

2010/2011 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
November 15, 2010

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-four Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kaufman, Lessow-Hurley,  
Kolodziejak, Sabalius,  
Van Selst  
Absent: Kassing

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Laker, Najjar, Lee, Selter

**Deans:**

Present: Merdinger, Chin, Parrish,  
Stacks

**Students:**

Present: Peddada, Salazar, Solorzano,  
Beilke  
Absent: Starks, Armendariz

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Absent: Norton

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Kauppila, Lin, Peck

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Kao, Schultz-Krohn, Semerjian  
Absent: Fee, Correia

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Nellen, Campsey  
Absent: Jiang

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Kimbarow, Smith

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Gleixner, Backer, Du

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Van Hooff, Desalvo, Frazier, Brown, Miller, Mok

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Silber, d'Alarcao, McClory  
Absent: McGee

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Heiden, Ng, Peter  
Absent: Lee, Von Till

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**

Senator Sabalius asked if the Provost's comments on page 7, the last line of the first paragraph under the Question section, should have read, "As long as the process proceeds properly," instead of saying, "As long as the process proceeds." The Senate Chair commented that the Provost's comments were taken verbatim from the tape of the meeting. The Senate voted and the minutes of October 11, 2010 were approved (44-0-0).

### **III. Communications and Questions –**

#### **A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Kaufman announced that that he had just attended the first of two forums conducted by the Curriculum and Research subcommittee on facilitating research. The forum was held in MLK 225/229, and was well-attended. Chair Kaufman encouraged Senators to attend the second forum being held Tuesday, November 16, 2010, from noon to 1:15 p.m. also in MLK 225/229. Chair Kaufman will post this information on the Senate blog.

Chair Kaufman announced that the official groundbreaking for the Student Union will be held at noon on Wednesday, November 17, 2010, in the 7<sup>th</sup> Street plaza.

Chair Kaufman announced that the only open meeting of the Presidential Search Committee will be held at noon on Thursday, November 18, 2010, in MLK 225. Chancellor Reed, several of the Trustees, as well as all of the members of our local Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees for the Selection of the President including Chair Kaufman, Senator Heiden, Professor Rycenga, Senator Kolodziejak, and Senator Najjar in addition to a community and alumni member will be there. Chair Kaufman encouraged Senators to attend.

Chair Kaufman announced that Senators would be receiving a formal invitation to attend the Holiday Reception at the President's House in the next day or two. Several Senators commented that they had already received the email. Chair Kaufman asked Senators to RSVP to Sheri Bragg, the Event Coordinator in the President's Office.

Chair Kaufman welcomed Senator Tamar Semerjian, the newest Senator from the College of Applied Sciences and the Arts. Senator Semerjian is taking Irene Gonzales' place. Irene had a scheduling conflict and could not attend the meetings.

Chair Kaufman announced that Arthur Dunklin had passed away. Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that there is a memorial service for Arthur on Friday, November 19, 2010, at the Campus Chapel at noon.

**B. From the President of the University –** No comments. The President was not in attendance at this meeting.

### **IV. Executive Committee Report –**

#### **A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

##### **October 25, 2010 –**

Senator Frazier asked for clarification as to what was meant by item 3c when it states that, "The Provost will be putting out a call to the colleges for up to 12 new searches for Tenure-Track faculty. Selections will be made based on learning assessment." Provost Selter responded that there are about "half a dozen points that we are using to evaluate requests that come in for tenure-track hires and that is one of them." Chair Kaufman responded that there were four items captured in the minutes and they included, "assessment, need, scholarship, and diversity." Provost Selter said another point was, "whether a department was following its own strategic plan if it has one, and whether it is following the college's strategic plan if the college has one."

Senator Frazier asked whether the statement in 3d that says, “The Provost plans to do a large faculty recruitment in May for next fall,” meant that the Provost planned to hire new faculty for next fall. Chair Kaufman responded that he believed it meant starting the process for hiring in May for hires that would start a full year beyond that. Senator Frazier also asked for clarification as to who was being referred to as “they” in the sentence, “There will be a new feature requiring the colleges to articulate how they will help develop inter-disciplinary programs, e.g. by merging departments.” Chair Kaufman responded that this referred to the departments and how the new hire would fit into the department’s plans. Senator Frazier inquired as to how the new hire would have anything to do with merging departments. Provost Selter responded that, “If the department had plans to merge, or to develop interdisciplinary programs, anything that is a little less traditional than what we are doing now, then judiciously choosing faculty for a new position might speak towards achieving those kinds of goals. That is what that means.”

**November 8, 2010** – Senator Buzanski inquired as to what “clickers” were, and also asked for more explanation about what “Red Balloon” was. Chair Kaufman responded that clickers are a device somewhat like a remote control that allows students to register their responses to various questions in a classroom automatically. Senator Kolodziejak clarified that the AS resolution wasn’t against clickers themselves, it was for the standardization of clickers. Faculty use different clickers and it can be quite costly for students to have to purchase a different clicker for each class.

Senator Lessow-Hurley explained that there was concern at the CSU Statewide level about a program called the “Red Balloon” which “bore all the earmarks of yet another strange management initiative about to be visited upon the campuses by the Chancellor, but no one was really clear.” There was a rumor that we were all signed up for it by the Chancellor, but that was unfounded. It did not come from the Chancellor’s Office. However, it was embraced by about six to eight campus presidents that enacted it on their campuses.

Senator Lessow-Hurley pointed out a typographical error on page 5, where it reads, “December 18, 2010.” This should read, “November 18, 2010.”

## **B. Consent Calendar –**

Senator Heiden commented that she believed the intent was to stagger the terms on the Sustainability Board and asked why all the faculty being appointed to the Sustainability Board on the consent calendar had the same term ending date. Associate Vice Chair McClory (also the Chair of the Committee on Committees) responded that there were still quite a few vacant seats on the Sustainability Board, and she had given the 3-year terms to the initial appointees. She will stagger the terms for the rest of the faculty appointed to the committee.

Senator Buzanski made a motion to approve the consent calendar. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved (44-0-0)

## **C. Executive Committee Action Items: None**

**V. Unfinished Business - None**

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

**A. University Library Board (ULB) –**

Senator Kao reported that the ULB had been working on two subcommittee tasks. The first subcommittee is working on open access to scholarly and academic works. Examples include the embargo on publishing a student thesis in open access format. Currently, there is a 180 day waiting period before those can be made available in an open access forum. The subcommittee is also looking at what the impact would be on tenure-track faculty that make a choice to publish in open access journals, and how that might affect the RTP process, and how that might be considered during the RTP process.

The second ULB subcommittee is working on Alumni privileges to journals available through the library. The subcommittee is working with the Alumni Association to identify who might be interested in that type of service, and whether they would be willing to pay for it.

Senator Silber commented that, “When this was being discussed in the Professional Standards Committee, people were told that they were talking about peer-reviewed open access journals. You mention only non-peer reviewed journals.” Senator Kao responded that he would pass that on to the subcommittee, but from what he gathered the subcommittee was talking about non-peer reviewed. Senator Peter noted that, “Open access is a format, and there are peer-reviewed, and non-peer reviewed journals.” Chair Kaufman commented that what he remembered from the task force recommendations were that the quality of the material was to be the primary consideration, and not whether it came in electronic or print form.

**B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

Senator Ng noted that the PS Committee will be bringing a final reading of the Selection and Review of Department Chairs Policy to the December 6, 2010, Senate meeting. The PS Committee is also working on referrals having to do with open access, department chairs serving on peer review committees for RTP purposes, and online SOTES.

**C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No report.**

**D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –**

Senator Kimbarow presented *AS 1444, Policy Recommendation, Amends S06-3, Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)*.

Senator Kimbarow explained that O&G received a referral early this semester asking them to take a look at the process for the selection of participants in administrator search and review committees. The committee discussed the policy at length and felt it was sound. However, the committee felt that nominations should be accompanied by statements of interest/qualifications, and confirmation that the nominee is willing to serve.

**Questions:**

Senator Van Selst asked if “administrator” was defined somewhere in S06-3, and if it was not could Senator Kimbarow make sure it was inserted in the policy before bringing it back for a final reading.

Senator Backer asked whether signed consent included email consent. Senator Kimbarow said that would be fine.

Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that O&G consider making sure that the policy is consistent in the use of Search and Review throughout the policy.

Senator Gleixner asked if the O&G Committee would consider adding workload for the faculty and staff to generate the statements.

Senator Merdinger expressed concern that requiring statements would make it more burdensome to get members to serve on the committees, and asked how we would find community members. Chair Kaufman responded that generally, we are more likely to get a statement from a community member than someone internal. If a community member is interested, the Senate Office usually gets a statement from him/her.

\*\*\*\*\*

Senator Kimbarow presented *AS 1445, Policy Recommendation, Amends S78-7, Membership, Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) (First Reading)*. Senator Kimbarow commented that O&G had received a referral from the Chair of SERB last year asking that the C&R Committee change their membership by adding a representative from the Center for Faculty Development. Also, the title of the representative from Institutional Research has been updated.

**Debate:**

Senator Peter made a motion to suspend the rules and make this resolution a final reading. The Peter motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion was approved. Senator Peter made a motion to move the previous question on AS 1445. The Senate voted and the Peter motion was approved with 1 abstention. **The Senate voted and AS 1445 was approved with 1 abstention.**

**E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1443, Policy Recommendation, Applying to Declare, Change, or Add a Major or a Minor (Final Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Senator Peter asked for clarification as to what was meant by “15 or fewer additional units” in section 4.5. Senator Gleixner explained that it meant “beyond what they had to take to complete the degree.”

Senator Peter asked if this policy was designed to replace a Presidential Directive. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct. Senator Peter asked if the Presidential Directive came about as a result of a change in Title V. Senator Gleixner said, “I don’t think so. It came about because of impaction and budget changes in general.”

Senator Stacks inquired about the last Resolved clause and whether I&SA would be reevaluating the policy in Spring 2014. Senator Gleixner said, “Yes.” Senator Stacks asked if I&SA had considered requiring an annual report on the impact instead. Senator Gleixner asked for clarification as to whether Senator Stacks was suggesting that I&SA write a report. Senator Stacks asked if the idea was then just to review the policy to see if it is working. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct, because the campus does not currently have a change of major policy. Senator Stacks asked if I&SA had determined what criteria they would use to determine if the policy was working. Senator Gleixner responded that I&SA had not yet come up with the criteria.

Senator Mok asked if I&SA could include something in the policy that stated clearly that if a student received a scholarship to major in a specific major, and then chose to change their major, that the scholarship would be rescinded. Senator Gleixner responded that I&SA had not considered that, but that she felt that was more of the scholarship’s responsibility to do that.

Senator Peter asked if I&SA had considered the impact on graduation rates by restricting changes of major. Senator Gleixner responded that they had, and that their opinion was that it would improve graduation rates by encouraging students to be proactive in picking a major that suits them earlier. Senator Peter then asked if I&SA “had considered the data presented to the Senate a few years ago by then AVP Cooper [then AVP of Undergraduate Studies] that indicated that people who change their major once, or even twice, graduate at a higher rate than those that don’t?” Senator Gleixner responded that I&SA had considered this information, but “after the first time changing their major the graduation rates go downhill. This policy encourages students to find the right major sooner rather than later.” Senator Gleixner further commented that, “This policy was not designed to block changing majors in any way.”

Senator Van Selst commented that he was concerned about what would happen to part-time students in section 3.0. If these part-time students are accepted undeclared, and then they take one or two classes would they then be restricted? Senator Gleixner responded that she wasn’t sure why Senator Van Selst was concerned about part-time students, because it is based on units. Part-time students would accrue those units at a slower rate than full-time students. Senator Gleixner explained, “The difference between these is that now to be admitted to the university as a transfer student, you have to have taken 60 units and that is why this is 30 new or additional units. That is what the second paragraph is targeting.”

Senator Van Selst asked, “So, what does the first paragraph add?” Senator Gleixner clarified, “There are three ways you could not have a major. You could be a freshmen and you applied undeclared and then you have up to 60 units to declare a major. You could be a freshman that applied to a major and didn’t get in, so you are assigned undeclared, and again you have 60 units to pick a major. You could be a transfer student, which means you are coming in with 60 units already and you have to apply to a major as a transfer student, but maybe you didn’t get into that major so you are assigned undeclared, and then you have 30 additional units to pick a major.” Senator Van Selst commented, “So if I understand then, the first paragraph is about native undergraduate students and the second paragraph is about transfer.” Senator Gleixner replied, “Yeah, and former students returning.”

Senator Gleixner asked, “Your biggest confusion is with the word “all” in the first sentence?” Senator

Van Selst responded, “Well, then it says “may be restricted” which makes it un-interpretable.” Senator Gleixner said, “I think the “may” was put in there to be a little bit looser in this practice change, but it is essentially “will” in the current form.”

### **Debate:**

Senator Sabalius spoke against the resolution. Senator Sabalius explained that, “this change in policy initiates an ideological shift in what we are trying to do here. There is a notion that students that are in here are basically keeping other students out, because we are impacted and the privilege of education should be spread more equitably, so we want to get students out as soon as possible. However, I still believe in the old fashioned concept of a university education as having not only depth, but also breadth by graduating universally skilled students and citizens and not just specifically vocationally trained students. Also, in my experience, the students who double-major are actually the most diligent ones, the more eager ones, the more interested ones, and the better ones, and my anecdotal experience seems to be confirmed by the data that Senator Peter has referred to that the graduation rates for students that double major are essentially excellent.” Senator Gleixner clarified that the information Senator Peter was referring to was on changing majors, not double majors. Senator Sabalius said, “I would rather graduate only eight students with a good education, than 10 with an insufficient one.” Senator Sabalius further commented, “I call upon my fellow Senators to vote against this policy.”

Senator Gleixner responded, “In terms of vocational, technically-minded, insufficient education, this is a policy about changing majors, so it doesn’t change the curriculum or the rigor of any of the majors. Again, they are going to graduate with a sound San José State degree, and this is not about the quality of the degree at all. The second thing that I would add on that...” [Note: Senator Gleixner was interrupted by Senator Peter]

Senator Peter presented a point of order and asked if Senator Gleixner was on the speaker’s list. Senator Gleixner responded that she thought she did get to respond to comments during debate. Senator Peter explained that policy committee chairs got to respond during questions, but that they need to get on the speakers list during debate.

Senator Peter presented an amendment to strike section 4.5. The motion was seconded. Senator Peter explained his amendment and said, “Section 4.5 deals with additional bureaucratic hurdles and possible denial of change of major for students with as few as 90 to 100 units. The genesis of this change came originally from the Presidential Directive that did emerge from a change in Title V legislation. In my view, this particular portion of the policy is not consistent with the change in Title V legislation. The Presidential Directive cites that Title V legislation as its rationale for existence. It says, “Pursuant to the authorization granted by the recent revision in Title V,” and then it gives the revision in Title V which says, “The President of each campus may preclude any student from enrolling in any additional state supported courses when that student has met all necessary requirements for the degree for which that student is matriculated.”

Students who have near 90 units haven’t come close to meeting all the necessary requirements for a

degree. The change in Title V was aimed at requiring students who have actually met the requirement for the degree to graduate whether they want to or not.” Senator Peter commented that his first objection to section 4.5 was that it was “not consistent with the rationale for the change,” and his second objection was that he believed that it “would add layers of bureaucracy” and he was also “not convinced that it would help students in the long run.” Senator Peter further commented that he felt the policy might be “counterproductive and actually harm graduation rates if the university made it more difficult for students to change majors when it was really appropriate for them to do so.”

Senator Peter noted that the sentence that he found particularly objectionable in section 4.5 says, “Students who propose, even with compelling reasons, a change that will require more than 15 additional units to graduate will most likely not be approved.” Senator Peter noted, “This is a student that is just starting their senior year and even with compelling reasons, if they are going to add a major which takes 16 units they most likely won’t get approved according to this policy. They will be trapped in an inappropriate major. They are not going to just go away and make space for a student who needs entrance into the university. They are trapped in an inappropriate major. They will continue to flounder and fail until we kick them out for some other reason. This isn’t going to help them to graduate, and it’s not going to free space for a needy student who is being shut out of the university. The reason I suggest striking 4.5 alone, is that there does seem to be a degree of fairness based upon other aspects of the policy for students who go beyond 120 units, but I think that 4.5, bringing this down to the 90 unit level, is not appropriate.”

Senator Buzanski made a motion to move the question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion failed.

Senator Gleixner responded, “In response to that, I think and I’ll just use one quote there, “they are just starting their senior year and we are not allowing them to change their major,” I think the tone of this is new to our campus, but it’s not new to many places, and it’s not a bad thing to encourage students to find the major that is right for them earlier rather than later. Their senior year is late to be choosing their major and finding the right path for them here at the university. They are better served if we encourage them to find a major sooner rather than later. That’s the positive side of this policy in my opinion. It is proactive in encouraging students to find their major.”

Senator Silber suggested that if the Peter Amendment did not pass, the part of the sentence in 4.5 that reads, “will most likely not be approved” should be stricken, because this is opinion and does not belong in the policy.

### **The Senate voted and the Peter Amendment failed.**

Senator Stacks presented an amendment to strike from section 4.5, “Generally, students who propose, with compelling reasons, a change that will require 15 or fewer additional units (or 5 or fewer classes) to graduate will be approved. Students who propose, even with compelling reasons, a change that will require more than 15 additional units to graduate will most likely not be approved, though an exception may be possible. Such exceptions will generally be based on either extenuating personal circumstances, or specific blended or interdisciplinary majors in the SJSU Catalog that require completion of additional units.” The Stacks Amendment was seconded.

Senator Nellen spoke against the Stacks Amendment. Senator Nellen commented that she did not think it was fully opinion, and that it was just giving some guidelines.

Senator Lessow-Hurley commented that anything that constitutes a guideline could be published by the appropriate administrative office.

Senator Laker proposed a friendly amendment to the Stacks Amendment to move the sentences in Senator Stacks Amendment to a footnote. The Laker Amendment to the Stacks Amendment was not friendly. Senator Laker withdrew his amendment.

Senator Peter proposed a substitute Amendment to the Stacks Amendment to amend the following sentence in section 4.5 that reads, “Students who propose, even with compelling reasons, a change that will require more than 15 additional units to graduate will most likely not be approved, though an exception may be possible,” to read, “Students who propose a change that will require more than 15 additional units to graduate will most likely not be approved, except for compelling reasons.” The Peter Amendment to the Stacks Amendment was seconded.

Senator Heiden presented an amendment to the Peter Amendment to read, “Students who propose a change that will require more than 15 additional units to graduate will most likely not be approved, although with compelling reasons an exception may be possible.” The Heiden amendment to the Peter Amendment was not friendly.

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented a friendly amendment to the Peter Amendment to change the language, “will most likely not be approved” to read, “will not be approved.”

Senator Van Selst presented a motion to refer the resolution back to the committee to make these sections clearer. The Van Selst motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion to refer the resolution back to the committee was approved with 4 Nays.**

Senator Gleixner commented, “You all saw this as a first reading, and you can refer back to the Senate minutes and see the minimal amount of questions that were raised during it. This particular section (section 4.5) did have questions raised on it, but I think if the Senate wants to move forward in a timely and productive manner, it is more timely and productive to email committee chairs, and I’ll speak for all of our committee chairs here. This could have been handled much more quickly. You know that I&SA has been working on this for months. You saw it before.”

\*\*\*\*\*

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1446, Policy Recommendation, Grading Symbol for Drops and Withdraws, Amends University Policy S09-7 (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner explained that when University Policy S09-7 was passed, the Senate had come up with two withdrawal grading symbols, the “WA” and the “WB.” The WBs would happen later in the semester and were things outside of the student’s control, like a death in the family. It turns out that PeopleSoft can’t track “WAs.” PeopleSoft can only track “Ws,” so the policy needs to be changed.

**Questions:**

Senator Backer asked if what Senator Gleixner was saying was that we are changing a policy, because a programmer can't change PeopleSoft. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct. Senator Gleixner clarified that this was a CSU system wide feature of PeopleSoft, and is outside of control of the campus.

Senator Peter asked if there was any difference between calling it a "W" instead of a "WA." Senator Gleixner responded that the old policy had a "WA" and a "WB." WA had an earlier deadline, was easier to get approved, and had less stringent rules attached to it. WBs happened later in the semester, and were only approved for things beyond the student's control. With this change to the policy, the definition of a WB will still hold, but it will be called a "W." However, both the symbol WA and the definition will remain the same. Senator Gleixner also noted that the "W" and "WA" both convert to a "W" on the official transcript. Chair Kaufman clarified that calling it a "W" and a "WA" are only for internal reasons.

Senator Parrish inquired as to why if you can modify a "WB" to a "W," you can't modify a "WA" to a "W." Senator Gleixner responded that PeopleSoft will not be counting "WBs." PeopleSoft can only count "Ws." Senator Parrish then said that he thought Senator Gleixner had said that "WBs" were going to be changed to "Ws." Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct, but that this was done manually.

Senator Van Selst asked if the I&SA Committee was trying to keep "WAs," but just have "Ws" on the official transcript. Senator Gleixner responded that right now we have WAs and WBs, and both of these convert to "Ws" on the official transcript. I&SA wants to have the meaning of a WA, but call it a "W," so then we would have a "W" and a "WB" that convert to a "W" when the transcript is posted.

**Debate:**

Senator Peter made a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1446 a final reading. The Peter motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion was approved. Senator Peter moved the previous question on AS 1446. The Senate voted and the Peter motion was approved with 1 abstention. **The Senate voted and AS 1446 was approved.**

\*\*\*\*\*

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1447, Policy Recommendation, Determination of Academic Standing (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner explained that this policy is to clearly state when probation and disqualification are determined.

**Questions:**

Senator Peter inquired if adopting this policy would change the way things are currently being done. Senator Gleixner responded that, "The one thing it would do is consistently guarantee that practice occurs all the time." Senator Gleixner clarified that, "based upon input from the Registrar's Office, this is common practice, but once in a while something slightly different happens."

Senator Nellen inquired as to why students were not disqualified after summer session. Senator Gleixner explained that unlike probation, which is based on your rolling GPA, disqualification is based only on that term GPA. You get disqualified if your term GPA is below 2.0. Often, the Winter and Summer terms do not reflect a traditional course load. I&SA did not feel that it was fair to disqualify a student based on one accelerated course.

Senator Peter made a motion to suspend the rules and make this a final reading of AS 1447. The Senate voted and the Peter motion was approved with 1 abstention.

Senator Laker inquired if there was a different impact on graduate students, and suggested that the Senate should always keep in mind the impact on graduate students.

Senator Sabalius spoke against the Peter motion and suggested that he did not see any urgency to the resolution, and therefore no reason it could not come back to the next meeting.

Senator Peter withdrew his motion to suspend the rules.

Senator Gleixner clarified that one of the reasons the policy is needed is because there is no policy on when academic standing is determined right now, with the exception of one clause in university policy S10-6.

Senator Laker asked if the I&SA Committee could research the impact on graduate students before they bring the policy back for a final reading.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked that I&SA consider correcting the format of the resolution and adding a rationale.

Senator Peter commented that, "If the problem is an ambiguity in S10-6, why is AS 1447 not an amendment to S10-6, as opposed to having separate resolved clauses?"

## **VII. Special Committee Reports –**

Provost Selter gave a brief report on the changes within the Academic Affairs Division over the last year and a half.

Provost Selter commented, "I am honored to be confused with Provost Sigler. On the other hand, it could mean nobody knows that I am Provost."

Provost Selter announced that, "The first slide represents the structure of Academic Affairs about a year and a half ago. On July 1, 2009, our base budget for the year was reduced by about \$4.06 million. The second part of the reduction was a planned \$12.2 million reduction, although the exact amount wasn't certain at the time. That was going to be mitigated during the 2009-2010 academic year by furloughs. In Academic Affairs, and in the President's cabinet, they were working on establishing furlough schedules. They were also working on a mandate from the Chancellor requiring that the campus not exceed its budgeted resident target for 2009-2010. Ordinarily that would not have been that difficult to achieve, however in 2008-2009 the campus

was about 11.5% over our budgeted California resident target. Consequently, the university had to reduce enrollment by about 4,000 FTES.”

Provost Selter commented that when he came into the office, he had no intention of making any changes in Academic Affairs, except for moving university computing, telecommunications, and possibly Academic Technology under the new CIO. However, Provost Selter began to wonder if the Center for Faculty Development, which fell under Academic Technology, should be under the CIO.

The Provost presented a slide showing the structure of the Academic Affairs Division and commented that this slide was based on where the changes were going to occur. The only changes that occurred in the colleges were in Humanities and the Arts, and a minor change in the College of Education. In the Provost Office, there was a Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Budgets and under that were Academic Planning and Budgets and also Academic Scheduling. There is also a Vice Provost for Academic Administration and Personnel, Charlie Whitcomb.

The Provost commented that we then have the divisional units. Academic Technology is shown at the top, then Faculty Affairs which wasn't changed at all, Institutional Research, Graduate Studies, the Research Foundation, International and Extended Studies, and Undergraduate Studies.

Changes the Provost did not make included moving Academic Technology under the CIO, and appointing a new Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Budgets. These two moves did not take place for a couple of reasons. First, the Provost was in an interim appointment and planned on retiring. Secondly, the Provost and the administration were focusing their energy on how the university was going to survive the next year with a budget reduced by \$16 million, and a mandate to reduce enrollment by 10.8% the following year. The Provost did not feel it was appropriate for him to make changes the new Provost would inherit. Later on, the Provost decided to give up the Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Budgets position to cover budget cuts in the Office of the Provost.

In addition, towards the end of the fall in October 2009, the Chancellor held a workshop for Provosts and Presidents. What unfolded as a result of this two-day workshop, was the Chancellor's determination to have the CSU campuses embark on a retention and graduation initiative. Provost Selter commented that, “We were not asked whether we wanted to participate in this, we were told we were going to participate in it, and this was an unfunded mandate.” However, Provost Selter noted that he had been interested in doing something along these lines for a while.

The Provost commented that the way the administration chose to handle this mandate was through advisement. At the time this mandate was handed down, SJSU had three colleges that were doing their own advising. These colleges were Engineering, Business, and Science.

The Provost had five weeks to put together and submit a plan to the Chancellor. It was due on December 25, 2009. The Provost put a team together to come up with the plan. Provost Selter got permission from President Whitmore to make some structural changes in the university, so that he could focus on activities related to improving student retention and student success.

The Provost created a new unit in Academic Affairs called Student Academic Success Services (SASS) that is being led by Maureen Scharberg. The Provost has moved a number of units under SASS including the Peer Mentor Program, the Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC), the Writing Center, Academic Advising and Retention Services (moved over from Student Affairs), the ASPIRE Program, the McNair Scholars Program, the EOP Program, Student Athlete Success Services, and the Foster Youth Program (in the process of moving and should be completed in the next month or two).

Provost Selter commented that at a recent workshop of the Provosts, they heard from Larry Able, a Provost at Central Florida State University. Provost Able took over at Central Florida State University about 16 years ago. When he started, his primary focus was on improving retention and graduation rates. Central Florida State University's graduation rate was close to our six-year graduation rate of 42% for first-time freshmen. Today, Central Florida State University's graduation rate is above 90%. Provost Selter said, "In other words, this is not an initiative that will take full form within a year or two. If we are lucky, the new unit in the Academic Affairs Division will probably be reconfigured in about a year to 1 1/2 years."

The Provost is trying to improve the quality of advisement, and remove redundancies in advising. The Provost is planning on offering a "federated model of advising." For example, all of the Peer Mentors would be centrally trained by the university and then put out into the various colleges.

CASA is in the process of opening a new advising center for students in January, and the College of Social Sciences is looking into changing some of their advising strategies. Both the College of Humanities and the Arts and the College of Social Sciences are considering putting up advising centers. When that happens, all of the colleges except Education will be online with advising centers. The Provost is not that concerned about the College of Education, because it deals mostly with graduate students.

Another move the Provost made was to move the Center for Faculty Development out from under Academic Technology and put it under Graduate Studies. The reason for this move is that the Provost wants to pay a lot more attention to faculty development within the university. The Provost would like for faculty development to become more inclusive so that it contains everything from how to prepare green sheets, how to put classes online, how to use new technology in the classroom, to proposal writing and research. The Provost is also partnering with VP Laker to include student life as a part of student success on campus.

### **Questions:**

Senator Heiden asked if support for online classes would be moved from the Center for Faculty Development. Provost Selter responded that right now he didn't have any plans to move it from where it is, but he wanted to strengthen the partnership between the Center for Faculty Development and International and Extended Studies (IES). The Provost clarified that he wanted to "breakdown some of the barriers and silos between sub units of the division. Having the Center for Faculty Development fall under Graduate Studies, but also have a close relationship with Academic Technology is an example. However, maybe it will be moved some day depending on how it will best operate."

Senator Buzanski asked the Provost to elaborate on what he meant by greater online education. Senator Buzanski commented that President Kassing had said that we should have more online instruction, and there is a lot of discussion about this nationwide. UC Berkeley is reducing the amount of online classes they have. The question concerns faculty rights and whether you can export Professor A's lecture to another campus and have Professor X at the other campus teach it. Provost Selter responded that this was a "pretty thorny issue." Professor Selter commented that, "We are interested in finding ways we could have some measure of online instruction to enhance the quality of our classes, but that doesn't mean converting entire classes to online, however in some cases that may be possible. We are not trying to convert entire programs to online, but there are some valuable techniques that can be incorporated." The Provost is not in favor of having the university become an online university with one professor doing a lecture that is put online throughout the state. Provost Selter commented that he believes students need personal interaction with their instructors and other students, and ensured Professor Buzanski that this would not "go away" while he was here, and he doubted it would go away thereafter.

Senator Silber noted that, "In the College of Science, the Advising Center, the Academic Excellence Workshops, and the efforts to help students navigate through the courses, are all paid for by external grants." Senator Silber estimates that \$100,000 to \$200,000 a year comes from external grants to support these activities. Senator Silber commented that, "The federal government doesn't like paying for the same thing over and over again, and that they like to see new activities." Senator Silber expressed his concern that support for these activities may not be forthcoming in the future, and these activities have increased the graduation rates, especially for minority students. Senator Silber wanted to know, "Given the shortage of staff and faculty, how are we going to pay for these programs when we can't even pay for teaching classes?" Provost Selter responded that there were two questions there. The first was how to institutionalize programs like these, and the Provost is working on ways to institutionalize all of the advising that he is establishing. The Provost also agreed that the university is short on staff and has been going in this direction for a decade or two. Every time there has been a budget reduction, we have given up positions. The Provost is going to try and recover from that, but the state funding we've been allocated this year is not firm yet. There may be a mid-year reduction. In September, when it looked like our funding would be increased, the Provost was ready to start planning on adding staff positions in the division. However, the Provost backed off from that, because of the budget uncertainty. Hopefully by mid-January 2011, when the new Governor submits the budget, the Provost will have a better idea if he can move forward. The Provost commented that there is "no doubt" that we have to rebuild.

#### **VIII. New Business – None**

#### **IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.** **A. Associated Students President (AS) –**

AS President Kolodziejak announced that AS is currently in the process of hiring a new Marketing/Public Relations Coordinator. In addition, AS recently passed their audit, and AS is also getting ready to send out a campus-wide survey to evaluate their services.

At the CSU Statewide level, the Student Trustee has been appointed by the Governor. Steve Dixon from Sacramento State University is the new Student Trustee. Mr. Dixon will be shadowing a Trustee for a year, and then next year he will be a voting Trustee.

AS has been participating in International Week and Annual Legacy Week, and also working on developing a strategic plan.

**B. Vice President for University Advancement –**

VP Najjar announced that we have publically launched our Annual Campaign, and the \$200 million goal. We are at about \$130 million.

The University has also received \$5 million from the Valley Foundation for the School of Nursing and the College of Applied Sciences and the Arts. This is a wonderful gift.

VP Najjar announced that there is a six-minute video about the campaign on the website and encouraged Senators to view it, and the campaign website. VP Najjar also noted that there are banners up across campus. There was also recently a campus kickoff event.

VP Najjar announced that there are two new Tower Foundation Board members, Amir Moshkori, who is the CEO of Covio, and David Wang from Angel Investors. There will be two new board members coming in during December, and VP Najjar will announce them at the next meeting.

**C. CSU Statewide Senators –**

Senator Van Selst commented that he had sent out an email distribution to Senators and asked if anyone had questions on that.

Senator Van Selst gave an update on actions at the CSU Statewide Senate. The Early Start Taskforce has met once. They are working with the Community College Faculty on the transfer degree and Nursing, and also SB 1440 implementation.

The CSU Statewide Senate has also discussed the “Red Balloon” Initiative a little bit. This initiative took the CSU Statewide Senate by surprise, because nobody knew what was happening.

The Board of Trustees has changed fees to tuition. An item that remains a big concern is the use of one-time money to increase enrollment, and what happens in the fall after all these students have matriculated.

Faculty Trustee nominations are open right now, and despite the opinion of CSU counsel, the opinion of the CSU Statewide Senate is that FERP faculty are eligible.

The General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) is considering further alignment with community college GE area breadth and curricula. GEAC is also looking at the use of the International Baccalaureate as a part of the GE requirements. GEAC is also looking at Statway. Statway takes students all the way through the objectives for the statistics course, but doesn't meet the algebra prerequisites. There is discussion right now about whether to allow that. The major concern is that once a student has been given credit for a college level statistics course they have, by default, automatically met the algebra prerequisites.

There are several resolutions pending. There are two resolutions on returning veterans. One has to do with support services, and the other is about catalog rights for returning veterans. Another resolution commends the CSU for hosting a National Teacher Education Summit.

Other resolutions include one recognizing and commending efforts that have increased proficiency rates in reading and writing for entering freshmen, and establishing a taskforce for developing CSU system wide policies for online degree programs.

Other areas of concern include the sale of class materials for commercial purposes, and fiscal concerns about the implementation of the Early Start Program.

The President of CSU Long Beach, F. King Alexander, gave a presentation on the fiscal efficiency of the CSU as a degree-granting institution. The cost per student per degree from a private institution is staggering. The cost per student per degree at the CSU is amazingly low. Senator Lessow-Hurley added that, "This presentation was astounding. The CSU as a system is very cost-efficient at granting degrees. In addition, SJSU stands out within the CSU as being particularly good at doing what we do." However, Senator Lessow-Hurley was a little disturbed that the focus seemed to be on vocational aspects, and said that she "hoped that as we move forward we maintain a consciousness that there is more about a bachelor's degree than just getting a job."

There were concerns around course redesigns. There was also concern in CFA Bargaining about the large number of takeaways on the table right now.

Senator Sabalius commented that we still have no Faculty Trustee. The CSU Statewide Senate has passed resolutions deploring that fact, and resolutions calling on the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to use their influence to have the Faculty Trustee appointed. The CSU Statewide Senate just passed their fourth resolution directed to the new Governor asking him to act expeditiously in appointing the Faculty Trustee.

#### **D. Provost –**

The Provost invited all Senators to the final University Scholars lecture at noon on Wednesday, November 17, 2010. The speaker is Professor Mary Pickering from the History Department.

The Provost announced that several years ago the university applied for an Ace-Sloan grant through Faculty Affairs on faculty career flexibility. It was a very competitive proposal,

but SJSU was awarded one of the six grants. Part of the requirement for the proposal was that faculty had to complete a survey, and the university had to get a 40% response rate from faculty. Faculty are now being asked to complete an end of project survey. The Provost encouraged faculty to complete the survey, and announced that there will be rewards for those that do so.

The Provost stated that he hadn't planned to do any faculty hiring this year, because it was his understanding at the time that our enrollment target could remain the same in 2011-2012 as it is this year, and that our budget could be the same. However, things changed in September, and there was the possibility that we would have more funding and higher enrollment targets, which currently is the case. The Provost then decided to put out a pilot call for faculty recruitment, and that went out several weeks ago. The Provost plans on hiring about a dozen faculty members throughout the university with the new guidelines that were referred to earlier.

If our funding and our enrollment targets are increased for next year, the Provost plans on having more substantial faculty recruitment. The Provost will put out a call in early spring for faculty hiring and approve those that are going to be approved by May, so that all university departments will know what faculty they are going to have for the following year.

#### **Questions:**

Senator Sabalius had a question about the "Red Balloon" project. This is an initiative to build new models for higher education, and specifically undergraduate education. Although it is not a CSU Statewide initiative, seven CSU campuses are participating. SJSU is not one of these campuses. Senator Sabalius inquired as to whether the Provost had been approached by anyone asking if SJSU would like to be a part of this. Provost Selter responded that he had not been approached by anyone about the "Red Balloon" project, nor was there any mention of it in the Academic Council meeting on October 21, 2010. It was not mentioned in the Provost meeting. Provost Selter first heard about this from Professor Lessow-Hurley.

Senator Buzanski commented that he "was very confused as to what our deadline for spring applications is at this point. The Provost responded that VP and Senator Laker could comment on this later, but he believed the deadline was today [November 15, 2010]. VP Laker responded that this was correct.

Senator Peter inquired as to what kind of information the Provost believed he would have by May so that he could make a judgment about how many faculty positions to move ahead with. The Provost responded that he was going to be looking at what the Governor's budget proposal was in January. If there is support for higher education in his budget, then the Provost believes we have a chance. However, if the new Governor does a mid-year budget reduction, and then follows up with another budget reduction next year, then that doesn't look good.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if we were going to pursue our strategic planning process. Provost Selter commented that, "I spend most of my time doing strategic planning. You may not want to hear that, but I do." The Provost commented that he had been trying to schedule a meeting of the Strategic Planning Board and that Monica was working on it.

Senator Sabalius commented that somebody in authority told him that the Provost had committed our campus to Stretch Model for remediation. Provost Selter responded, "Interesting! What kind of a commitment did I make?" Provost Selter commented, "I don't think that is quite true. I was made aware of the Stretch Model and that apparently it is working quite well at San Francisco State University." The Provost encouraged the AVP for Undergraduate Studies to explore the possibility, and to work with the English Department. Provost Selter said, "We have been trying for at least six months to a year to bring people from San Francisco State down here to talk to the English Department faculty about Stretch, and that is where it stands. I've made no commitment. I made a commitment to look into it." Senator Frazier commented that he could second what Senator Sabalius said, and that he had heard from someone that, "Gerry wants it."

#### **E. Vice President for Administration and Finance –**

VP Rose Lee announced that she would be giving the annual budget report at the December 6, 2010, Senate meeting. Copies of the annual budget report will not be distributed this year. Senators will be given a link to VP Lee's website where they can print off the pages that they are interested in.

#### **Questions:**

Senator Sabalius inquired, "How many millions is SJSU supposed to get, have we gotten any of this money, and can they still take this money back from us?"

VP Lee responded that after the budget was passed, they found out that there may be as much as a \$6 million shortfall this year. VP Lee said, "No we don't have the money in the bank. It doesn't quite work that way. It's not all cash. We have to collect a good portion of it, those are the student fees. If we do not meet our budgeted enrollment, obviously, we will not be collecting those enrollments. That is part of the calculations that I will finalize with the AVP of Finance this week based on the latest enrollment projections being given to me. It is always possible that money will be taken back. In the history of the CSU, we have had mid-year reductions, and we have had to return money in the middle of a fiscal year. That has happened before. I can't predict that that will happen, but I do know that there is a serious budget shortfall.

At the December report, I will attempt to give you summaries. Unlike in past years, there will be a lot of scenarios that could happen. I will try and touch on the next fiscal year and what it means.

You guys already know about the action the Board of Trustees took last week, which was to approve a 2011-2012 fee increase. This is already different, because they typically do not

ask for a fee increase until the May meeting, after the budget revise, but in fact they have already done it and I will talk about the reasons for that.

There will be \$336 million. The Chancellor's Office is holding \$106 million and has not distributed that to the campuses. If there is a shortfall, I believe that is where they plan to take it instead of coming back to the campuses. We were not counting on that money, because I will show you on the spreadsheet that is the last set of FTE we need to meet. We were not going to meet the target before that, so we were not expecting any of that money, so it is fairly complicated compared to prior budgets. There is no question about it.

We are sorting through, and I believe we will have money. I've already talked to the Provost. We will have funding to cover the increased enrollment that we expect to generate in the spring. There isn't any doubt on that, but what will remain as base is clearly up in the air."

Senator Sabalius replied that the way he understood it, "from the \$365 million that the CSU got, about \$66 million is tied to enrollment growth, then there is another \$300 million left. About \$109 million comes from the federal government, so even if the state legislators do something, we should get at least \$109 million." Senator Sabalius noted that, "The distribution sheet of how much every campus should get is already out there, so you haven't answered how much we are supposed to get if the budget stands as it is. I understand that we have the risk of having to give something back, but I really want to know how big the slice of the pie is for SJSU."

VP Lee responded, "Okay. It would have been \$18 million, but because we will not meet our budgeted enrollment, I will be taking off about \$4 million because that is fees we will not collect. We will have somewhere around \$14 to \$15 million in 2010-2011 to distribute. Most of this will be for new enrollment. We will allocate in the spring. We started this year with a budget that had been drastically reduced from last year. Our budgeted enrollment was reduced 10.8%. That brought us down to 20,027 resident FTE, then the Chancellor said we got the \$106 million in one-time, so you can all increase and our share was about 500 FTE. Then the final budget got signed and the Governor said, now you can move your budgeted resident FTE to 21,145, and that's when the big rush was to open up for spring. We do not believe we will meet that target."

The Chancellor then gave us an additional target of 22,222 and said if you can increase from 21,145 to 22,222 FTE, we will give you money for that, but until you do we will hold that money centrally. VP Lee said, "It is complicated. I will bring in spreadsheets that will hopefully summarize what has been happening. However, almost all of the new money we got is either tied to increasing enrollment or paying for those mandatory costs that we always have to pay for which are the health, dental premium increases, and increases in the PERS contribution rate for employers.

I'm going to lay all that out. When that is done, I believe we will have somewhere between \$14 and \$15 million that has to go to cover the increased FTE, which Provost Selter has already told you we will cover. Now, there should be some money left for other things, but

at this time we don't know what that is, because we still don't know what our final enrollment will be for this fiscal year.

Now, that letter you are talking about—what Senator Sabalius is referring to—if you go to the CSU website and go to the budget office, they have a very complicated budget letter. It's almost impossible for anybody that doesn't work in finance to understand it. To make it even more complicated, we were to plan for a 10% fee increase for this year, and you guys know that didn't hold true. Even though they passed a 5% increase effective for this spring that is not equivalent to 10% starting in the fall, so we are out \$2 to \$3 million from that. The calculations are going forward and backward, and there are quite a few of them. I will do my best to make it understandable, and will certainly be open for questions. I spoke to Chair Kaufman, and I think I have 45 minutes, I don't know if I'm going to need more time than that. This is not an usual budget by any means."

#### **F. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

Vice President and Senator Laker commented that he has been with the university for three months now and it has been a pleasure.

VP Laker has spent a great deal of time learning about SJSU's Enrollment Management issues, and in the three months he has been here there have been five different enrollment targets.

VP Laker reminded Senators that the Student Union Groundbreaking Ceremony is at noon on Wednesday [November 17, 2010] in the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Plaza.

VP Laker announced that this is Transaction Week and today was the kickoff. There was a lecture by Jamison Green and he gave a good overview of the issues.

VP Laker is also spending a lot of time taking inventory of the 23 departments in the Student Affairs Division to identify partnerships for each of them. VP Laker's expectation is that every department will have two or three specific partnerships with academic colleagues.

#### **Questions:**

Senator Silber inquired as to why we are still impacted, if we haven't met our enrollment targets. VP Laker responded that, "Admissions is prepared to evaluate student applications and either admit or not admit students, but as to the criteria for admission, that is something Senators need to debate."

Senator Van Selst had a student come to him last week that had a letter from SJSU that said, "Congratulations! Welcome to San José State University," but at the bottom of the letter it said, "This offer is conditional upon being accepted into a major." Senator Van Selst felt this was a "strong-arm twist" to the department to accept the student.

VP Laker responded that this was an excellent case example of how messy it could get when we are trying to balance certain principles, while also making sure we can keep the lights on. VP Laker cautioned Senators “to be very careful when contemplating changes to the impaction plan so that it isn’t materially changed in such a manner that we are bumped down to not having one and have to start again.”

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