

2014/2015 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 13, 2014

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Daniels, Van Selst, Sabalius, Heiden
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Dukes, Bibb, Feinstein
Absent: Qayoumi, Terry

Deans:

Present: Steele, Stacks
Absent: Kifer, Green

Students:

Present: Blaylock, Jeffrey, Amante,
Hernandez, Romero

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Kohn, Fujimoto, Huang

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett,
Grosvenor
Absent: Goyal

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Sibley

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow, Mathur

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Fatoohi, Sullivan-Green

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Bacich, Riley
Brada-Williams, Grindstaff
Absent: Brown

SCI Representatives:

Present: Kress, White, Muller
Absent: Kaufman

SOS Representatives:

Present: Ng, Peter, Rudy, Feist

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of September 15, 2014 were approved as amended (41-0-1).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Heiden welcomed Senator Huang and Senator Romero.

Chair Heiden provided a brief update on the governance review. The Statement on Shared Governance is nearly done and will come to the Senate after it is reviewed by participants in the Shared Governance retreats.

The Senate Retreat is scheduled for January 30, 2015. Please save the date. This is an all day event; topic to be determined.

Chair Heiden recently attended the CSU Senate Chairs meeting. The CSU Statewide Senate

Chair, Steven Filling discussed the importance of communication between the campuses and the CSU Statewide Senate and is looking for input regarding ways to enhance communication.

Another area of discussion at the CSU Senate Chairs meeting was the Student Success Excellence and Technology Fee (SSETF). SJSU rolled back the SSETF level this year to match the fees charged in Fall 2013 and lists all fees separately to allow greater transparency (e.g., -the IRA, course materials, and SSETF fees are now identified individually).

CSU campuses vary in the level of fees charged, how they are identified, and what they support. While SJSU collapsed all fees under the SSETF umbrella, other campuses identified their SSETF fees separately. Our practice made our SSETF fee look larger than it was. The campus chairs are trying to pull data together and provide accurate comparisons across campuses regarding their SSETF, course materials, IRA, athletics, library and other fees.

Senate structures were also discussed at the Chairs' meeting. The chairs are going to create a spreadsheet with information from all campuses regarding Senate membership and voting privileges, as well as the membership and voting privileges of their Executive Committee. Campus senate structures vary greatly. This will allow each campus to understand its structure in the larger context of the CSU, and will help inform the Statewide Senate, the Chancellor's office, and the Board of Trustees regarding similarities and variances across the system.

Additional announcements by Chair Heiden: Today the Provost will be talking about the Academic Affairs Budget along with AVP Marna Genes. Next month at the November 3, 2014 Senate meeting, we will receive a presentation from the VP of Administration and Finance on the University budget. The 2014-2015 University budget is posted on the Administration and Finance website. In addition, open forums on the budget will be held on campus between now and the November 3, 2014 Senate meeting. Chair Heiden encouraged Senators to review the budget online and to send her any questions so that she can pass those along.

The Chancellor's Task Force on the SSETF is looking for individual feedback from all faculty, staff, and students in the CSU; the link for input is provided on a handout. The deadline is today (other campus groups were notified last week).

B. From the President of the University –

President Qayoumi traveling to Long Beach for meetings of the President's Council and was unable to attend today's meeting.

Provost Feinstein announced he is "at a crossroad" with regard to the Next Gen classrooms and would like the Senate's input. In the Spring of 2013, an SSETF Proposal for \$1.15 million was approved to install 10 Next Gen Classrooms. Because of the timing of funding approval, they were not installed in the Summer of 2013. In the Spring of 2014, VP Bibb and Provost Feinstein decided not to move forward with any additional technology implementation in the classrooms until there was a better understanding of demand and preferences. The SSETF funds for the project were carried forward to this year. The Provost has been asked by Information Technology Services (ITS) if they can move forward with the installation of these classrooms over the Winter break, noting the results of a faculty survey

(n=266) endorsing the need for more advanced technologies. Provost Feinstein also discussed classroom technology development with the Deans of Engineering, Science, and Business, as new Next Gen classrooms were being recommended in facilities that they largely utilize. In addition, the Provost has a list of recommendations from ITS. There is some time-urgency to his decision, as the best time for installations is Winter or Summer break.

Questions from the floor:

Q: Clark Hall has all these wonderful classrooms and then you go to DMH and those classrooms are horrible. The university should be taking into consideration what actual buildings and classrooms need the renovation most.

A: Agreed. There are several classrooms recommended for update that have no technology in them at all like those recommended in Engineering.

Q: If the decision is to not move forward, how will the funds be allocated?

A: If we don't use the money as intended, I believe that the money will go back to the SSETF pool.

Q: Can you briefly summarize the results of the online faculty survey and what faculty want according to that survey?

A: ITS completed the faculty survey in Spring 2014 and received 266 faculty responses. Sixty-six (26%) of the faculty said it was "extremely important" to have lecture-capture capability. Additionally, 64 (25%) faculty identified having and overhead projector as "extremely important." Lastly, 62 (24%) said it was important to have live-streaming video. The numbers dropped off some for telepresence and web-video conferencing. This is to be expected given that pedagogy typically lags behind technology. Given data indicating lecture-capture and retrieval capabilities aid student success, we suggest moving forward conservatively in that direction, with adequate tracking of performance.

Continuing with Next Gen classroom development was supported by the deans. Dean Parrish wrote that there was general positive sentiment regarding the tech upgrades in Science 142. Also, DH 415 is a suitable classroom for expanding these technologies. Dean Steele wrote that faculty support the conversion of BBC 206 and BBC 226 into Next Gen classrooms. Dean Steele pointed out the lack of training for faculty campus-wide on new technology. Dean Hsu would like to see Next Gen technology installed in Engr. 301 and 403 and expects many Engineering faculty will want to teach in these rooms.

Currently there are 45 sections being taught using Next-Gen classrooms, with 32 faculty participants.

Q: It would be very helpful to know what faculty mean when they say they want Next Gen classrooms. What does a Next Gen classroom actually mean to each person? Do all of these rooms really need all of the technologies, or is it possible to include some features in one room and other features in other rooms?

A: Three different levels of a Next Gen classroom have been proposed by ITS during this round. Level III are classrooms with lecture capture. This level is recommended for BBC 226, DH 415, MH 520, and CL 302. Level IV includes telepresence and lecture capture and

is recommended for BBC 205, Engr. 301 and 403, and CL 117. Level V, the most advanced classrooms or mega-auditoriums, would be in SCI 142 and Uchida Hall 124.

Q: *If the cost for Level V classrooms is \$100,000, will Level III and IV classrooms cost less?*

A: There variables in addition to technology to consider, such as new furniture needed to facilitate different pedagogies, etc. Provost Feinstein has left the exact costs up to ITS to determine.

Q: *Has the University shared the budget for the maintenance of these Next Gen classrooms after they are built?*

A: No.

Q: *Shouldn't there be a middle ground instead of doing all or nothing.*

A: Agreed, this is a possibility. The Provost would like to be cautious moving forward, but not delay so long that we fall behind on demand and are still be talking about these upgrades three years from now.

Q: *Wouldn't it make sense to bring all classrooms up to some minimum level and then move forward from there?*

A: Agreed. Provost Feinstein was told there were two classrooms with no technology at all in them; they are both on the list to get the Next Gen classroom upgrades. However, there are about 155 centrally-managed classrooms that also need to be reviewed.

Q: *Are there 32 faculty scheduled in the classrooms or are the 32 faculty actually using all of the technology available in the rooms?*

A: Good question. We have five classrooms in operation for instruction, but the 32 faculty using the technology in these classrooms aren't using all the technology for every class. There are 45 sections and 32 faculty teaching one or more classes in these five classrooms. Faculty have recorded at least 25 lectures in five different courses. The recorded lectures have had over 700 video views.

Q: *Questions still remain regarding the most efficient use of the funds.*

A: It comes down to what you want in those classrooms. We are in Silicon Valley and some of this technology is new, but sometimes you have to use it before you know its benefits. Either we address and fulfil this expectation of technology implementation in the classrooms, or we pause and say we aren't going to do this right now until we have a better plan.

Q: *The \$1.15 million, was that originally conceived of as part of the \$28 million contract with CISCO?*

A: The original SSETF request for \$1.15 million outlined how the funds were to be used and what technology would be included in these classrooms. It did not specify if it was part of the \$28M

Q: *The observation is that whatever is decided, we should pay attention to the ongoing maintenance costs, as well as faculty development to be sure faculty are able to use the technology installed. Sometimes faculty development gets left out of these decisions.*

A: Provost Feinstein agreed 100%.

Q: *How long will it take for the work to be done?*

A: Possibly a few could be done during the Winter break, and then the bulk would be completed next summer.

A: Focusing on upgrading a few classrooms instead of all of them sounds like the best idea. Especially considering that one of the classrooms in Engineering is not even at the minimum level. We should bring all of them up to the minimum technology level first.

Q: *Provost Feinstein asked the Student Senators how they would feel about only doing four Next Gen classrooms over the Winter break.*

A: (Students) If only certain classrooms that benefit some colleges and not others are upgraded to Next Gen classrooms, the colleges with classrooms that are really in poor shape, such as DMH, might feel they are being passed over for any improvements once again.

Q: *FD&O pointed out in a recent meeting that, if a building is slated to eventually be torn down, such as DMH, too many technological improvements could halt building replacement efforts. If we had more information about which buildings are slated to be torn down and rebuilt that would be helpful.*

A: (Provost Feinstein) That's a good point. The DMH building is a good example of a building slated to be torn down. Provost Feinstein walked through DMH this summer with a thermometer and found that the South-facing offices were so hot that the classes of eight faculty members were moved to other buildings. While this kind of flexibility helps in the short-run, it is not a long-term solution. The question then becomes whether or not we should we spend \$3+ million for air conditioning in a building that is slated to be torn down. As solutions are considered, the Provost has talked to the scheduling team to ensure that classes scheduled in DMH on the South-side are scheduled during the coolest parts of the day. The Provost has also requested quotes on what the actual cost would be to put in air conditioning in DMH as a starting point for discussion of long-term solutions. After the Provost gets the actual costs, he will pursue further conversation regarding air conditioning.

A: (Chair Heiden) When a student at SJSU many years ago we were told that DMH would be torn down, along with other "outdated" buildings. She is concerned that a building being slated for tear-down some time in the future is not sufficient reason to postpone the installation in DMH or other buildings without temperature control in hot weather. It was noted by Chair Heiden that faculty in DMH appreciated the Provost's efforts to find solutions; this is the most attention given to these concerns in over 20 years.

Q: *The Cisco contract states very clearly that the \$28 million was supposed to pay for 51 classrooms being built in 18 months. However, over \$27 million has been spent and now there is an additional \$1.15 million being proposed to update classrooms included in the contract. This is very confusing and faculty do not want to support this proposal until there is some accountability for how the \$27 million was spent.*

A: Provost Feinstein is fine with holding off on putting any new technology in the classrooms, but is concerned about how we get this started again after a delay and with what resources.

A: (Student). Next Gen classrooms are not a priority for students. Students feel that they have some of the highest fees in the CSU, but not enough class sections to accommodate need. Additionally, impaction has locked students out of certain majors, but the university has \$28 million to spend on a Cisco contract. In addition, students see some buildings that don't have air conditioning and really old furniture in the classrooms and wonder if our priorities aren't misplaced. AS realizes this is already an approved proposal, but this isn't what students really need right now. A Next Gen classroom isn't going to help students graduate in four years.

Comment: There is obviously value in lecture-capture, but not everyone uses smart boards. However, video in the offices seems valuable.

Comment: DMH was scheduled for tear down in the 1960's; it was hot then and still doesn't have any air conditioning.

Q: *Making a classroom Next Gen doesn't always mean technology. Wouldn't just putting some new furniture in the classrooms be helpful?*

A: Provost Feinstein agreed.

Q: Why wasn't this on the Senate agenda instead of just a report from the Provost for the President? We need more time to review and discuss this.

A: Provost Feinstein apologized but said that he had just learned of the timeline for decisions last week and needed the help moving forward right away. He used this time to seize the opportunity for discussion.

Q: *If we do not move forward with the Next Gen classrooms, or go with the proposal to do only half of the classrooms, what guarantees do the faculty have that the funding will be there in the future?*

A: Funds that are not spent this year would revert back to the SSETF account and would have to be applied for next year.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Executive Committee Minutes of September 8, 2014 – **No questions**

Executive Committee Minutes of September 22, 2014 – **No questions**

Executive Committee Minutes of September 29, 2014 – **No questions**

B. Consent Calendar –

AVC Backer presented the consent calendar. One amendment was made to add Mark Van Selst as a Faculty at Large in the Humanities and Arts seat to the IRB. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as amended (42-0-0).**

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Election of faculty member to recommend to the President for the Athletics Board:

There were two faculty nominees for one vacant seat on the Athletics Board; Miwa Merz and Yao Tian. The Senate reviewed statements from both candidates. **The Senate voted by secret ballot and Yao Tian received a majority vote.**

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented an update on online SOTES.

The Senate passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution in 2005 that encouraged our conversion to online student evaluations. However, it took several years to accomplish. A few years ago we passed a new teaching evaluation policy that implemented online SOTES. The 2005 Sense of the Senate Resolution required that the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB), which oversees the development of online SOTES, monitor the development of the online system and report annually to the Senate through the Professional Standards Committee. This is the annual report.

There have been two outstanding chairs of SERB since 2005, James Lee and Rachael French. Rachel French is the current chair and provided the following notes:

Many of you are aware that the implementation of online SOTES has been difficult. The difficulty has primarily been due to the inadequacies of the Peoplesoft system. The San Diego State model used for our SOTES had one significant difference -- San Diego State does not use Peoplesoft. SDSU has their own system, which is more flexible and user-friendly. Despite the difficulties, things have improved each semester. This has primarily been due to the efforts of James Lee and Rachael French in bringing issues back to the programmers to get things tweaked.

The biggest concern the Senate had prior to going online with SOTES was that the response rate would collapse. The opposite has occurred. The paper SOTES had a response rate just under 60%. The online SOTES response rate for Fall 2013 was 78%, and in Spring 2013 the response rate was 80%.

After the original policy regarding teaching evaluation was passed, the Senate amended the policy to exclude very small classes from required SOTES administration, primarily because there is a problem with anonymity in very small classes. Although not unique to online SOTES, a remaining problem is the norming of data. For example, how do you establish a good norm for student evaluations when you don't evaluate every class? Paper SOTES were normed about once every five years and sometimes not that often. When we implemented electronic SOTES, norms dropped about 3/10th of a point. This was an unwelcome shock to faculty. SERB stresses the importance that the only appropriate comparison to make is against that semester's norm. One of the advantages of the new system is that it is re-normed every single semester.

SERB is currently working on providing alternative norms as was provided for by policy,

including norms related to class size and class level. They hope to develop and implement by the end of this year the ability to compare a particular professor's norm in a particular class to other classes of the same level or of the same size. We have already implemented a comparison based on students' anticipated grades. While there was some concern that faculty would be tempted to give very good grades to get good evaluations, or that faculty with good evaluations must only have achieved it by inflating grades. Controlling for grades addresses these concerns.

SERB is currently working on revising the questions for the SOTES and SOLATES. These revised questions will come before the Professional Standards Committee and the Senate. Also, SERB is working on revising the interpretation guide. It is Senate policy that all evaluations must be accompanied by interpretation guides.

Questions:

Q: *Our department has a number of classes that are primarily labs, but have a small class component to them. Is there a way to just use the SOLATE and not the SOTE?*

A: These kind of issues are dealt with in an "elastic clause" in the policy which says these type of issues can be worked out between IEA and SERB. Just ask Chair French to bring this to SERB.

Q: *A concern that has come up from some of our department faculty is that some students that may have dropped the course, or done a challenge exam during the semester, are still receiving an email notification to do their SOTES at the end of the semester. I'm not sure how often this occurs, but I've been told that this does happen.*

A: SERB worked for the better part of a year trying to figure out how to exclude students that received the unauthorized withdrawal grade. It is possible to exclude those results after the fact. Part of the Senate policy was that IEA and SERB would look for a way to exclude students that didn't attend the course from evaluating it. However, this is the first the PS Committee has heard about the challenge exams. We will bring this back to Chair French.

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1549, Policy Recommendation, Emeritus Faculty, Rescinds F92-6 and F96-7 (First Reading)***.

The CSU Statewide Senate has urged that all of the campus Senates review their policies with regard to granting emeritus status for temporary faculty. There also have been lecturers that have requested emeritus status. The old policy from 1992 gives the President the right to grant emeritus status to anyone, but it creates the expectation that tenured faculty will normally be granted that standing while it creates no such expectation for temporary faculty. The PS Committee tried to balance several concerns. The emeritus standing is an important honorific title. It is a way to honor faculty for their years of service at the university. Also, the PS Committee wanted to be able to give some concrete guidance when temporary faculty sought emeritus standing. The old policy has been left alone with regard to granting of emeritus standing to tenured faculty. However, a new section, 1.2, gives guidance on granting emeritus standing to temporary faculty.

The recommendations the PS Committee is making are in line with what the other campuses are doing with regard to emeritus standing for temporary faculty. The faculty member/lecturer must have 10 years of service, so if they teach part-time that would be 20 years of service. The lecturer must also be recommended by a department Personnel Committee. If both of these requirements are met the PS Committee believes that the lecturer should be granted emeritus standing.

Questions:

Q: Would the committee consider six-years of full-time equivalent service instead of ten years for lecturers? This would be in line with our tenure-track faculty for RTP and the Emeritus Retired Faculty Association (ERFA) requirement for six years of full-time equivalent service for membership. This would be more in line with campus policies and not so much other campuses.

A: The PS Committee will consider this.

Q: Would the committee consider listing under faculty privileges in item 2, retention of the university email address? Would the committee consider having it say that consultation with the chair and dean should occur with regard to item 2.4?

A: The PS Committee will consider this.

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

Senator Brada-Williams presented a report on the activities of the Board of General Studies (BOGS) for 2013-2014.

In 2013-2014, BOGS completed the WASC Rubric and the new General Education (GE) Guidelines that came to the Senate and approved as University policy S14-5. BOGS also approved 14 new courses including African-American Studies 2A and 2B that satisfy areas D2 and D3 of the GE. BOGS also approved American Studies areas 1A and 1B.

Biology and Chemistry were granted the ability to offer classes in area R within the major. Engineering 10 now satisfies area E. FORL 25 satisfies all of area C for six units. Global Studies 143 and 188 were accepted for area Z. JS 25 satisfies area D3. KIN 68 satisfies area C1, and NURS 138 satisfies area S.

BOGS also provisionally approved three one-year sequences; H&A 96F and 96S for area C2, and Humanities 177A and B for areas R, S, and V. Engr 195A and B satisfies area S and V.

BOGS also approved a resolution satisfying area D2 with sets of non-GE intensive physical science classes. BOGS approved a resolution to discontinue the ACT objective portion of the WST, and developed new scores for passing the WST based on essay only.

This is interesting because the bubble-in machine scores for the ACT were taking longer to grade than human grading of the essays.

Looking ahead to what is going on right now in 2014-2015, BOGS has experienced a backlog

in reviewing the GE component of program planning studies as well as in reviewing courses being dropped on the spot - senior GE policy. This is particularly troubling in light of the plan to get us one-year ahead in getting classes into the catalog.

BOGS has begun to work on encouraging new integrated course sequences based on new high impact practice, and working with high-unit majors to incorporate GE within their majors. Obviously this is due to continuing pressures to deal with the 120 unit requirement.

This year BOGS will also be doing program-level assessment of GE as required by WASC including the demonstration of five core competencies at the upper division level. BOGS will also be implementing review of class size as required by the new GE policy passed last year.

BOGS will be looking at future revisions of the GEAP Guidelines including; defining area D3, integrative student learning objectives, and assessment of integrative courses; including WASC core competencies in R, S, and V, and institutionalizing GEPA or General Education Program Assessment.

Questions:

Q: *Many CSU campuses are looking at specifically endorsing schematic GE as a pathway toward the minor. Is that something we are looking at?*

A: We discussed what has gone on at Chico about a year ago, but seeing there were so many other revisions going on at the same time, we decided not to tackle that at this time.

Q: *Will AFAM 2A and 2B satisfy area D2 and D3 right now?*

A: AVP Branz will check the catalog to be sure it is active, but if not it will certainly be active for areas D2 and D3 for Fall 2014.

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) – No report.

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

Senator Frazier presented *AS 1547, Policy Recommendation, Scheduling of Advance Registration and Priority Registration (Final Reading)*.

Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to add a new number 3.1 to read, “3.1 It is the intention that no more than 10% of the FTES of SJSU be available for priority registration under the policy.” **The Senate voted and AS 1547 passed as amended (39-2-1)**.

E. University Library Board (ULB) – No Report.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

A. The Chief of Staff, Stacy Gleixner, presented a Presidential Directive on a Smoke-Free Campus.

Chief of Staff Gleixner explained that Senators had received a draft Presidential Directive on implementing a Smoke-Free Campus. This issue came before the Senate in Spring 2012 and the

Senate passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution asking the President to consider further action. This Presidential Directive is in response to that Sense of the Senate Resolution.

As required, meet and confer sessions with each union were completed before the Presidential Directive was enacted. The meet and confer sessions began on May 6, 2014, and this Presidential Directive was approved by the unions on October 6, 2014.

The President and Chief of Staff are looking for the Senate's input on how to implement the Presidential Directive, and will seek input from other campus groups.

Questions:

Q: *Does smoke-free include all the things one might smoke?*

A: Yes.

Q: *Instead of coming as a Presidential Directive, could this possibly come as a referral to the Senate?*

A: That is one idea to have it come to the Senate to create an implementation plan.

Q: *As you know, we debated and tabled the issue of becoming a totally smoke-free campus several years.*

A: Chief of Staff Gleixner responded that she was told that a Sense of the Senate Resolution came out of that meeting and the biggest hurdle was getting the unions to agree to it.

Q: *Is this also coming out of the Chancellor's Office?*

A: The Chancellor's Office is moving forward with a smoke-free CSU, but they are still in the discussion phase and haven't drafted anything yet.

A: *Chair Heiden announced that the idea is to roll this out slowly, and not to make it punitive. The campus wants to emphasize that there are resources available to help people quit smoking and implement this in a way that gives people time to adjust.*

Q: *Some students think this has already been passed and employees are ignoring it. These students try and get the faculty to force the employees to stop smoking near the windows.*

A: The University passed a policy a few years back that requires employees not to smoke within a certain distance of a building, but the ashtrays are put right outside the doors and this encourages smoking near the building. Please look at this when implementing this Presidential Directive.

Comment: One suggestion is to establish a working group to look into how to implement this and include faculty, staff, and students. I'm not sure this needs to come to the level of the Senate or a policy committee.

Comment: Once the working group sets an implementation date then they need to back off and give people a chance to adjust. The orientation staff should be involved in spreading the word so

that the new employees know something is coming as well. It should be phased in incrementally.

Q: *Are you saying a totally smoke-free campus, or areas where smoking will be allowed?*

A: Smoke-free completely.

Q: *Is this up to debate?*

A: No.

A: We should invite other campuses that have successfully implemented a smoke-free campus to tell us what worked and did not work, and what problems they encountered.

A: Humboldt is now smoke-free and they might be a good campus to speak to. Humboldt prides itself on being the only CSU campus that is smoke-free.

A: A few years ago we held a poll and the students were totally against a completely smoke-free campus.

Q: *This is clearly a popular measure that helps the health of students and faculty, but I question the wisdom of doing a Presidential Directive when faculty are looking for more shared governance.*

A: One of the reasons it is deliberately so short is to get consultation on the implementation. There were also 11 meet and confer sessions with the unions.

Q: *Last year I was on a panel that actually discussed how to implement a smoke-free campus, and I have notes on this. Who would I send that information to?*

A: Send it to Chief of Staff Gleixner, Roger Elrod, and Chair Heiden.

A: As of January 1, 2014, the U.C. is smoke-free. In this case, the President is responding to the Senate's request and therefore a Presidential Directive would be appropriate.

B. Report on the Academic Affairs Division Budget by Provost Feinstein and AVP of Academic Budgets and Planning, Marna Genes.

AVP Genes introduced herself and explained that she has been with Academic Affairs for six months now and with SJSU for four years. She worked for the UC system for 20 years.

Every budget has a story. The story this year is a really good story. Almost all the resources that came into the division went into the colleges. There has been a desire for awhile to establish college-based budgets that were more predictable and stable. The budgets in place this year were determined using the number of students and a factor called the Instructional Cost for Full-Time Student (ICFTS). The ICFTS was determined by a study led by a consultant that was a very experienced CSU employee that looked at 2012-2013 cost data. She did an extensive study about the instructional costs in each of the colleges. We used that information and applied it to the enrollment targets established for each college and that determined a base budget for each college. When we compared the base budget that was determined to the 2012-2013 base budget

that was given to the colleges, there was a \$10.8 million gap. That gap was funded through a couple of different funds.

In 2013-2014 our enrollment increased by 770 students. Academic Affairs received \$3.8 million as a result of this increase. The division requested \$4.2 million to fund the college base budgets. Then the division identified \$2.8 million in existing resources. This is how the \$10.8 million came about. In addition to this, we had launched a new Education Doctorate program and we received funding for that. These funds were passed on to Education. The change in the college base budgets was a total of \$12.5 million this year.

The model was based on actual cost of instruction for 2012-2013. An issue we are going to have to look at next year is that colleges that had a large number of tenure/tenure track vacant positions will be teaching at a lower cost model than they would if the positions were filled. Some of that was captured in this budget.

It is up to the colleges how they are going to use their portion of the \$12.5 million. The new budget model is very decentralized. It allows the deans to determine how best to use their funds. In addition, there are 64 new faculty hires this year. This is the largest number of faculty recruitments in more than a decade.

In the past, funds were not allocated until positions were filled. That is not happening now, and colleges have all of their funds so they can use it to recruit, etc. Deans also have the authority throughout the year to replace vacant staff, MPP, and faculty positions provided they have the funds available.

Under this model colleges have a lot more resource stability as their budgets will move forward from one year to the next. Also to provide stability, this year we started a new process where we are not adjusting budgets throughout the year based on actual enrollment levels. This should allow colleges to schedule their classes earlier.

At the start of the year there was a general desire by leadership to come up with a more objective way to determine enrollment distribution. During the Winter of 2014 there was a division workgroup that was led by Dean Chin that came up with some options for distributing enrollment across the colleges. The model that was selected was called the Induced Course Load Matrix Model (ICLM). That model uses the course-taking behaviors of students to determine where our demand is going to be. For example, in Fall 2013 Engineering had 5,810 majors. Those majors generated 4,647 FTES across all the colleges. As you would expect, Engineering had 60% of the workload. However, Science was second with 21%, and H&A and Social Sciences had 16%. As you can see here, we can now evaluate the impact across the colleges of taking enrollments in certain colleges. We have applied this model to our entire student population now to determine where the workload is going to be and then put the resources there. This allows us to align colleges and target our resources with the selected majors of our student population.

There were some shifts in the colleges. Engineering went up because we have accepted some larger classes of Engineering students over the last several years. When you think about it, it

makes sense. Sciences enrollment went up because Engineering students must take Science classes. AVP Genes and Provost Feinstein will be looking at the year-end results to see how closely they matched, and will make any adjustments that need to be made.

The total division base budget this year was \$130.4 million. This is a \$10.5 million increase over the prior year budget. CERF went down a little bit because revenues are down a little. The SSETF budgets are determined at the campus level through the process that applies to those funds. The lottery funds stayed the same. Growth in revenue in the lottery pretty much goes to K-12. Our operating fund is recovering due to proposition 13. Our total budget including one-time funds and roll-forward funds was \$171.7 million.

The Academic Affairs Budget Plan was just posted on the web today. There will also be some question and answer sessions scheduled in November 2014. There will also be additional resources listed online about where to go for additional budget information.

Questions:

Q: Are graduate students included in the budget prediction model FTES?

A: Yes.

Q: Nursing and Education have on and off enrollments with more students some semesters than other semesters. Typically there are additional students coming in every fall and spring in education, so are there exceptions to the funding model to accommodate these majors?

A: Provost Feinstein and AVP Genes are very interested in stabilizing our enrollment plan so that we do not have all the peaks and valleys that we've had. It would be nice to have some student enrollments every spring so that we could smooth out our pipeline.

Q: Previous budget reports showed that the budget given to Academic Affairs was about 1/2 of the total budget. This has always been very frustrating for faculty. Are there any plans to ask for additional funding?

A: That was certainly the intent when we brought in the external auditor, and this is why we have an additional \$10.5 million in funds this year.

Q: If ICLM is based upon counting majors and taking particular courses, then what about the undeclared students and those students that change their mind all the time?

A: The undeclared students are included in the matrix model. We have not looked to see how much they've changed year-to-year.

Q: In the 1990's there was a fight between the deans that wanted to count majors for allocating resources and the deans that wanted to count FTES. Obviously those college that do more general education wanted to count FTES and the colleges with more majors wanted to count majors. Is the ICLM system more or less neutral between these two standpoints as far as allocating resources is concerned?

A: Yes. We actually look at the majors our students are admitted to and then evaluate their impact across all of the colleges. It is difficult to argue that it is unfairly treating anyone.

Q: Doesn't this system then make decisions over admissions the decisions that really drive the budget? If certain majors are allowed to admit more students than others, and certain majors are prohibited from admitting as many students, the admissions process drives their budget in the future.

A: That would be true if there were not cooperative efforts by the leadership, but we have these discussions about what each college wants to do for admissions and the impact it will have on the other colleges. Everyone has been very open in the discussions and we have come to a good consensus in those discussions.

A: This year we will be at 106% of our enrollment target. One of the things we had to be very careful of was how that 6% above target was distributed to make sure classes were offered where students needed them for their degrees.

Q: Can you clarify how the model accounts for students that have to take general education, such as Engineering students?

A: I used Engineering because they have so many required courses they make a really good model. We are seeing the general education for the Engineering student in Humanities and the Arts and the College of Social Sciences. There is a far lesser extent in CASA.

Q: CASA came down 268 FTES, but this was not due to demand. There is an excessive demand for classes and yet the college has to hold down its enrollment. What flexibility in the short term is part of the model?

A: There were issues in all of the colleges around enrollment, but because CASA did have a change down from one year to the next they felt it in a much more pronounced way. However, even colleges that had an increase in the FTES were still having a hard time staying within their resident targets. We really have two groups of students we are admitting. We have resident students that get first priority, but we are limited in the number the students we can take. We elect to go over the 100% to take as many students as we can, but there is a hard limit. It is actually 105% and we had to get permission for the extra 1%. The example with CASA is not a resource issue it is a cap of the number of resident students we can actually teach based on the quota provided to us by the Chancellor's Office. CASA has the resources to deliver more instruction, but we also have the limitations on the number of students we can teach. We will look very closely at this next year, and will try to stick very closely to the Chancellor's target.

VIII. New Business –

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

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance –

The university has received notification from the Chancellor's Office that we will be receiving a penalty for over enrollment in the amount of \$1.7 million. The university did hold back some funds in the event we were assessed this penalty.

Please attend the upcoming budget forums. One item of discussion will be how to spend the \$15 million we have accumulated in CERF funds.

Questions:

Q: The argument has been made in the past that despite the penalty, it is an advantage for us to over-enroll. How is that possible?

A: The argument has always been that it makes sense for us to be over-enrolled as long as we do not exceed the Chancellor's cap. The cap this year was 105%. As long as we can stay under the cap, it makes sense to get the extra funds for the over-enrollment.

Q: Have we paid this penalty before?

A: Yes.

Q: So why do we continue to go over the cap?

A: Every year we must balance the demands of our students for classes and enrollment targets. Just two years ago our admissions policy required that we admit all students that met the minimum requirements in our service area.

Q: There was a recent article in the Chronicle that talked about how the Governor vetoed a bill that would have given us \$50 million. How does that impact us?

A: This was a trigger bill. If you look at the original budget process, if the revenues in the State of California exceeded a certain amount the Governor would give the CSU an additional \$50 million. However, due to all the disastrous fires this year, the cost of fire-fighting has already exceeded the annual budget and the additional revenue will be used to fund fire-fighting. SJSU's budget was developed without these funds.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs – No report.

C. Associated Students President –

AS President Daniels announced that AS had elected a new Director of Faculty Affairs that would replace Senator Subhi Vijaywargia, Senator Joshua Romero. In addition, AS is still seeking a replacement for Senator Niblett, the AS Director of Student Affairs.

Unfortunately, AS recently had to terminate its Executive Director for misuse of funds.

AS is in the process of finalizing the Board of Directors restructure for next Spring. Some of the AS Director positions will have different names.

AS President Daniels was unable to attend the Diversity Task Force meeting last week, but he did hear many complaints from students regarding implementation. It sounds as if the concerns passed on by AS are being heard, but the problem is that they are not being implemented. For example, while AFAM classes have been added to areas D2 and D3, it is important that areas S and V incorporate cultural studies. Another request AS had was to add another tenure/tenure-track faculty member to African-American Studies and African-American Studies was only given a lecturer. Students were very upset about this.

AS President Daniels commented that he was very disappointed in the earlier conversation about SSETF fees being used for projects that students feel are out of alignment with what they want. This is creating feelings of mistrust.

Questions:

Q: You talked about firing the Executive Director for her handling of AS Funds. Did AS lose a lot of money?

A: This case is still under investigation by UPD and AS President Daniels could not comment on the case. AS will make a decision about how to go about collecting the misspent funds after the investigation is completed.

Q: Has AS considered having student representation from every college on the SSETF Committee?

A: AS is considering creating a student Senate that would have several student representatives from every college. AS hopes to get greater participation from students for all committees.

D. Vice President for University Advancement – Moved to Next Meeting.

E. Statewide Academic Senators – Moved to Next Meeting.

F. Provost – Moved to Next Meeting.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.