

2013/2014 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 21, 2013

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Heiden, Von Till,
Lessow-Hurley,
Ayala
Absent: Sabalius, Van Selst

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Hebert, Cara
Absent: Goyal

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Junn, Dukes, Nance
Absent: Qayoumi, Bibb

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey
Absent: Nellen

Deans:

Present: Kifer, Green, Stacks,
Absent: Vollendorf

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow
Absent: Swanson

Students:

Present: Gupta, Jeffrey, Hart
Gotheil, Hernandez
Absent: Miller

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Du
Absent: Gleixner

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Frazier, Bacich, Harris,
Brada-Williams, Grindstaff

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Bros-Seemann, Kress, Kaufman

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Kohn, Kauppila, Fujimoto,
Morazes

SOS Representatives:

Present: Trulio, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The Senate minutes of September 23, 2013 were approved as amended by Senator Frazier.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Heiden made the following announcements:

The Senate picture will not be taken today, but will be taken at the November meeting.

The Senate has been given clickers and they will be brought to the next Senate meeting for Senators to test.

AS 1529, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Legislation to Ensure Continuous Faculty Trustee Presence on the California State University Board of Trustees (First Reading) will be

presented by the Executive Committee today, but it was not included in the packet. Please get a copy from the back table.

Printing the Senate packets is very expensive and Chair Heiden asked how many Senators could live with just an emailed copy of the packet. About half of the Senators indicated that they could print their own copy as long as the network was working.

The President's Holiday party for the Senate is scheduled for Sunday, December 8, 2013, from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Chair Heiden announced that last year the attendance was very low, and asked for a vote as to how many Senators would prefer to move the party to early spring instead of having it in December. The Senate voted to keep the party on December 8, 2013 as scheduled. Chair Heiden asked Senators to please ensure they show up if they RSVP. Last year many Senators RSVP'd and then did not show up. Senators may bring a guest.

Chair Heiden attended her first Campus Chairs' meeting in Long Beach last week. It was interesting to learn how other campuses operate, and what issues they have.

Chair Heiden and Senator Gleixner have been working to setup campus meetings to discuss pedagogy and other concerns that continue to come up on the campus, but have been having trouble getting a location for the meetings. Senators were encouraged to attend these meetings when they are announced.

Chair Heiden announced that Provost Junn was recently honored with the 2013 Chang-Lin Tien Education Leadership Award presented to her by the Asian Pacific Fund.

B. From the President of the University – No report.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Executive Committee Minutes of September 9, 2013

Senator Jeffrey asked if anything had been decided about the Student Success, Excellence and Technology Fee (SSETF). Chair Heiden said no, but she is meeting with Josee Larouchelle to discuss this matter in the near future. There is some confusion about where the Campus Fee Advisory Committee fits in this process.

Executive Committee Minutes of September 30, 2013

Student Senators asked VP Dukes for some of the refrigerator magnets with the Spartan Fight song that she handed out at this Executive Committee meeting. VP Dukes will provide them.

B. Consent Calendar –

AVC Ng announced that there were two additions to the consent calendar. Alan Leventhal was added to the staff seat on the Sustainability Board, and Gali Levi-McClure has been added to the student seat on the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The Senate voted and the Consent Calendar was approved as amended (43-0-0).

AVC Ng presented the Elections Calendar for 2014. AVC Ng announced that the Senate Administrator prepared the calendar as she does each year. This year ballots will be online and the college Committee on Committees representative will be responsible for getting the election information out to their respective colleges, Deans, etc.

AVC Ng urged Senators to check to see if their terms are expiring and to get their nominating petitions in early. The Election Calendar will be online and has the deadline dates. **The Senate voted and the Election Calendar was approved (43-0-0)**

B. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Peter presented *AS 1525, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting Official Campus Visits for all CSU Presidential Finalists (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1525 was approved with 1 abstention (43-0-1)**.

Senator Kimbarow presented *AS 1526, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting the Request for Appointment of a Faculty Trustee (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1526 was approved (43-0-0)**.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1521, Senate Management Resolution, Updating the Membership of the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA)*. Senator Frazier presented a friendly amendment to change AS Director of Student Resources to AS Director of Student Resource Affairs. Senator Nance presented an amendment to change the Ombudsman to the AVP of Student Affairs (or designee). The Senate voted and the Nance amendment passed with 4 Nays (39-4-0). **The Senate voted and AS 1521 was approved as amended (40-3-0)**.

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

Senator Frazier presented *AS 1522, Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Academic Advising (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski inquired as to what mechanism the committee envisioned to enforce number VI. Senator Frazier responded that this was why they brought it to the Senate for a first reading. Senator Frazier would be opposed to the resolution if there is not some guarantee of resources and funding.

Senator Bros-Seemann commented that there is often a disconnect between the various advisors and asked if the committee had considered a built-in requirement for communication between the advising centers and the departments. Senator Frazier said that the committee would consider this.

Senator Trulio asked the committee to consider, as part of the resources, adding more

tenure/tenure-track faculty. In addition, in section IV, would the committee consider having the advising of students with declared majors be left to the major advisors.

Senator Hebert asked if the committee had considered in section II having faculty only advise in their major, rather than being responsible for classes across campus. Senator Frazier would be interested in other Senators' opinions about this.

Senator Brown asked the committee to clarify what the department is supposed to do in reference to the assessment requirement in section III, number 8.

Senator Peter asked in the 2nd Resolved clause, and under section II, number 1, how much of the review requirement existed previously versus what is a new requirement. Senator Frazier responded that all incoming faculty were supposed to attend an advising workshop under S89-10, but he did not remember ever doing that. Senator Peter commented that if a department has a designated advisor for undergraduate studies, for example, then the requirement outlined under section II, number 1, seems reasonable. However, if every faculty member in the department must get trained this could become very costly. Senator Peter asked the committee to consider how the different patterns of advising would affect the outreach and resources for the department.

Senator Brada-Williams asked the committee to consider inserting a minimum amount of assigned time based on the amount of advising.

Senator Kaufman asked the committee to consider having Student Academic Success Services evaluated by someone outside of Student Academic Success Services.

Senator Trulio commented that she supported a requirement for assigned time, and suggested that the background in the resolution be expanded to include how everything is related.

Senator Hart expressed concern about VI, number 2, A., "the Associate Vice President of Student Academic Success Services shall authorize advising holds," because nowhere else in the policy does it talk about why there would be a hold. It should be crystal clear why a hold is being placed. Senator Hart also asked the committee to consider whether having the Associate Vice President of Student Academic Success Services place these holds was the correct place for this authority.

Senator Bros-Seemann asked if the committee had considered the faculty workload under different scenarios depending on the number of students faculty would have to advise.

Senator Morazes expressed concern that she sees students in counseling that have seen three different advisors and have gotten different advice each time. The students are very confused, and this can have a dramatic impact on whether they can stay in their major, etc. Senator Morazes asked the committee to consider a way of ensuring

quality control across all advisors.

Senator Brada-Williams asked the committee to consider adding a requirement that advisors that advise more than one discipline be required to learn about the requirements of all disciplines they advise.

Senator Frazier presented *AS 1524, Policy Recommendation, Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (First Reading)*. Senator Frazier commented that this policy rescinds a policy from 1968 that was meant to ensure students received timely feedback on test scores, papers, and exams, but we now assess additional things, such as powerpoints, etc. This policy expands the types of assignments.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked the committee to consider removing the parentheses in the first Resolved clause.

Senator Kaufman asked if the committee were aware there were other forms of materials that were not being returned to students in a timely manner. Senator Frazier replied that the committee was aware of this, and had received this referral from the Student Fairness Committee (SFC) as a result of these complaints.

Senator Du asked if the committee had looked at all the past policies to see if there was a timeline for faculty to report to students. Senator Frazier replied that he had looked through all the grade policies and none of them had any reference to a timeline for reporting this information back to students.

Senator Ng asked if the committee had considered there might be an increase in cases brought to the SFC as a result of implementing this policy. Senator Frazier responded that he did not think that there would be an increase, and this would certainly make it easier for the SFC.

Senator Kaufman asked if the committee would consider making this a final reading. Senator Frazier responded that he would, but he would like to make an amendment to the 1st Resolved clause if that occurs. After further discussion, Senator Frazier decided it was best to keep this resolution as a first reading.

Senator Backer suggested that maybe it was not a good idea to have the third Resolved clause. This resolved clause tasks the committee with cleanup of all the older policies, and I&SA might not be able to complete this task.

Senator Bros-Seemann commented that if students don't get their materials in a reasonable time, there is no language about what the recourse would be, or the impact on the faculty member. Senator Frazier commented that the SFC would become involved. Senator Bros-Seemann asked if the committee would consider making this a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Several members noted that in order to rescind a policy, you must bring a policy recommendation.

C. University Library Board (ULB) –

Chair Daryl Eggers gave a report from the ULB. Chair Eggers was recently voted in as Chair of the ULB after only one year, and he said it was “an honor to serve on the ULB.”

Last year the ULB met 10 times. One of the main projects the ULB worked on last year was the Affordable Learning Solutions Project (especially e-books.) E-books are really taking off and the ULB is heavily promoting them. Last year was also the first year of the Textbook Alternatives Project in which small grants were given to faculty to help them introduce e-books into their classes. This project is ongoing this year and the deadline for faculty to apply for stipends is November 15, 2013.

Another major project for the library is the Institutional Repository known as ScholarWorks. There are over 230 faculty listed for SJSU. The repository links all faculty publications to their names, and all these are also housed there.

The ULB spent three meetings last year going over the library’s budget. One meeting was devoted to funding sources, one to expenditures, and one to the collections. The library’s total budget is just under \$7 million. Most of this is spent on salaries, but about \$2 million is spent on collections. One important outcome of the budget review is that there was no line item from the research foundation. The ULB drafted a letter about this to Provost Junn. Provost Junn then gave the ULB \$100,000 to support faculty research and scholarship through additional journals and e-books, etc.

Chair Eggers noted that the cost of a journal is between \$2,000 and \$5,000 each year, whereas the e-books are in the \$100’s of dollars and these are one-time costs.

There are two major items the ULB will be working on this year. One project is the result of the Libraries of the Future Task Force (LOFT). LOFT looked at ways the campuses could consolidate into one database, and the Chancellor also paid for an analyst to look at the collections to see where there was duplication across campuses.

The second major item the ULB will be working on this year is helping the library get ready for their 5-year review. The Dean is seeking input from ULB on their self-study document, and then the library’s external review is scheduled for next semester.

Questions:

Senator Peter noted that when he was chair of the ULB many years ago, there was a proposal that a certain percentage of funds raised by University Advancement would automatically go to the library and asked whatever happened with that. Senator Dukes responded that University Advancement is in the planning stages of the next fundraising campaign and that attempting to raise funds for the library would be about

18 months away.

The library gets \$1.9 million from lottery funds, but that \$1.9 million is taken back out of the library base. It is not additional money for the library. Senator Peter expressed concern about the use of lottery funding for the library base budget and asked if the Senate could be given a more detailed budget report about this in the future.

Senator Hart noted that the MLK Library is one of her favorite libraries in the whole world. Senator Hart expressed concern that volumes she reads would be removed to make space for student activities. Chair Eggers responded that the volumes to be removed are those that haven't been touched for about 15 years. The volumes to be removed also depend on the discipline, how many copies are in circulation, and other criteria.

Dean Kifer noted that every time they clear an area in the library it becomes filled with students almost immediately. This is why they would like to open up as much space as they can for study areas.

Senator Hernandez asked how long the selection/de-selection process would take, and Dean Kifer responded that it could be years depending on staffing.

Senator Von Till presented *AS 1527, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Library (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and the resolution was approved unanimously.**

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1523, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Concerning the Need to Continue to Increase the Proportion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty at San José State University (First Reading)*. Senator Peter commented that the idea ratio is 80% tenure/tenure-track faculty to 20% lecturers. It was disturbing for the PS committee to find that San José State University had slipped to under 50% tenure/tenure-track faculty. However, the committee commended the current administration for their efforts to increase tenure/tenure-track faculty, and over the last few years we have risen above the 50% mark again. However, the committee also found that the CSU average is 62%. In addition, not long ago the legislature called upon the CSU to increase its tenure/tenure-track faculty to 75%.

In addition, the 2nd resolved clause endorses the CSU Statewide Senate resolution which calls upon the system as a whole to increase the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty.

The third resolved clause asks for particular help for those campuses, such as ours, that have high cost of living areas and difficulty recruiting tenure/tenure-track faculty. Senator Peter recalled an attempt to hire a tenure/tenure-track faculty member in his

department that was offered more money to teach at DeAnza Community College than his department could afford. Regional cost of living is also an issue for us.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski expressed concern that the resolution does not take into consideration the budgetary difficulties the campus is facing.

Senator Frazier asked if it was true that the pay scale was the same for faculty across the CSU campuses. Senator Peter commented that we have a statewide senate and a statewide union. Senator Peter noted that he had proposed regional cost of living pay when he was on the CSU Statewide Senate, but was “hooted down” by the Senators from Stanislaus that said they needed higher pay in order to get people to come live in their areas.

Senator Kimbarow asked why there were members of the committee that voted against this resolution. Senator Cara responded that she felt the resolution did not go far enough in specifying action that should be taken.

Senator Kaufman asked if the committee would consider adding a link to where the data in the resolution came from. Senator Peter commented that the footnotes must have been deleted. Senator Peter will make a note of where the data came from.

Senator Kimbarow commented that there was nothing regarding retention in the resolution and asked that this be added.

Senator Junn commented that SJSU was third from the bottom in terms of percentages of tenure/tenure-track faculty at SJSU when she was hired.

Senator Du asked for more data that gives absolute numbers, and also for the number of students to faculty.

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

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1520, Policy Recommendation, Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs (First Reading)*.

Senator Schultz Krohn noted that in the printed packet pages 2-4 were somehow omitted by duplicating, but they were included in the packet that was sent by email to Senators.

Questions:

Senator Bros-Seemann commented that the last time this resolution was brought to the Senate she had brought up the issue of workload especially concerning lecturers being required to develop courses, and asked why the committee did not address the issue of

additional workload. Senator Schultz-Krohn noted that the committee felt that issues of workload would be dealt with by the chair and the dean. Senator Bros-Seemann said she is concerned that a new lecturer could be required to develop an online course. Senator Schultz-Krohn asked Senator Bros-Seemann to send her concerns to Senator Gleixner.

Senator Hebert noted that “distributed instruction” shows up in only two places and then the term “hybrid online” shows up in the rest of the document, so is this an editing error. Senator Schultz-Krohn said it was not an editing error, the primary issues of concern were technology intensive hybrid online courses, but also distributed courses. Senator Hebert asked if the committee would consider clarifying where distributed education may fit in the policy.

Senator Rudy expressed concern about who owns the materials in a distributed or hybrid course and asked how SJSU can maintain the property rights to the whole delivery mechanism. Senator Rudy suggested the committee consider adding a full discussion on faculty property rights, as well as SJSU’s rights in section IV.

Senator Brown asked what was meant by “timely interaction.” Senator Schultz-Krohn commented that the committee left this sufficiently vague so that they would not be dictating to the faculty member when the materials had to be returned. Senator Brown stated that she had emailed suggestions to Senator Gleixner. Senator Brown asked how many students per faculty member is reasonable, and stated she would like a number specified. Senator Schultz-Krohn will bring this back to the committee for consideration.

Senator Hebert asked hypothetically if he assigned a TV show for students to watch, but some students could not watch it that night and instead watched it online the next day, would this be a distributed assignment or an online assignment? Senator Hebert asked for the committee to consider redefining their terms of online instruction and distributed instruction to interactive instruction and one-way instruction.

Senator Junn responded that the content that the faculty member creates is owned by the faculty member and this is specified in the contracts we have with Udacity.

Senator Kaufman noted that in II.7 it states that personnel decisions will not be based on the mode of instruction, but this resolution is about online instruction and not RTP. Senator Kaufman asked the committee to consider coordinating with the PS Committee about incorporating this into the RTP policy.

Senator Frazier asked if a course has a cap of 25 then will the alternative class offered through this policy have the same cap? Senator Schultz-Krohn responded that the intent was to not change the caps established by other policies. Senator Frazier said there was a clause dropped from S01-10 on class size limits, and the clause was “a DE course shall not exceed the limits for the curricular classification of that course and shall be substantially the same as in comparable face-to-face courses.” Has there been further discussion about reinserting this clause? If not, would the committee consider

reinserting that clause.

Senator Peter asked the committee to consider consulting with the PS Committee to discuss issues surrounding Intellectual Property Rights.

Senator Harris presented *AS 1528, Policy Recommendation, Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading)*.

Chair Heiden announced that the meeting was running out of time, and questions would have to be limited to five minutes to get to updates.

Senator Brown asked for clarification as to the role of assessment since page 9 says that assessment is filed without Board of General Studies (BOGS), but page 10 looks like it is tied to assessment. Stephen Branz responded that this section had not been changed from the previous guidelines. Senator Backer responded that she had written that section of the previous guidelines. When program planning occurs, there is a special section of the program planning document for GE, and the GE offerings of a particular program are reviewed at that time.

Senator Branz commented that the WST is passed at a lower rate by transfer students than by our native students. However, English 1B is not a graduation requirement, and we cannot insist on students taking this if they come in with a full GE certification. We have a lot of inconsistencies.

Senator Peter asked what happened to the old A3 statement regarding plagiarism, the statement about distinguishing between reasoning and assertion, and learning objectives that were in the old GE guidelines, but aren't in the new guidelines? Stephen Branz commented that some of the content objectives contain some of this information. Also, some of the stuff on information literacy was pulled out and moved to the 100W. This was partly driven by the Executive Order that said we were to reign in our GE programs by LEAP objectives, and they define critical thinking a little differently. One of the inconsistencies since the 2009 GE Guidelines were completed is that there is a requirement that you must assess at least one learning outcome per year, and all within the five year period.

Senator Peter requested that the committee bring this resolution back for another first reading at the November meeting since there was so little time for questions.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

VIII. New Business – None

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

A. Associated Students President –

AS President Ayala made the following announcements:

This week is Homecoming.

The “Fire on the Fountain” event is this Thursday from 4 p.m.-9 p.m.

This Saturday, October 26, 2013, is our Homecoming game again Wyoming, kickoff is at 4 p.m.

All Senators are invited to the AS Board meeting this Wednesday, October 23, 2013 in Clark Hall.

The “Campus to the City” program was featured in the San José Mercury News.

B. Vice President for University Advancement –

VP Dukes announced that University Advancement is in the planning phase of campaign 2.0.

University Advancement has also been working with AS to establish a student foundation.

C. Statewide Academic Senators –

Senator Lessow-Hurley announced that all Senators should have received the CSU Statewide Newsletter.

A resolution was passed in opposition to community colleges being able to grant Baccalaureate Degrees.

The next meeting of the CSU Statewide Senate is next week.

D. Provost –

Provost Junn announced that Helen Stevens had created the Outstanding International Educator Award for any faculty, staff, or administrator on campus that has done a lot to advance international education. The recipient this year is Dr. Dominique Van Hooff. Dr. Van Hooff will be given her award today at 5:30 p.m. in MLK 225/229.

The Provost has established a new policy regarding email announcement to the campus. If you have announcements you want to get out get them to Senator Beth Von Till and she will be putting that information in the Academic Affairs newsletter.

Provost Junn announced the creation of a new permanent position, AVP for the Center for Faculty Development. The Provost’s Office will be starting the recruitment process in the next few weeks.

Last spring a new organization was created for untenured faculty called the “UFO,” Untenured Faculty Organization. The President hosted a reception for them this

week and 70 faculty members showed up. They are in the process of creating a website.

Questions:

Senator Kaufman asked if the Provost was aware if anything had changed in our relationship with Google to allow them to now send us ads, etc. VP Dukes will check into this.

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

F. Vice President of Student Affairs –

VP Nance announced that effective last week graduate admissions was pulled out from under the undergraduate and graduate admissions office. A consultant was hired that strongly recommended having a separate graduate admissions office. Graduate Admissions will be temporarily headed up by Tricia Foust.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.