leaving the Senate, or if there will be vacancies in your college. I'd like all of the Senators to try and get on their Deans calendars in the Spring. We

will have information for you to pass along to them."

Chair Veregge said, "Either today or tomorrow the U.S. Supreme Court will be considering the Solomon Amendment. We are very interested in seeing how they rule on the constitutionality of the Solomon Amendment. We had a visit last week from three Trustees, and we mentioned the issue with ROTC and violation of the CSU non-discrimination policy as well as our non-discrimination policy. The two Trustees we talked to had no idea this was happening and were very happy to be informed, and to have us provide them with information."

Chair Veregge said, "We also spoke with the Trustees about some other issues, such as workload and our concern over the Chancellor's office wanting to reduce general education. It was interesting that the Trustee's said that the Chancellor had met with business leaders who indicated that the liberal education was the most important part of the CSU's education, not the specific majors."

Chair Veregge said, "One of our Senators was involved in an accident last week. Senator Leddy was walking across campus when a tree limb fell on him. We will be passing a card around for everyone to sign."

Chair Veregge said, "The Communications and Publications Department has produced a film about the university they would like us to view (film was played).

Chair Veregge said, "I'd also like to thank once again Senator Lessow-Hurley, Senator Thames, Senator Nellen, Thalia Anagnos, Emily Wughalter, and Eva Joice for putting on an outstanding Senate Retreat on Student Success."

B. From the President of the University –

President Kassing thanked Sylvia Light and Senator Ashton for the work they put into the film. President Kassing said, "I just have a few things to share with you. Chair Veregge already mentioned the Trustees' visit. The meeting was setup rather quickly. The feedback I got was that they think a lot of the people here and this institution."

President Kassing said, "Let me tell you about two things I've been involved with recently. Senator Alquist and Assemblyman Joe Coto had a meeting last week about barriers to Latino education. The topic covered everything from K-12 to workforce issues. We were invited to participate. Gerry Selter prepared a report for Senator Alquist and Assemblyman Coto that you are welcome to review. It talks about where the university is, and what programs are in place. We have about 4,000 Latino students right now. Gerry pulled together graduation increases over the last ten years for Latino students at the university. We had only five minutes to present our ideas. We spoke briefly about remediation and some of the programs we have in place. We mentioned to them that we are going to be involved in a CSU-wide program called Parents Institute for Quality Education. It started in San Diego about twenty years ago. It is built around the idea of reaching low-income immigrant families. Mayor Gonzales put it in place in San José when he was first elected Mayor. It is built around the idea of nine classes for parents. The first four classes are directed at what kind of an

environment you need to create in your home so that your children will think about going to college. The last five classes are built around building a relationship with the school system--superintendent, principal, teachers, etc. This program worked very well in San Diego. San José State will be involved with ten schools that haven't been picked yet. We also had a chance to mention the mentor program. There is a Senate committee working on this. The mentor program being the idea that we explore the possibility of creating a more formalized approach to introducing our students to teaching at the college/university level. I received a preliminary report from the Senate committee and it looks good."

President Kassing said, "I was recently invited by the Mayor to participate in a program called "CEOs for Cities." It is built around the idea of a city team that includes a mayor, a university president, a foundation president, and a corporate CEO. Each city sent a team to a conference held in Chicago last Thursday and Friday. All the major cities across the USA were involved. A lot of focus was on how cities can build connections between people. We also spent a lot of time on the "Echo Generation." The Echo Generation is the next generation--the 25-34 year olds. We talked about how cities are focusing on reaching this generation. There was also a very clear impression that an engaged university is really important to a city that is trying to change. We had a whole session on innovation, and how cities can innovate. If I have time, I'll try and assemble some of the notes for the Senate."

President Kassing said, "The last thing I want to mention is that Tower Hall is going to shut-down on December 20, 2005. We will begin renovation then. My office will move over to the Administration building for about six months."

Questions:

Senator Norton said, "The Senate voted that the plaza in front of the Martin Luther King Jr. Library was to be designated the Caret Plaza, would a sign be appropriate as there is no marking there?" President Kassing said, "We have a team working on that right now. There will be a plaque put up in the near future."

IV. Executive Committee Report –

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –
November 21, 2005 –**

Senator Stacks asked, "I was wondering if the Executive Committee had a chance to make any assignments to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Task Force yet?" Chair Veregge said, "Actually we did that at today's meeting, but all those seats are not filled yet. If Senators know of anyone interested in serving on that task force, you can check with Associate Vice Chair McClory to see if there is a vacancy from your college."

Senator Stacks said, "When will the task force begin meeting?" Chair Veregge said, "It will begin meeting in the spring. Senator David will be acting as a calling chair."

B. Consent Calendar – None.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Bros said, "At the last meeting we talked about budget issues and the need to plan for release time if we were going to increase the workload for people. Some of the PS committee members have come up with excellent suggestions for reducing the workload. I'd like to share a couple of these with you and get some feedback from you. One recommendation is that the Professional Development Plan (PDP) and the Annual Summary of Achievements should be done primarily for probationary faculty and faculty that haven't achieved tenure yet. This means that the group we would be leaving out is the Associate Professors that have tenure. This will substantially reduce the workload. The second suggestion was to have the college Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) committee excluded from reviewing the PDPs. A third possible suggestion was not to have the college RTP committee review the Annual Summary of Achievements. The PS committee feels that we can do this without substantially changing the workload."

Questions:

Senator Van Selst said, "Right now the Board of Trustees is very interested in merit pay. I assume that would create something like the Annual Summary of Achievements." Senator Bros said, "The Annual Summary of Achievement would still be done by the department, the chair, and the dean."

Chair Veregge said, "One interesting proposal from the Trustees was instead of having merit pay, to have assigned time as a reward/incentive for faculty."

B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

Senator David said, "There are no new actions for today, but what you will see coming up in the spring is the Animal Care policy, we are also going to be looking at program planning, and we're doing a general investigation on the interdisciplinary programs."

C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

Senator Thames presented *AS 1308, Final Examination, Evaluation, or Culminating Activity Policy (Final Reading)*. Senator Thames said the committee made some changes after the last Senate meeting. The I&SA committee is recommending that all rules except #4 be eliminated.

Debate:

Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to strike the last sentence of the underlined part of the final examination policy that reads, "Rescheduled exams should be taken during the makeup period." Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to the Sabalius amendment to leave in the last sentence, but add "generally" after "should." Senator Sabalius then amended the Van Selst amendment to change "makeup period" to "final exam

period." Senator Van Selst made another friendly amendment to the Sabalius amendment to change it to read, "Rescheduled exams should be taken during the final exam or makeup period." Senator Hebert presented a substitute amendment to the Sabalius amendment to read, "**If an alternate exam date and time during the regular final exam period cannot be arranged between the student and the instructor, the rescheduled exam will be taken during the final exam-makeup period.**" The Senate voted and the Hebert substitute amendment to the Sabalius amendment passed. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to reorganize the underlined paragraph to read, "Exams may be rescheduled under two circumstances: a) verifiable emergency circumstances, b) a student having exams that total 9 or more units within a 24-hour period may request an alternative exam date from one instructor at least three weeks prior to the last class meeting (if the student and instructor are unable to agree on rescheduling, the department chair shall negotiate an appropriate solution). The Hebert amendment would follow the Van Selst amendment above. Senator Bros presented a substitute amendment to the Van Selst amendment to read, "A verifiable emergency circumstance should be recognized by the instructor as a valid reason for a student to reschedule an exam. In addition, a student having exams in courses that total nine or more units within a 24-hour period may request an alternative exam date...." The Bros substitute amendment was not friendly. Senator Lessow-Hurley presented an amendment to the Van Selst amendment to remove the sentence in the parenthesis which reads, "(if the student and instructor are unable to agree on rescheduling, the department chair shall negotiate an appropriate solution)." The Lessow-Hurley amendment was not friendly. Senator Thames made a motion to return the resolution to the I&SA committee to make changes. The motion was seconded. **The motion to return the resolution to the I&SA committee was friendly.**

VII. Special Committee Reports – None

VIII. New Business –

A. Budget Report by the Vice President for Administration and Finance -

Vice President (VP) Rose Lee presented the annual budget report to the Senate. VP Lee said she would just be presenting the university budget today, division budgets will be discussed at a forum in February 2006. An additional forum will be held in May 2006 to go over the 2006/2007 budget. VP Lee introduced Cynthia Haliaz, the Director of University Budget Administration. VP Lee said, "Cynthia and her staff put together this report and it is a lot of work. Cynthia will be assisting me today."

VP Lee said, "We will be spending most of our time discussing the general fund, since it is the largest. The general fund budget for 2005/2006 is close to \$237 million. We received an increase of 7.8% over last year's budget. The increase, which is a little over \$17 million, came from 541 new budgeted FTE, and it also funds another \$11 million to cover mandatory costs. Some of the mandatory costs covered include \$5.9 million to cover a 3.5% compensation pool. This is the first compensation pool we've had in two years, and I think almost all of the bargaining units have completed bargaining. In addition, we have the capital budget. For this year, we have \$2.1 million to complete the work on Clark Hall. The \$2.1 million is for equipment. The first departments should be

moving into Clark Hall in March 2006. We also have \$2 million in renewal funds. We will be using the \$2 million to renovate Tower Hall."

VP Lee said, "You can see that from the general fund, \$150 million is general fund appropriations, and \$86 million comes from various fees. The largest of the various fees are student fees. We now get 2/3rds of our budget state-funded, and 1/3rd of our budget from student fees. We are considered state-assisted rather than state-funded, although we are not at the percentage the University of California (UC) is."

VP Lee said, "We will meet our budgeted FTE of 22,196 this year. We will not be asked to return funds to the central office. If we are over that budget, we need to be over by 2% before we will get any additional funding for 2005/2006. At this time, we don't believe we will be over our FTE by 2%, so there is no impact on SJSU for this fiscal year for being over or under our budgeted FTE."

VP Lee said, "The general fund budget is driven by FTE, new FTE, by initiatives the chancellor's office may be supporting, and by fixed or mandatory costs. Other than these categories, we don't get new general fund dollars. Under "all other funds budgeting process" there is a description of how we estimate revenues for International and Extended Studies (IES), housing, and parking. I'm not going to go through these budgets today."

VP Lee said, "Page 7 is a summary of the financials for the university. We can see here that SJSU is a \$472 million operation. By next fiscal year we will be close to \$500 million due to an increase in student fees and other costs. The general fund is roughly 50% of that \$472 million. The general fund is followed by the revenue fund. Revenue funds are still state funds and they include housing, IES, lottery funds, parking funds, and student health. Revenue funds total \$47 million. The next category of funds includes the four external auxiliaries--Associated Students, Foundation, Spartan Shops, and the Student Union. The auxiliaries are followed by the other categories of fees including IRA fees, our trust Financial Aid, and Student Course related fees (roughly \$1.7 million), and then our capital projects which I mentioned earlier."

VP Lee said, "Page 9 is a summary of the general fund and how we allocated it out this year. The basic approach is that we have base budget and one-time budget. We were able to move \$1 million from the staff benefits budget to be available for allocation by the Resource Planning Board (RPB). Then we have \$4.7 million that the RPB left unallocated from last year. And, we have \$3.8 million available for allocation this year."

VP Lee said, "If you will go to page 20, you will see that we started out with \$17.1 million in new general fund dollars, but most of that had to be committed to either mandatory fees, or the salary increases. A few of the mandatory costs included: \$2.9 million to fund an increase in the PERS retirement costs, \$5.9 million to fund the compensation pool which averaged at 3.5%, Financial Aid and Students costs of \$1.4 million, and an increase in utilities of \$314,000. All of these mandatory costs added up to \$13 million which has to be funded, we don't have a choice. After all of these costs

are deducted, \$3.8 million was left to allocate to the general fund for this year. A good chunk of this went to opening new sections."

VP Lee said, "There was an agreement that Athletics would reduce its base budget by approximately \$2.2 million over three years. The first installment to go into the pool of money for university use was made (\$750,000). This gave us a total of \$10.291 million available for allocation in base funds."

VP Lee said, "Let me briefly talk about the one-time dollars. One-time dollars are typically left over from the prior fiscal year. Our benefits pool had almost \$2.8 million dollars left over. The reason we had left over money is that we didn't spend 100% of all our budgeted salaries due to turnover, etc. And, we are always estimating the amount needed because the rates can change. We ended up with \$809,000 left from all these miscellaneous funds. In addition, \$452,000 was given back by the Chancellor's office. I'm hoping this comes in permanently as base for 2006/2007. Then we have our lottery funds which were \$1.9 million. We are treating lottery as one-time funds even though it comes in every year. So, we had close to \$6 million available in one-time funds."

VP Lee said, "We had to fund some mandatory costs on campus. We set aside \$776,000 to cover health premium increases in January that aren't funded by the Chancellor's office, or the state. We also had to pay for the leases for off-campus offices including the modulars and University Advancement offices. Hopefully, when we move into Clark Hall in March 2006, these two line items will not be needed (\$247,000 and \$183,000). Then we set aside \$3.9 million at the beginning of the fiscal year, because we thought we might be under our FTE by as much as 3% and we would lose that in fees. We are now ready to release some of those funds. And, we also set aside \$1 million in one-time funds to cover sections that didn't get full."

VP Lee said, "We have had several years of budget reductions. In 2003/2004, the Academic Division was given a reduction of \$6 million out of a total \$9 million reduction. That base reduction was never made and allocated out to the colleges. What we did was reallocate back to the Academic Division 1/3rd of that, \$2.3 million, so that the appropriate number of sections could be offered. There was a three year plan to reduce \$6 million from the college budgets, and I believe the first \$2 million was taken, but the remaining \$4 million was not. After analyzing the budget with Provost Sigler and Vice Provost Nance, we realized we could not offer the number of sections we needed to offer this year with a \$2 million budget reduction, so we restored the \$2 million. And, we have another \$2.3 million to restore to the Academic Division budget in 2006/2007."

VP Lee said, "We did have a 2.5% increase in our budgeted FTE, so that \$1.3 million is going to the colleges for sections. And, \$500,000 was allocated from the lottery funds for faculty development. In addition, \$220,000 was allocated for ADA which is a federal requirement."

VP Lee said, "\$8.1 million is in base, and \$3.3 million in one-time funds. This gives us a total of \$11.4 million. The RPB recommended that we set aside 1% in base and 1% in one-time funds for emergencies. This amounts to \$2.3 million in base reserve, and \$2.3 million in one-time reserve. This gives us a total of \$4.6 million. One possible emergency use could be heating costs this year. We are having an extremely difficult time judging where we will end up with utility costs this year, and that is a bill we have to pay."

VP Lee said, "We had a total of \$344,000 of base requests, and \$370,700 of one-time requests that came into the University Planning Council (UPC) Panels. We've actually over-allocated about \$500,000 from base funds, and almost all the one-time funds. However, on page 9, line 18, you can see where we had reserved the 3.9% in the event we had a serious enrollment shortfall. We are not going to have a serious enrollment shortfall, so the RPB has agreed to allocate enough of the funding to cover the UPC Panel Phase 1 allocations and mandatory costs. This leaves us with \$3.4 million in base to cover Phase 2 and 3 allocations. In addition, we have \$2.3 million in base reserve."

Chair Veregge said, "We will ask VP Lee to continue this budget report at our February 2006 meeting."

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

A. CSU Statewide Senator(s) - No Report.

B. Provost - No Report.

C. VP for Administration and Finance - No Report.

D. VP for Student Affairs - No Report.

E. Associated Students President - No Report.

X. Adjournment – A motion was made to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The Senate voted and the motion failed. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.