

2010/2011 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
December 6, 2010**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Associate Vice Chair, Susan McClory. Forty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

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

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Laker, Najjar, Lee, Selter

COB Representatives:

Present: Nellen, Campsey
Absent: Jiang

Deans:

Present: Merdinger, Parrish
Absent: Stacks, Chin

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow, Smith

Students:

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

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Backer
Absent: Du

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

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

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Silber, d'Alarcao, McClory, McGee

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Absent: Norton

SOS Representatives:

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

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Kauppila, Lin, Peck

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

Note: The Senate minutes of November 15, 2010 will be brought to the February 14, 2011 Senate meeting for approval.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Kaufman said, “Today's meeting will be a busy one. We have one first and four final readings of policy recommendations, Senator Lee's budget report, and brief reports from the chairs of subcommittees for our NCAA recertification.

Our Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, is out today because her husband, Pat, had back surgery last week. Many of you know Pat and we all send him our best wishes. Senators McClory and Von Till will be helping with minutes, etc. There are attendance sheets going around the room;

please check off your name when it comes around.

At the Senate Chairs meeting in Long Beach a few weeks ago, there was a lot of discussion about SB1440, the Transfer Degree bill that has now been signed into law. To facilitate transfer between community colleges and the CSU, a council of CC and CSU faculty are generating what are called "Transfer Model Curricula (TMC)" templates for the courses that a transfer degree student would take at a CC before coming to a CSU. SB1440 says that a CSU can't require more than 60 units of a student who comes to a CSU major with an acceptable transfer degree. It is very important for CSU faculty to have input on the degree path. I urge you to look at the information on the C-ID web site <http://www.c-id.net/degreereview.html> and be sure that you and your colleagues sign up for the listserve in your academic area so that you can have input into the relevant TMCs.

Make sure to RSVP for the President's holiday party this Sunday. I sent a reminder email to all of you just before the meeting, with a map and RSVP information.

Happy Holidays to everyone.”

B. From the President of the University –

President Kassing made the following announcements:

This year's graduation speaker will be Jim Thompson who graduated from SJSU in 1962. Mr. Thompson started, what is today a \$6 Million business in Japan. The emphasis of Mr. Thompson's speech will focus on globalization. The President asked Senators that have any projects addressing globalization to let VP Najjar know.

SJSU will be partnering with Fresno State to offer a doctorate in Nursing.

Dr. Rona Halualani will be evaluating the diversity master plan.

The Journalism and Mass Communications Department received a \$1 million grant from the state department to work with Herat University in Afghanistan.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

November 29, 2010 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar – The Consent Calendar was approved.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: The Election Calendar for 2011 was approved.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA):

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1443, Policy Recommendation, Applying to Declare, Change, or Add a Major or Minor (Final Reading)*. Senator Brown presented an amendment to strike all of section 4.5. The Brown amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Brown amendment failed.

Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change sections 4.5.1, 4.5.2, and 4.5.3 by inserting a reference to return to section 1.0 for the definition of “earned units” whenever it appears, and to also strike the portion of line 7, section 4.5.1 that reads, “or specific in cases where blended or interdisciplinary majors in the SJSU Catalog require completion of additional units.”

Senators Fee and Peter commented that while they appreciated the amount of work that the I&SA Committee put into this policy, it does not completely replace the Presidential Directive. It only replaces certain sections, and they would prefer one policy that replaced the whole Presidential Directive. Senator Gleixner responded that she was opposed to lumping different things into one package that are not the same concept, and that the other items in the Presidential Directive are very different from what is in this policy.

Senator Sabalius spoke against the policy, and pointed out that there was opposition to it in the committee as you can see by the vote, 10-4-3. Senator Sabalius also commented that several students on I&SA that were not present on the day the committee voted, have told Senator Sabalius they disapproved of it.

Senator Buzanski presented a motion to call the previous question. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion failed.

Senator Peter asked if any member of the administration could tell the Senate whether it was the intent of the administration to revise the Presidential Directive if/when this policy is passed. The Chief of Staff, Bill Nance, responded that he has not had that conversation with the President yet, so he could not answer the question, but he thought that it was a “fair presumption.”

Senator Sabalius, and five additional Senators, requested a vote on AS 1443 by secret written ballot. **The Senate voted by secret ballot and AS 1443 failed (15-22-5).**

B. University Library Board (ULB) –

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Ng presented *AS 1442, Policy Recommendation, Revision of the Policy for Selection and Review of Department Chairs (Final Reading)*. Senator Ng presented a friendly amendment to add the date approved, November 22, 2010, and those members that were absent during the committee vote to page 1. Senator Frazier presented a friendly amendment to remove the word “and” from the first line of page 2. Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to modify section IV.1. to remove the restriction that only tenured or tenure-track faculty holding the positions of Associate or Full Professor may be nominees for department chair.

The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment failed. Senator Rose Lee presented a friendly amendment to add, “VII.” before CONFIDENTIALITY on the last line of page 4. Senator Peter presented a friendly amendment to section V.2, line 6, to change it to read, “Interim appointments are for the period of six months or less.” **The Senate voted and AS 1442 passed as amended.**

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

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –

Senator Kimbarow presented *AS 1444, Policy Recommendation, Amends S06-3, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)*. Senators Lessow-Hurley and Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change the third/fourth lines to read, “The Academic Senate shall publish notice of intention to appoint a search committee and shall solicit written nominations, either in hard copy or electronically, for membership on the committee from the University community.” **The Senate voted and AS 1444 passed as amended.**

VII. Special Committee Reports –

VP Rose Lee and her staff presented the annual university budget report. VP Lee introduced Josee Larochelle, AVP for Finance and Administrative Technology. AVP Larochelle introduced Marna Genes, our new University Budget Director.

VP Lee commented that California set a record of 100 days to pass the budget this year. While SJSU was waiting for the budget to pass, the semester began and the Chancellor’s Office told SJSU to plan on a budget that was approximately \$20 million less than 2009/2010.

In 2009/2010, most of the \$20 million in budget cuts was covered through furloughs, but the university was asked to make that reduction permanent in 2010/2011. The university was also instructed to count on a 10% fee increase, and a 9.8% reduction in budgeted residential FTES.

In October 2010, VP Lee learned that the CSU had received \$199 million in base, plus an additional \$60.6 million in base for an additional 2.5% enrollment increase. In addition, the CSU received \$106 million in federal one-time money.

SJSU started the 2010/2011 fiscal year with an enrollment target of 20,027 FTES. This was down considerably from 22,460 FTES in fiscal year 2009/2010. VP Lee and her staff also started out the year with a plan for \$263 million. SJSU had a small reduction of \$2.4 million in the beginning of the year. However, SJSU ended up with a net change of almost \$18.6 million from 2009/2010.

The university was then asked to reopen enrollment for Spring 2011, and our enrollment target was raised from 20,027 to 21,145 resident FTES. The university’s best estimate is that we will have 20,715 FTES, and will not make our enrollment target. However, the Chancellor has said that campuses that do not make their new target FTES will not be asked to return the state appropriation associated with it, but if we don’t make the target we will not collect the state university fee.

VP Lee commented that non-resident FTES is budgeted very differently from resident FTES. The non-resident FTES is taken from two fiscal years ago, and that becomes the budget. The 1819

FTES shown on the slide is our actual non-resident FTES from 2007/2008. In 2008/2009, we dropped a little, and then we ended 2009/2010 at 1441 FTES. VP Lee estimates that we will come in way lower than that at 1243 FTES for 2010/2011. The drop from 1819 to 1243 FTES has generated a loss in revenue of about \$6.4 million.

VP Lee said that there is money being held at the Chancellor's Office should the campus reach 22,222 in resident FTES this fiscal year. Any campus that can go from their budget base level up to their new target will be given marginal cost funding, plus they will collect the fee. That is one-time money.

The Trustees have passed the Trustee's budget for 2011/2012. What was unusual this year is that they also passed a student fee increase of 10% for 2011/2012. This is unusual because the trustees typically pass fee increases in May. Campuses have already been told what their targets will be for 2011/2012. By passing the fee increase now, the money collected will be more than the \$106 million that is currently one-time. Otherwise, planning is much more difficult.

VP Lee commented that last year we crossed the line where the state appropriation was actually less than the revenue the university brought in. With the increase in funding this fiscal year, we will be back to almost 50/50 state appropriation versus fee revenue.

Last year an adjustment of \$2.7 million was made because we did not expect to make our target enrollment. This year an adjustment of \$6.9 million was made for two reasons. First, SJSU will drop again in non-resident FTES, and second we will not make our enrollment target for resident students. For every FTES that we don't meet, we lose about \$6,000 in state university fee revenue and over \$10,000 in non-resident fees.

On page 3 of the full report, you can see that our state appropriation went up by about \$15 million this year. That is the funding for the new FTES from 20,027 to 21,145 that we need to meet. There will also be a 5% fee increase in the spring term. However, original planning assumptions given by Chancellor's Office depended on an annual 10% fee increase. The 5% fall fee increase, instead of a 10% fee increase, reduced our budget by about \$3-\$4 million, and the revenue a 10% annual fee increase would have generated would have been \$18.6 million.

VP Lee and her staff have informed the President's cabinet that we have \$15.5 million new additional funding that we were not counting on at the beginning of the fiscal year. Most of this allocation will go towards funding the additional FTES. The university has not yet allocated the funds. We are waiting for spring actual enrollment. The cabinet will also consider urgent and other budget requests that the divisions might have. VP Lee commented that it may be necessary to have another report to the Senate at a later date to explain the allocations that are made.

The numbers on page 8 refer to the line subtotal SJSU CSU Operating Fund, which totals \$261 million. The reason these numbers are lower is because the \$15 million hasn't been allocated. VP Lee clarified that about three years ago, the term "general fund" was replaced with the new terminology "CSU Operating Fund". This is the official label for the general fund budget. The CSU Operating Fund is distinct from Revenue and Auxiliary funds which are self-support programs/organizations.

The next slide shows sources and uses. VP Lee and her staff identify all the revenue available to allocate, both base and one-time, and then they identify the allocations made. This is pages 6 and 7 in the full budget book. What is shown there are the actions that were taken in May in preparation for the beginning of the fiscal year. It does not include the \$15.4 million that has not been allocated. If you look at those pages you will see that a total of \$15.1 million was available. However, only \$1.6 million was in base, and \$13.1 was one-time. The allocations are detailed on page 6.

On the base side, VP Lee and her staff had to allocate \$148,000 in base salary due to reassignments in the spring. There was an agreement that if a department received an employee with a higher salary than they had in their budget during the bumping/reassignments, that the department would get the difference. In addition, VP Lee and her staff had to allocate \$120,000 for CFA equity increases. There was a prior year compensation pool and not all of the funding was used up, so everyone got a very miniscule pay raise because the CFA decided to distribute it that way. The average was about \$4 a month. In the one-time column, VP Lee and her staff had to set aside \$1 million for a settlement with the CFA on the FERP and the calculation of some of the assignments. VP Lee and her staff are still awaiting the results of that. The allocation has not been made yet, but the money had to be set aside.

After VP Lee and her staff were finished allocating what was mandatory, the university was left with \$20,000 in base and \$1.5 million in one-time funds in May. After receiving the final budget, VP Lee can now add the \$1.5 million in one-time to the \$15.4 million, and that is the budget the university will be working with for the remainder of this fiscal year.

For fiscal year 2011/2012, we will not carry forward the \$15 million. The university will have more, because the 5% fee increase effective in spring will be in place in fall. In addition, there will be a 10% fee increase that is new.

On January 10, 2011, we should be getting the Governor's budget for 2011/2012. VP Lee commented that she was not sure how the Trustee's budget passed in November would translate to the Governor's budget, but that there is a compensation pool request of 3%, and coverage requested for mandatory increases in PERS, health, and dental. VP Lee and her staff will begin the 2011/2012 budget planning as soon as they receive that budget.

Questions:

Senator Heiden asked if the \$15 million that had not been allocated yet had been received. VP Lee responded that it had, but the President's cabinet is still deciding where it is needed. However, most of it will probably be allocated to fund the sections necessary for the new enrollment. SJSU jumped from an enrollment target of 20,027 FTES to 21,145 FTES this spring. There will be some money left and the President's cabinet is looking at where it will be most needed. VP Lee told the Senate that it would be prudent for SJSU to set aside some serious reserves. Governor Schwarzenegger's budget is already short by about \$6 billion, and this could mean mid-year reductions for us. The Chancellor's Office has said that the \$106 million pool that is being held by

the Chancellor's Office will be used for the new additional FTE and could be used for a mid-year reduction.

Senator Heiden asked why the utility bills weren't significantly lower if we were teaching fewer sections. VP Lee responded that the buildings themselves have to be heated and have the lights on from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m., Monday through Thursday, and from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Fridays. The electricity from a few less classes doesn't have a major impact on the heating and lighting for the entire building.

Senator Sabalius commented that the pie chart on operating fund expenditures from 2007/2008 had an expense chart, or education-in-general budget fund divided by functional classification of people that Senator Sabalius found very informative. It showed exactly how much went to instruction, how much went to scholarship and fellowship, how much went to operation and maintenance, and so on. Senator Sabalius asked if there was any chance of getting this pie chart again. VP Lee responded that she believed it was dropped because it took some doing to get the information together. However, VP Lee does have the information and will look into having her staff put together the pie chart.

VP Lee commented that when you look at all the funds, SJSU is a \$491 million business, and that we have had an increase of 4.3% over the last fiscal year. VP Lee also noted that SJSU's housing program is about 84% occupied, and we need it to be 95% occupied.

VP Lee went over the slide on the lottery funds. The university gets a total of about \$2.4 million in lottery revenue. In 2006/2007, the University Planning Council (UPC) permanently allocated \$1.9 million of the lottery budget for purposes in the academic area. Specifically, there is a \$1.3 million allocation to the library, and additional funds for release time, etc. Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that the money set aside for release time for faculty was to meet the strategic planning goal of lightening the faculty teaching load to promote student success, and asked if that program was still in place. VP Lee responded that she allocates the money to the Academic Affairs base.

Senator Peter was concerned about the way page 28 referred to lottery funds. On page 28 it states that, "The senior management team has identified \$1.9 million in lottery funding to be distributed annually to meet the operational needs of the university." Senator Peter noted that if this language is correct, this could be in violation of the Lottery Act. VP Lee responded that it was not in violation of the Lottery Act. The Lottery Act states that the funding must be for academic and academic-related activities, and not for instruction. VP Lee further clarified that the funds are not for instruction, but are for the library and faculty development. VP Lee also clarified that the reference to the senior management team did not refer to the President's Cabinet, but to the Goals Advisory Council (GAC) that was active at the time. VP Lee will change her report to reflect this.

Senator Heiden commented that she did not believe that providing release time for faculty involved with student success projects had been done for several years, and she asked for clarification as to where the money went and what the future plans were for that money. VP Lee responded that this was a complicated question, because where the money is at depends on the budget. Our budget has just been reduced. In the Academic Affairs Division there have been reductions to the budget since 2008/2009, and "where the funding isn't very straightforward."

Senator Lessow-Hurley responded, “Senator Lee, with all due respect, there is a fairly straightforward question on the table. There was \$1.9 million of lottery money which was to be allocated for faculty development grants distributed by a particular committee, and they were .20 release time grants to support student success. If there is still lottery money, the question I believe that Senator Heiden is asking is, where is that money and what happened to that distribution process.

If that’s not a question you can answer, I would understand that, since it’s internal to Academic Affairs, and perhaps that question should be readdressed to Provost Selter, however, I don’t believe that money was ever intended to generally fund Academic Affairs. We have not had any strategic planning process going forward since the process was revisited by this body, so one would have to assume that the UPC allocation stands until somebody does something to change it.

I don’t think this is a very complicated question. There are certainly questions that come up about the budget that are complex, and there are many that come up that I don’t understand either the questions or the answers, but this seems like a very straightforward question that ought to have a straightforward answer.” VP Lee responded, “I will say that is not a question I can answer in any detail.”

Senator Sabalius commented that when Dr. Goodman was Provost, the Executive Committee of the Senate determined where the lottery funds would go. After Provost Sigler took over, the Executive Committee formed the budget committees (UPC, GAC) that then decided where to allocate the money, and they decided to allocate \$1.9 million to Academic Affairs rather than deciding in the Executive Committee where the money would go. Release time was promised for faculty, and for a couple of years release time was given from the \$1.9 million, but now it isn’t being given any more.

Senator Sabalius noted, “Even in your report it says it is distributed annually to meet the operational needs of the university, and I think Senator Peter is right that the Lottery Act or state law specifies that these funds are not supposed to supplant ongoing operating costs.” Senator Sabalius further commented that he supported Senator Lessow-Hurley’s comments and felt that it was time for the Senate to revisit lottery funds again. VP Lee clarified that \$1.3 million of the \$1.9 million went to the library, so the Senate is only talking about the \$600,000 that was left over. VP Lee will go back to the 2006/2007 budget books, look at the allocations, and work with the Academic Affairs Division to see where the remaining funds were allocated.

Senator Heiden wanted to know if there was a particular reason why the \$711,000 remaining in lottery funds had not been allocated to support faculty instruction and improving student success. VP Lee responded that some of the remaining funds were required by the Chancellor’s Office as reserve, and then there are also some encumbrances that still need to be paid out. However, there are remaining funds available for allocation, and VP Lee and her staff have pointed this out and are going to be working on this.

Senator Peter asked for an explanation of page 29 of the report which contains a breakdown of the lottery funds. Under operating costs, it lists an university administrative overhead of \$129,042, and

then the footnote below indicates that it represents the administrative overhead on the total lottery revenue of \$2.435 million. VP Lee responded that the overhead is roughly 4% of the total lottery revenue, and is in compliance with Executive Order 1000, which used to be Executive Order 753. This Executive Order covers expenditures in managing the lottery funds, e.g. payroll, purchase orders, etc. These fees are charged to every revenue fund. The university is not allowed to use general fund positions for payroll, paychecks, and any number of things. Not all of the cost is for VP Lee's personnel, it is other administrative positions.

VP Lee explained that the last slide shows the auxiliaries and we have five of them. VP Lee explained that the difference between an auxiliary and a revenue fund is that auxiliaries are separately and legally incorporated.

Questions:

Senator Peter asked how many of these budget presentations VP Lee had done. VP Lee said 26 or 27 and told a brief story about the first Senate meeting she attended as Budget Director. Senator Peter noted that this would be VP Lee's last annual budget presentation before her retirement this summer, and commented that the budget just won't seem the same without her. The Senate thanked VP Lee for her service over the years.

B. AVP of Human Resources, Maria De Guevara presented the NCAA Gender, Diversity, and Student Well-Being Committee Report.

In the NCAA recertification process, AVP De Guevara is the Chair of the Gender, Diversity, and Student Athlete Well Being Committee. This committee is broken down into three subcommittees, Gender, Diversity, and Student Athlete Well Being. AVP De Guevara noted that there are 12 self-study areas, and 15 program areas, so this is why she took this large committee and broke it down into three subcommittees.

The first subcommittee focuses on gender issues and ensuring that athletic programs are free from gender bias. Cathy Busalacchi is chair of this subcommittee. The second subcommittee focuses on diversity and ensuring that all our athletic programs promote respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of all of our students. This subcommittee has four program areas, and 17 self-study questions that they have to answer. The chair of this subcommittee is Whitney Rotrock. The third subcommittee focuses on ensuring our athletic programs are designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational well-being of our students. This subcommittee has 22 self-study questions, and the subcommittee's chair is Dr. Sonya Lilienthal.

The subcommittees meet weekly. AVP De Guevara will be providing an interim report to Provost Selter by January 14, 2011.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski asked for examples of the type of questions being asked. AVP De Guevara replied that for gender they were looking at scholarship, equipment, travel allowance, total number of coaches, salaries, and the reason they are looking at that is to be sure these programs are free of gender bias between men's and women's sports.

Senator Peter asked if support for academic performance was part of these three groups. AVP De Guevara gave an example of one of the areas under diversity that asks whether we have enough minority students graduating.

C. Natalie King, the Assistant Associate Vice President (AAVP) for Faculty Affairs and Chair of the Governance and Commitment to Rules NCAA subcommittee, gave a brief presentation.

This subcommittee had two operating principles. The first is governance of the university, and there are 15 questions under this category. The second principle is the rule of compliance, and there are 17 questions under this category.

The subcommittee has met twice, but their meetings are long. They also do a lot of work by email. The subcommittee's last meeting is scheduled for next week, and their report is due in early January. The subcommittee is divided up so there is a primary and a secondary person on each question. The two of them will then formulate their final answer to the question.

Questions:

Senator Peter asked if the Senate was included in the subcommittee's survey about governance, and what sort of questions did AAVP King have about the Senate. AAVP King replied that the Senate did enter into the survey in terms of the policies.

D. Richard Francisco, Counselor and Chair of the subcommittee on Academic Integrity gave a brief presentation.

Richard Francisco is Chair of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee. Chair Francisco has also been a past Chair of the Athletics Board. The fundamental operating principle of this subcommittee is to ensure that student athletes are treated consistently with the student body. The two components of this operating principle include ensuring that all student athletes be regularly enrolled degree-seeking students with regular published entrance requirements that apply to all students, and ensuring that we only admit student athletes that have reasonable expectations of attaining academic degrees.

This subcommittee will be writing about the improvements that SJSU has made since the last cycle involving student athletes. This will include such things as graduation rates and academic progress. The NCAA calls this APR.

Chair Francisco said, "Let me just say that since our new Athletic Director has come aboard, Tom Bowen, he has come here and has put student back into student athlete." SJSU has also come a long way from just being an institution that would bring in athletes and just try and keep them eligible, to a university that not only wants our student athletes to be academically qualified, but

encourages and helps them to attain a 3.0 or better grade point average. When Tom Bowen became Athletic Director at SJSU, the graduation rate for student athletes was 48%, and now the graduation rate is 52%. Although that is still not as high as the university would like, it is moving in the right direction. In terms of academic progress, the university went from 851 to 926 APR. All of the athletic programs are now above 925, except women's basketball. Chair Francisco hopes that they will be above a 925 soon.

The subcommittee has met twice. Chair Francisco split the subcommittee because there is so much data to go through. Chair Francisco noted that most of the information needed is already here, the subcommittee just needs to pull it together.

Chair Francisco explained that the mission of Student Athletic Success Services (SASS) is to provide quality programs for student athletes. One of their programs is called, "Grades First" and a component of this program is online progress reports on student athletes given directly from faculty to SASS, so that they may make interventions when necessary. SASS notifies coaches and students and works with them when they need to pull up their grades. SASS strives for a 3.0 grade point average for every athlete. Currently, the response rate from faculty is only 45%, and SASS would like to get that up to 100%. Chair Francisco encouraged Senators to provide the information requested if contacted by SASS.

Comments from Provost Selter:

"Our timeline is roughly the following. The subcommittees will all have the first draft of their reports to submit to the steering committee. There is an overall steering committee, which is comprised of about 20 people including the Vice Presidents, the Athletic Director, some coaches, some faculty, some students, a few other administrators, and the Faculty Athletic Representative, Billy [Senator B. J. Campsey] and the like. We should get the rough draft in roughly mid-January. We are going to compile that into a first draft of a self-study report that is going to go into NCAA around the end of April. I think the 29th of April. We intend the review of this report to be a public exercise. We are going to find ways to distribute it throughout the campus and into the community, probably create a website for the self study, post the document electronically, and entertain any feedback that we can get. Then we will do several iterations on getting this together for submission to NCAA.

We will have a site visit here. I think it is scheduled for October 12th. It is about a three-day visit by a visiting team from NCAA. It has already been scheduled, so that's our plan for the recertification. This is our 3rd cycle on this. I have to publically thank the subcommittee members and the subcommittee chairs, because of the fact that this is an onerous task. Richard is correct that we are planning to expand the faculty reporting university-wide on tracking students and students who may be in danger, but that is another topic.

Since I have the floor, I will not give a report at the end of the meeting. Let me say that I will be happy, well, first of all this year's budget has been nightmarish and Rose has indicated the changes that have gone before us since August, so I would be happy if the Senate would invite me in the spring semester, once the dust settles on the allocations that Rose was talking about, to give a budget report for Academic Affairs, including the \$1.9 million in lottery money. I would be happy

to explain that and any other questions you may have about where all the money goes in Academic Affairs.”

Chair Kaufman commented, “We will certainly take you up on the offer.”

VIII. New Business – None

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

A. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Laker announced that SJSU received about 37,287 applications for next fall 2010. There were 22,924 first-time freshmen, and 12,471 transfer student applications for fall 2010. Our current enrollment target is 22,222. We will not be able to achieve this due to the changing enrollment targets this semester. It looks like SJSU will grow 6% to 7% without even trying that hard.

B. Associated Students President –

AS President Kolodziejak made the following announcements:

- AS recently launched a survey of all student services.
- AS is in the process of changing their website to make it more student friendly.
- AS will be hosting a January winter retreat that will focus on strategic planning.
- AS is also launching a student scholarship program to help with the student fee increases.

C. CSU Statewide Senators –

Senator Van Selst made the following announcements for the CSU Statewide Senate:

- Faculty Trustee applications are due at the Chancellor’s Office by December 10, 2010.
- CFA has a budget update tomorrow on campus.
- The Chancellor’s Office is searching for both an Executive Vice Chancellor and a Vice Chancellor of Transfers.
- The Doctor of Nursing Practice and Doctor of Physical Therapy have just been legislatively authorized. At the CSU Statewide level they are starting to look for people that have the interest and expertise to start guiding the process around these programs.
- A bridge course to meet GE’s Mathematics requirement is being discussed.
- Programmatic assessment of GE is being discussed.

D. Provost – No report.

Questions:

Senator Van Selst asked how the FTF target increases were being handled out of the Provost's Office to the colleges and departments. Provost Selter responded, "We don't use static targets any more. We readjust them as demand increases. We will essentially give targets for the 22,222 and encourage the departments to do the best they can. We do still manage courses in terms of bottleneck courses, and those that have a high demand and waiting lists and try to ensure there are open sections of that. The whole atmosphere this fall on enrollment in classes has changed. We're back to chasing enrollment."

E. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No report.

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