

2011/2012 Academic Senate

MINUTES
December 5, 2011

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Five Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Von Till, Kaufman,
Sabalius, Van Selst,
Lessow-Hurley, Kolodziejak

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Selter, Nance, Bussani,
Qayoumi
Absent: Bibb

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Nellen
Absent: Reade

Deans:

Present: Merdinger, Chin
Stacks, Bienenfeld

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow, Swanson, P.

Students:

Present: Salazar, Choy,
Swanson, K.
Absent: Minks, Sharma, Uweh

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Du
Absent: Backer

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Frazier, Fleck, Desalvo, Mok, Haramaki

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, d'Alarcao, Wharton, Bros-Seemann

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Heiden, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Terry

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Absent: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Peck, Bettencourt
Absent: Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The Senate approved the minutes of November 14, 2011 as amended by Senator Sabalius.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Von Till and the Senate thanked the President and his wife for hosting the Holiday Reception for the Senate at their home yesterday [December 4, 2011].

Chair Von Till thanked Senators for their hard work and for attending the President and Provost campus forums.

Several issues of concern have been raised to Chair Von Till regarding the Senate. The Executive Committee will be presenting a Sense of the Senate Resolution in response to one of those concerns today.

Chair Von Till and the Senate thanked all SJSU students for making their campus assemblies peaceful and non-combative.

The President's holiday reception for the campus is on December 14, 2011. Faculty were encouraged to bring an unwrapped toy for the Toys-for-Tots toy drive.

In response to complaints from some of the departments and faculty on campus that they are unaware of what the Senate is working on, Chair Von Till has drafted a form to be used by the policy committee chairs to distribute information to their deans and faculty detailing what the policy committees are currently working on. After the policy committee chairs have a chance to review and edit the form, it will be loaded on the Senate website under the forms section for the policy committee chairs use each month.

B. From the President of the University –

President Qayoumi thanked SJSU students for “the manner in which they conducted themselves during their demonstrations.”

The Board of Trustees (BOT) has adopted a budget for next year which includes enrollment increases, and a small faculty and staff salary increase. However, the Governor's initial budget comes out at the end of January, and many things can occur between now and then.

President Qayoumi has filled several key positions on his staff including the Chief of Staff (Dorothy Poole), Provost (Dr. Ellen Junn from CSU Fresno), and AVP for Information Technology (Terry Vahey, Cal Poly SLO) positions.

President Qayoumi thanked Senators for their comments and suggestions on the strategic planning process. The Strategic Planning Board (SPB) is reviewing all comments and it is hoped that a final version of the plan will be released within the next two weeks. Work on the Academic Master Plan will begin next semester using the same process.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

November 28, 2011 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar – The consent calendar was approved as amended by Associate Vice Chair (AVC) McClory.

C. Senate Seat Calculations for 2012-2013 – FTEF calculations by the AVC show the loss of a Senate seat from the College of Business to the General Unit for 2012-2013.

A member asked for clarification as to who is included in the General Unit, and why there was an increase in the membership. The Senate Administrator explained that all faculty that are not included in one of the colleges, as well as all Student Services Professionals (SSP) IIIs, and IVs are included in the Senate's General Unit. Personnel in the General Unit include the Librarians, Coaches, Counselors, and staff in unit 4 that are SSP IIIs or IVs in academic areas such as Academic Advising and Retention Services, DRC, Student Involvement, Career Center, Financial Aid, EOP, LARC, MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center, UG and Graduate Admissions Evaluators, Enrollment Services, College of Science, Student Health Center, Registrar Services, Student Academic Success Services, etc. The Senate Administrator is tasked with the responsibility of conducting General Unit elections, and maintains a by-name list of the members of the General Unit. Human Resources personnel generate the membership list for the AVC each fall, and the Senate Administrator then verifies the membership with campus departments. Prior to the Senate delegating responsibility for conducting elections in the General Unit to the Senate Administrator, no master list of general unit personnel was kept by the Senate. Consequently, the only general unit personnel notified during elections tended to be from the Library, or Counseling Services.]

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

1. Chief of Police Peter Decena addressed campus concerns regarding the recent events at UC Davis and Berkeley. There have been four very large and very peaceful student demonstrations at SJSU over the past four years. Chief Decena emphasized that UPD understands the unique learning environment that they work in and the need to allow peaceful demonstrations and freedom of speech.

UPD typically responds to demonstrations by making contact with the leaders prior to the event. Having this "point of contact" has worked well for UPD. In addition, another process that has worked well is the establishment of an "Incident Commander" to take charge of the police response. UPD informs demonstration leaders that they cannot allow them to disrupt classes, or interfere with the running of the university. UPD requests have been honored by most demonstrators on campus.

Chief Decena gave an example of a demonstration that students wanted to have in Tower Hall a few weeks ago. UPD initially locked-down Tower Hall. However, after the Incident Commander spoke with the demonstrators, and the Chief of Staff, it was decided that the demonstrators could have a peaceful sit-in on the first floor of Tower Hall. The peaceful sit-in lasted several hours, and then the demonstrators went on their way.

Questions:

UPD has guidelines they follow in the form of a "Continuum of Force." This is basically a common sense approach based actually happening at the time. Passive resistance is on one end of the continuum, but an officer dealing with assaultive behavior is at the other end. UPD can solicit help from the San José Police Department if needed. However, UPD would not be able to get enough officers to

quell a really large demonstration of say 400 people.

An inquiry was made as to whether UPD was consolidated with any other campus UPDs. There is a CSU Statewide unit called the Crisis Response Unit. They are not a SWAT team, but a tactical team. This team is called CREW, and deals primarily with crowd control issues. There might be a CREW callout if there is a planned event. For instance, SJSU's UPD sent four officers up to East Bay when they had the recent walkout.

Dispatching is the area that has been consolidated. UPD does dispatching for the California Maritime Academy as well as for some of the community colleges, and may start dispatching for CSU East Bay in the near future.

Some Freshmen have expressed fear and concern about being on campus due to the recent crime activity. Although it appears there has been an increase in crimes on campus, the number of crimes on campus has actually decreased by 6% from last year. The difference this year is that UPD is sending out SJSU Alerts for almost all crimes on or around the campus. In the past, UPD only sent out SJSU Alerts when there was an ongoing threat to the campus. Students are hearing more alerts, and this gives the perception that there is more crime occurring on campus. Students that are very fearful and concerned can also be referred to counseling services. In addition, Chief Decena has established a Chief's Advisory Committee where students can express their concerns and help UPD come up with solutions.

UPD has established a shuttle service for students. UPD hopes to acquire another van to be able to expand the shuttle service from 1st to 16th street and then to I-280.

Concern was expressed that the Evacuation Drills take ½ hour out of a class, and a suggestion was made to coordinate them so that they crossover two classes. UPD chose the 11:20 a.m. time, because when faculty were surveyed this was the time of least impact. UPD will continue to try and establish the best time for the drills. Several Senators noted that they did not receive advance notice of the last drill. Chief Decena will check into this.

2. Senators Gleixner and Sabalius presented *AS 1466, Policy Recommendation, FROSH Housing Requirement at SJSU (Final Reading)*. A motion was made to accept AS 1466 as a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed with no Nays, and 1 Abstention. A motion was made to suspend the rules to prohibit amendments. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed with 1 Nay, and 2 Abstentions. **The Senate voted and AS 1466 passed with 2 Nays and no Abstentions.**
3. Chair Von Till presented *AS 1469, Sense of the Senate Resolution, In Support of Right to Peaceable Assembly (Final Reading)*. Senator Choy presented a friendly amendment to change the "e" in Jose to "é." **The Senate voted and AS 1469 passed unanimously as amended.**

4. Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1468, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing Our Appreciation of Dr. Gerry Selter (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1468 passed unanimously.** [A long standing ovation was given to Dr. Selter.]

v. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Kimbarow announced that O&G had concluded the hearings on the department mergers in Humanities and the Arts, and will be working on their final report to the Provost and the President over the winter break.

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – No report.

C. University Library Board (ULB) –

Affordable Learning Solutions meetings are happening this week on campus. Senator Kaufman will report back to the Senate this spring.

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Ng presented *AS 1471, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Personnel Records: Confidentiality: Access (First Reading)*

Faculty Affairs had an Academic Personnel Audit in the fall. One of the preliminary findings was that the 1973 policy governing faculty personnel records had the wrong title and office listed for the office where Faculty Personnel Action Files are kept. The policy currently refers to the office as the “Dean of the Faculty.” The auditor instructed Faculty Affairs to correct the policy. While reviewing the policy, Faculty Affairs realized that they did not have a collective bargaining agreement when the policy was written, and the policy need to be brought into compliance with the collective bargaining agreement.

Several changes were suggested including the second line of Ia. which should refer to the “Associate Vice President of Faculty Affairs,” and not the “Associate Vice President of the Office of Faculty Affairs.” In addition, since the first three pages are rationale, they should be separated from the policy changes to make the policy less confusing.

A question was asked about what happens to a faculty member’s personnel file after they retire. The CSU has a record retention policy that Faculty Affairs must follow. Files must be retained for six years after a faculty member retires and then they are destroyed. Some university systems allow the faculty member to go through their file and pick what they think needs to be retained for the six years. It is especially important that a faculty member have a CV in their file, as Faculty Affairs is the office that people call when they are seeking background information on a faculty member. It was suggested this might be something to consider adding to the policy.

Concern was expressed that Faculty Affairs charges a faculty member to make copies of information contained in their faculty personnel file. However, it was noted that faculty are given copies of everything that goes into the Faculty Personnel Record prior to it being filed there.

Senator Ng asked Senators if they would like to move the first reading of *AS 1470, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Office Hours (First Reading)* to the first spring Senate meeting as there were only 10 minutes left in the Senate meeting. Senator Peter made a motion to suspend the rules so that they could pass the policy by acclamation. The motion failed. The first reading of AS 1470 was moved to the February 13, 2012 Senate meeting.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – No report.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

A. Senator and VP Nancy Bussani presented the Annual Fundraising Report. The powerpoint presentation is linked to these minutes on the Senate website. A brief summary follows.

President Kassing invested in fundraising beginning in 2004. President Kassing created the Tower Foundation with a community board to ensure we had “voices in the community” as we went out fundraising.

The first major gift of \$10 million came in December 2005 from Don and Sally Lucas. Then in 2006-2007, the university received the second major gift of \$15 million. However, beginning in 2008, SJSU fundraising had a couple of very difficult years.

In 2010, SJSU launched the public phase of the fundraising campaign. The university’s goal is \$200 million. To date, the university has raised \$163 million, or 81%. Individual gifts accounted for \$115 million of the \$163 million, whereas 14% came from corporations, and 15% from foundations. It is not unusual for an initial fundraising campaign to have more donations from individuals than foundations and corporations, but University Advancement hopes to move towards a goal of only 43% from individuals as is typical in later fundraising campaigns.

The university received a gift of \$750,000 from a donor to purchase state-of-the-art database for fundraising. This was a very unusual gift as most donors will not allow their donation to be used for this type of thing. Right now the database consists mostly of alumni (80%), and they are contacted twice a year. There are 4,600 updates to the database each month. In addition, there are 96,000 email addresses in the database now. University Advancement will be focusing on building the employment data this year.

Each of the colleges set a fundraising campaign goal. CASA is the first college to reach their goal. However, some of the other colleges may have gifts in the process. University Advancement has also had some difficulty hiring development personnel, so some colleges may not have had as much support as some of the other colleges.

In first campaigns it is typical for a lot of the money to be in the form of bequests. Of the \$163 million that has been raised to date, \$46 million is in endowments, with only \$44 million available as cash to spend. However, this is a little higher than the national average for cash raised in a first campaign.

Our endowment is valued at \$73.1 million. We are fourth in CSU campuses in endowments. San Luis Obispo is number one right now. When San Luis Obispo did their first fundraising campaign, they called it an endowment campaign and focused all of their work on getting endowments.

As a comparison, Harvard endowments amount to \$26 billion, Stanford endowments are at \$12.6 billion, while endowments for the entire UC system amount to only \$5.4 billion. However, Harvard started their first fundraising campaign in 1960, and SJSU is just now starting its first fundraising campaign.

In the CSU system, SJSU ran fifth in total gifts last year at \$25.6 million. Pomona was number one with \$58 million. Pomona received a \$42 million gift from the Kellogg Foundation last year. Kellogg owned the property right next to Pomona and gave them a \$42 million challenge grant.

In the late 1990s and early 2000's, SJSU averaged about \$6 to \$7 million in fundraising each year. We have grown to about \$25 million a year now.

University Advancement is already preparing for campaign two. There were only 18,407 donors in campaign one. This amounts to only 8.5% of possible donors, and clearly shows that we still have a lot of people to reach out to in campaign two. Also, 9,700 of the 18,407 donors in campaign one were new donors. VP Bussani emphasized the importance of stewarding our existing donors. Research shows that when alumni are invited to campus events, they are more inclined to feel a connection to the university and to donate.

VP Bussani noted that there were ten donors that made multi-million dollar contributions during campaign one and this amounted to 40% of all donations. This can be worrisome, but it is very normal for a first campaign.

VP Bussani asked that Senators let University Advancement know if they meet alumni that say they have not been contacted. Another way Senators can help is to share their success stories so that University Advancement can make potential donors aware of the impact that SJSU faculty are having in their fields. In addition, making student experiences more enjoyable and rewarding will pay off in 20 or 30 years.

Questions:

A question was asked about how much money is earmarked for specific things. VP Bussani responded that "almost all of the money is earmarked. There is hardly any money that comes in unrestricted."

B. Annual Budget Report for 2011-2012 by AVP of Finance, Josee Larochelle. [See attached slide presentation, and the university full budget report under the “Budget” link from the Senate main page.]

SJSU’s overall budget for 2011-2012 is \$501 million. This consists of the CSU Operating Fund, which includes state appropriations and student tuition fees, other student fees (mandatory IRA fees, miscellaneous course fees, and orientation program fees), campus revenue funds (Housing, Student Health, IES, and parking), and auxiliaries (Associated Students, Spartan Shops, Student Union, Tower Foundation). Last year SJSU’s budget totaled \$490 million, with \$277 million in the CSU Operating Fund.

The state of California implemented reductions totaling \$15 billion for this fiscal year. There was a \$650 million reduction for the CSU system included in that \$15 billion. SJSU’s portion of this reduction was \$39.4 million. After adding additional fee income of \$26 million, and mandatory cost increases for benefits and student aid, the overall reduction for SJSU’s budget was \$27.5 million.

Last year the President’s cabinet held \$15.5 million in reserve. After adding the \$15.5 million held in reserve, the remaining total budget shortfall was \$12 million. The campus had a sufficient cash balance to cover this shortfall.

Last year the pie chart showing the allocation of the operating funds across the divisions included benefits allocated to each of the divisions. This year, since the cost of benefits continues to increase and is managed centrally by the university, the cost of benefits has been separated into its own slice of the pie. This provides a better picture of the funds available to each division.

Last year the university-wide budget was \$48 million, but with mandated increases in financial aid of \$8 million, the total university-wide budget amounted to \$55 million. As stated earlier, the university has a deficit of \$12 million that is shown as an unallocated reduction in the university-wide budget.

Looking at the pie chart showing the breakdown of SJSU’s Operating Fund by revenue source you can see that the largest slice of the pie is tuition fees paid by our students. Last year the tuition fee budget totaled \$115 million. This year it has risen to \$142.5 million. In addition, \$10.9 million, or 4.2% of the Operating Fund revenue comes from non-resident fees. Other student fees include application fees, commencement fees, transcript fees, and other miscellaneous fees such as late registration payments. Other revenues include campus work study program, and other cost recovery revenue.

The next slide shows the reduction in state support for higher education. Keep in mind that last year the state budget was passed so late, that the additional state funds we were provided with were unable to be used.

Between 2006-2007 and 2008-2009, enrollment at SJSU was on the rise. However, SJSU was instructed not to exceed its resident target FTES over the next three years. This resulted in a

12% reduction to our resident FTES between 2008 and 2010. In 2010-2011, SJSU's resident FTES target was initially reduced by 11% from 22,460 to 20,027. However, after the school year began, SJSU was told that we would be funded for up to 21,145 resident FTES. Despite the late notice, the campus came with 1% of reaching its new target enrollment.

SJSU's target resident FTES for 2011-2012 is 21,045. This is a reduction of 1,000 resident FTES. Our projected resident FTES is 22,145 for 2011-2012.

Senator Buzanski asked for a simpler breakdown of the revenue. Ms. Larochelle explained that approximately 54.8% came from student fees, 38% came from state support, less than 1% came from other types of revenue, 1.3% came from other student fees, and 4.3% came from non-resident fees. Senator Sabalius commented that this was "taxation on the students."

Our non-resident student enrollment has dropped from a high of 1,819 in 2007-2008 to a low of 1,171 for 2011-2012. The reduction in our non-resident students has a dramatic impact on our operating revenue as our non-resident students pay both tuition fee costs as well as a non-resident per unit fee of \$372.

Current projections for this year show a 6% increase in resident FTES, and a near 5% reduction in non-resident FTES. Enrollment that is above 103% of our non-resident FTES will incur a penalty. The potential penalty for SJSU if we end up at 106% is \$3 million. If we hit 106%, the tuition fees over 103% will have to be returned. Senator Heiden asked whether we had to return the non-resident fees. Ms. Larochelle responded that we do not have to return non-resident fees. The state only sets an enrollment target for the resident FTES.

Senator Heiden inquired as to why we wouldn't try to manage our enrollment to stay at 103% so that we would not be penalized. President Qayoumi answered that in the past, those campuses that have proven that they can handle additional students have been first in line to receive additional funds when the CSU has gotten them.

Ms. Larochelle noted that the university's main concern is the state budget act trigger. The first trigger includes a \$100 million cut to the CSU. This reduction would equate to about \$6.5 million for SJSU. At this point, state revenue is \$1.3 billion behind. This would result in the trigger being pulled. Senator Peter asked if this could result in deans having to cut sections at the last minute. Ms. Larochelle responded that the answer was no. The Department of Finance should decide in December whether or not the trigger will be pulled.

On November 16, 2011, the Board of Trustees (BOT) unanimously approved the 2012-2013 budget. This budget includes a request that the Governor and legislature provide an additional \$333 million in state funding for the upcoming year. This also includes a 5% increase in FTES. An additional \$64 million would come from fee revenues associated with that 5% FTES increase. The BOT also approved an increase in tuition of \$498 a year that will go into effect Fall 2012. The budget approved for 2012-2013 assumes that any additional trigger cuts that occur in the current fiscal year are one-time cuts.

The best that SJSU can hope for is that the CSU Support Budget is passed as requested. This would result in approximately \$20 million in additional funding, and 1,050 additional students.

Ms. Larochelle noted that, “Even in the best case scenario, it is important to remember we still have to address the \$12 million deficit. In order to ensure the integrity of our academic programs in meeting the mission of the university, we must begin to look at all revenue sources to meet university needs. The university is exploring the benefit of what is being labeled an “all funds budget” approach. This would include not only the CSU Operating Fund revenue of state appropriations and student tuition fees, but other annual funds such as continuing education and lottery funds.”

Questions and Comments:

Senator Sabalius commented that the Academic Affairs portion of the budget continues to get smaller and smaller and that now only 1/3rd of the budget is going to Academic Affairs.

Senator Peter asked for clarification about why this report shows Athletics getting 1.5% of the budget, while the full budget report shows 2.2%. Ms. Larochelle confirmed that it is because benefits are not factored into today’s report.

Senator Merdinger commented that she felt the university should make benefits a part of the division budgets, because Faculty Affairs is responsible for saving a lot of money in benefits from lecturers that are under .4, which is the automatic benefit level. The salary savings could then be accrued and used by Academic Affairs. Senator Merdinger further commented on the slow decline in the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty since the 1990s.

VIII. New Business – No report.

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

A. Provost –

Provost Selter sincerely thanked Senators for his Sense of the Senate Resolution. Provost Selter announced this was his last report to the Senate on the state of Academic Affairs. Provost Selter noted that he wished he could be around to give the Academic Affairs budget report. However, the Provost said that “despite the poor financial climate that we are living in, the Academic Affairs Division is relatively healthy.” Provost Selter has made some significant changes in how funds are allocated within the division. The Academic Affairs budget is posted on the Provost’s website under budgets and planning, and the Provost encouraged Senators to take a look at it. Provost Selter will work with the new Provost whenever she might like to show her how he structured the Academic Affairs budget.

Provost Selter noted that faculty are often concerned about where the lottery money is being spent. Academic Affairs received \$108.7 million in funding this year. The year prior, the \$1.9 million in lottery money was folded into the total division funding. The Provost extracted the lottery money out of the state operating fund

allocation. However, all of the lottery money that comes to the division goes to the Library. Academic Affairs received an additional \$1.9 million this year, because EOP and a few other units moved under Academic Affairs from the Student Affairs Division.

The Provost explained what is meant by “All Funds Budgeting.” What this means is that the Provost is trying to account for all sources of funding within the division to pay for instruction, and everything else that goes along with providing instruction. The division does not receive any funds from any other sources except the state operating fund, including student fees and Continuing Education Revenue Fund (CERF) money.

The Academic Affairs Division had approximately \$1.9 million held in reserve in CERF funds when the Provost took over. There were also funds being held in reserve for various projects. One such project involved IES buying 10,000 square feet of the new Student Union, when completed, at a cost of \$6 million. However, IES cannot own state property. State property can only be leased. Therefore, this money was sitting in an account for a purpose that could not happen. The Provost took all that money into Academic Affairs. In addition, IES ran a two self-support summer sessions that generated revenue for Academic Affairs. The Provost has incorporated these funds into the Academic Affairs base budget.

The Provost took this money and used \$1.2 million for allocations to the colleges for equipment. The Provost then took \$1 million and used it to fund the hiring of additional support staff, approximately 20 positions, within the Academic Affairs Division. Almost all of these positions went to departments and not the dean’s offices. The Provost then took \$2 million and put it in a reserve fund to be used to pay the salaries for these support staff positions should the yearly revenue from IES somehow disappear. This would allow time for Academic Affairs to try and move these positions over to state support should this become necessary.

In addition, between \$1 million and \$1.5 million is used each year to fund student success. The state does not fund this. The Chancellor gave the campuses a mandate to increase retention and graduation rates, but no funding came along with that mandate. The university had to fund this, and the Provost used CERF money to cover these programs.

The Provost also used about \$800,000 to \$900,000 of CERF money to fund faculty development RFPs that are going out this semester. The award letters for the Curriculum Improvement Projects are going out this afternoon. The letters for the Student Success Grants should go out within a couple of days. The letters for the junior faculty and RSCA proposals should also go out by this Friday, or early next week.

Provost Selter commented that SJSU has the most “robust IES operation in the entire CSU. We have a gross revenue of about \$30 million a year now, including summer

school. This is at least \$10 million ahead of any other CSU campus including Sacramento. Sacramento is second, and is about \$10 million behind us. And, we have a way of distributing this money to the campus that is unique within the CSU system.” Provost Selter further announced that Academic Affairs has approved 42 faculty searches.

The Provost thanked Senators for their collegiality and friendship over the years, and agreed to answer any questions from Senators.

Questions:

Senator Sabalius commented that there were several deans and AVP reviews underway, and he suggested that it might be best to let the new Provost complete these reviews since she would be the one working with these administrators in the future. Provost Selter noted that two AVP and two dean reviews are in progress on AVPs Merdinger and Sujitparapitaya, and Deans Parrish and Toepfer. Three of these reviews will be completed by the review committees by the end of this month. Provost Selter explained that the new Provost would not be able to evaluate any of these administrators based on personal contact for quite some time, and therefore Provost Selter saw no reason why he should not complete these reviews. As for Dean Toepfer, O&G has just completed their hearings on the mergers in the College of Humanities and the Arts and will probably not get their report to the President until February 2012. Provost Selter noted that he will no longer be here at that time, so he will not be able to complete this review.

B. VP for Administration and Finance – No report.

C. VP of Student Affairs – No report.

D. AS President – No report.

E. VP for University Advancement – No report.

F. CSU Statewide Senators – No report.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.