

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 5, 2015

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius,
Amante, Van Selst, Lee
Absent: Heiden

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Martin, Blaylock
Absent: Feinstein, Larochelle,
Lanning

COB Representatives:

Present: Sibley, Virick
Absent: Campsey

Deans:

Present: Green, Hsu, Steele, Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Mathur, Laker

Students:

Present: El-Miaari, Abukhdeir,
Romero, Medrano, Cuellar,
Gay

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Bacich, Grindstaff, Khan
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Kaufman, White, Beyersdorf, Clements

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Medina
Absent: Kauppila

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Coopman, Curry, Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of September 14, 2015 were approved as amended (41-0-2).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

The search committee for the Vice President of Administration and Finance has been appointed by President Martin. The three faculty representatives on the committee include Chair Kimbarow, Senator James Lee, and Assistant Professor Robi Ragan.

The plan for the search is to bring the finalists to the campus sometime in March after the new President has been designated by the Board of Trustees. The same will be true for the Chief Diversity Officer search. That search committee is being led by Vice President Reggie Blaylock. The finalists from both of these searches will be here in March and the new President will then make the final selection.

The review committee for AVP Maureen Scharberg's five-year review will be selected by the Executive Committee on Monday, October 12, 2015. Chair Kimbarow thanked everyone that nominated themselves. The deadline for nominations is Wednesday, October 7, 2015, close of business.

Kell Fujimoto recently resigned as a representative from the General Unit. Despite numerous emails to the General Unit and General Unit Senators, we were unable to get anyone to run for the seat in the recent special election. Thus, the seat will remain vacant, unless someone steps forward to fill the seat, through the end of the academic year.

We were also unsuccessful in getting anyone to step forward to be the faculty representative on the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC) for one year. This committee is chaired by Interim Vice President Josee Larochelle. The primary purpose of CFAC is to review and approve any new student fees, but also to evaluate one-time funding proposals for SSETF funding. It is an important committee, but only meets about twice a semester.

The Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees meets next week with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The entire group will be present at the open forum from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., October 15, 2015, in Morris Daily Auditorium.

Chair Kimbarow announced he could not stress enough how important it is for all of us to attend the open forum to inform the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees about the qualities we think are important in a President. The Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, Trustee Rebecca Eisen, met with faculty members of the Executive Committee about 1 ½ weeks ago. Trustee Eisen stressed that the open forum is a critical opportunity for the campus to weigh in on how that search will proceed. Please take advantage of the opportunity to come to the open forum. You can provide feedback online. Also, please contact your constituents and get their feedback before the forum. The forum will be taped and will be available to the search committee.

Chair Kimbarow announced that he and the Senate Administrator are continually looking for ways to optimize the Senate experience for everyone. The two of us are looking into a new Public Address system that may meet our need for speakers and wireless microphones, and we are also working on acquiring clickers and clicker technology. It will take a little while to work some of these things in, but we are working on it.

Interim President Martin will host the Academic Senate at the President's house for the annual Senate Holiday Party on Sunday, December 6, 2015 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Martin announced that the entire campus had been very welcoming. The President visited Moss Landing Marine Lab on Friday and thought it was amazing. "You can reach out and touch the whales!"

Interim President Martin announced some of the cabinet members were absent due to fund raising events.

Chair Kimbarow presented a motion to suspend standing rule 7a for Academic Year 2015-2016 in order to allow the Executive Committee to set the Senate agenda in the best order for each Senate meeting. Chair Kimbarow informed the Senate that a 2/3rds vote was needed to suspend the standing rule. The Senate voted and motion passed (43-0-0).

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

A. Provost – No report.

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) – No report.

C. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –

Applications for Fall 2016 were accepted starting October 1, 2015, and the last day applications can be accepted is November 30, 2015. The first application came in at 12:06 a.m. and that person will get a sweatshirt. About 60,000 applications are expected for next Fall's class. The CSU anticipates approximately 700,000 to 800,000 applications throughout the 23 CSU campuses.

The Student Services Center (SSC) is hosting an open house with refreshments for faculty, students, staff, and members of the community. Come learn what services are offered in the SSC. The open house will be on October 15, 2015 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

This past week Student Affairs had two career fairs; one for technology and one for business.

Homecoming is less than two weeks away. Student Affairs will host several events including Tailgate Takeover Two (TTT) with free refreshments and food, and "Fire on the Fountain" held the Thursday prior to Homecoming.

D. Associated Students President (AS):

AS President Amante reported that next week is Legacy week and will begin with the unveiling of the "Peace Pole." The next event is the Student Town Hall meeting which will also be attended by the Student Trustee Kelsey Brewer on October 14, 2015.

AS has established a Student Hunger Committee. AS conducted a survey in which 1/3rd of SJSU students reported having to chose between eating and paying their living expenses. AS has worked hard to setup places around campus that students can go to get food assistance including the Health Center, Housing, the College of Science Advising Center, the Business Student Success Center, etc. Food insecurity is a major issue for students on this campus and AS is committed to helping those in need.

At a recent "Meet the President" event, there were student protesters that were

protesting inaccessibility for undocumented students. AS supports this effort.

E. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA): No report.

F. CSU Statewide Senators:

Senator James Lee reported that four CSU campuses are currently searching for a new president and they include San José State, Sonoma State, Chico State, and Channel Islands. All of these searches are closed searches. Resolutions are being considered by many campuses asking for open visits to campuses during presidential searches. If the CSU continues with closed searches, then the CSU Statewide Senate will consider asking for the addition of more faculty to the faculty representatives on the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees.

Questions:

Q: Did the CSU Statewide Senate discuss a resolution requesting an increase in the faculty and student representatives to the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees?

A: Yes. However, there is a resolution being considered asking for the addition of an Emeritus Faculty Trustee and there is current debate as to whether ASCSU wants to ask for two Faculty Trustees or a Faculty Trustee and an Emeritus Trustee since it is highly unlikely the Governor would approve both.

Q: Can you explain the Presidential Selection process?

A: The Presidential Selection Committee consists of the Chancellor and four Trustees. The Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees will recommend three finalists to the Presidential Selection Committee.

On December 2, 2015, the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee will review the paperwork from all candidates and narrow the selection down to eight semi-finalists. On January 15 & 16, 2016 the committee will interview the eight semi-finalists and narrow the selection down to three to four finalists. These three or four finalists will be provided to the Presidential Selection Committee which will make interview the finalists on January 22, 2016 the final selection by the end of February or beginning of March 2016.

V. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Exec. Minutes of August 31, 2015 – No questions.

Exec. Minutes of September 21, 2015 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

Senator Stacks inquired as to why so many members were being removed from the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee. Associate Vice Chair (AVC) Backer responded that there is a resolution from the Organization and Government Committee before the Senate today asking to disband this committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar of October 5, 2015 was approved (43-0-0).**

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Election Calendar of 2016. **The Senate voted and the Election Calendar for 2016 was approved (43-0-0).**

VI. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1581, Policy Recommendation, Instructor Drops in Online Courses (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to change line 31 from, "... Logging on to the LMS the first day of the class or informing" to read, "Logging on to the LMS the official first day of instruction or informing" and to change line 34 from, "after the official class start date." to read, "after the official first day of instruction." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the amendment failed (14-21-8).

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to change line 31 to read, "...the LMS shell for the class on the first day of the class" Senator White presented an amendment to the Kaufman amendment that was friendly to change it to read, "... the LMS class shell on the first scheduled day of the class" The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Kaufman/White amendment passed (39-3-1).**

Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return to committee. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion failed (7-33-3).

Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was friendly to change the word "within" in lines 29 and 34 to "before."

Senator Kaufman called the question on debate. The Senate voted and the motion passed (43-0-0).

The Senate voted on AS 1581 as amended and the resolution passed (40-3-0).

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1582, Policy Recommendation, Academic Integrity (First Reading)*.

The existing policy is not in compliance with several Executive Orders (EO) including 1037 and 1098. This policy creates an appeals process for students.

Questions:

Q: How many years have we been out of compliance? What happens if we don't pass this resolution?

A: Good question. I don't know the answer.

Q: On section 5.3 and 5.4, why not just to be clean say either the alleged violation is upheld or it is not?

A: The issue here is one of fairness and equity. One faculty member should not be giving much harsher sanctions than another for the same type violation. That is the goal with that.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1584, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding Outdated Policy (S98-11), Related to the 1998 GE Guidelines (Final Reading)*. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to add “9-28-15” to line 34 and “8-0-0” to line 35. **The Senate voted and AS 1584 passed (43-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1578, Policy Recommendation, Strategic Planning Policy (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Would the committee consider adding an Undergraduate Student seat?

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: It seems with every new administration there is another strategic plan, could there be some guidance about how frequently this process should be done?

A: The range should be 5-7 years.

Q: Why is there only two or three faculty on the committee out of 15 people?

A: The Senate Chair, a faculty-at-large member, and a Department Chair are on the committee. O&G tried very hard not to get back to 22 people on the committee which made it impossible to schedule meetings in the past.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1579, Policy Recommendation, Budget Advisory Committee (First Reading)*.

This policy would be in effect until O&G can bring the final Strategic Planning Policy back in Spring 2016. In the meantime, the campus needs a Budget Advisory Committee as a resource for the administration as well as the campus.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1551, Modification of Writing Requirements Committee Membership (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1551 was approved (43-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1585, Policy Recommendation, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership and Charge (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Line 67 says “Section moved here during 9/21/15 meeting.”

A: That is an error. A section should have been moved and will be fixed for the final reading.

Q: Has the committee considered that the structure of BOGS may not be well suited to the change in its mission where American Institutions (AI) is being added to its charge? Namely, the AI courses in U.S. Government and U.S. History are not general education courses, they are highly specialized. Normally one would expect people trained in those disciplines to evaluate those courses. If AI is going to be added to BOGS charge there needs to be some structural change to BOGS.

A: O&G will consider this.

Q: Lines 188-193 talk about how BOGS will develop and implement values for the evaluation of core competencies, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. Those are not necessarily aligned with any specific GE category other than written and oral communication, so can you tell us how BOGS will implement strategy and whether those core competencies are a critical part of GE or GE and upper division courses?

A: The discussion goes like this, where do you place the responsibility for developing and proposing information strategies? These are core competencies and are built into our GE program at lower and upper division levels. BOGS is a logical place to put this charge. Now, what are they going to do? When we talked to the Director of Assessment and the AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, and the Chair of BOGS, they were willing to get information for us about how we might do this. We already have some things in place and WASC gave us a thumbs up for doing such a good job on information literacy. This will take time.

Q: My understanding is that to keep within the 120 units some areas had to give and AI was one of the areas. Have you considered the possibility of removing the AI responsibility from BOGS?

A: Yes, and we are unable to do so. The Senate already approved the 2014 GE Guidelines. However, it is clear we need to revisit the membership of BOGS.

Q: Can you also consult with C&R Committee?

A: Yes.

D. University Library Board (ULB) – None

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

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1580, Policy Recommendation, Credit by Exam (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1580 passed (43-0-0).**

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1583, Policy Recommendation, Internships and Service Learning (First Reading)*.

In 2011, the Chancellor’s Office created EO 1064 which requires all CSU campuses to setup a policy and guidelines for all internships. Internships are defined in the EO as off-

campus activity designed to serve educational purposes by offering experience in a service-learning business, non-profit, or government setting. C&R consulted widely on this policy and has worked on it for the past year.

Questions:

Q: There was one dissenting vote, can you tell me why?

A: That person wanted to wait two additional days and do an online vote in order to get more feedback from his/her college.

Q: In the second Resolved, I get the impression all the departments will be able to setup their own participation guidelines. Am I reading this correctly?

A: Yes.

Q: Is there a difference for paid and unpaid internships in the requirements?

A: If the internship is required for the course, then EO 1064 applies to it.

Q: Will an attempt be made to actually calculate the financial impact?

A: C&R can try but there are a number of variables it depends on, so it would be difficult to put a dollar amount in there.

Q: Would the university consider purchasing liability insurance for smaller companies so that they are not forced out of student internships? Given that there is already an UOA and no policy, what is the purpose of a policy?

A: EO 1064 requires us to have a policy. This provides protection for the student from being sued by the company.

Q: There is a sentence in the UOA that specifies the general liability insurance of \$1 million to \$2 million dollars and some companies would not like this aspect of the UOA. Why is this million statement included in the UOA?

A: \$1 million dollars represents about a \$350 insurance premium per year. This is the minimum that is required - even for non-profits it is a very basic premium coverage amount. Most of the larger companies have much higher liability insurance coverage.

Q: What is the university going to do if major companies like Cisco refuse to sign the UOA? Cisco and Price Waterhouse have already said they will not.

A: C&R will consult with the College of Business directly. C&R did not get that feedback.

**VIII. Special Committee Reports –
Academic Affairs Division Budget Report by the AVP of Academic Budgets and Planning,
Marna Genes.**

AVP Genes reported that the Academic Affairs Division received about \$9 million in new funding this year. Of that \$9 million, \$4.2 million was for compensation adjustments. This included the campus-based equity program that amounted to approximately \$600,000. The Division also received \$4 million for enrollment growth at \$5,100 per full-time equivalent student (FTES).

Other adjustments include some miscellaneous categories such as funding given to Kinesiology for using the Event Center for some of their courses. Because the Event Center is funded by Student Union fees, they are reimbursed for this instructional use.

The college of Business also received a \$350,000 adjustment. When the new budget model was put into effect last year, the college of Business was the only college to suffer a budget reduction on a per student basis. The budget model does not fully address the costs associated with AACSB accreditation. Business suffered a 7% reduction, but we fixed that this year. The college of Science also received a \$50,000 swap to replace CERF money. In addition, \$770,000 went to the division account which included about \$500,000 needed to cover a deficit created last year when the division funded the new budget model.

Questions:

Q: It was my understanding that the colleges should have received an 8% increase this year, but when I apply that 8% to the budgets most colleges lost money while some increased a lot.

A: The 8% increase includes compensation adjustment funding (3.7%). The compensation adjustments are tied to specific people, so they are what they are. Enrollment funding (3.5%) follows FTES. Last year we began using the Induced Course Load Matrix (ICLM) model for enrollment funding. ICLM uses three years of historical course-taking behavior to predict the course enrollment patterns of the current student body. ICLM tells us how many FTES each college needs to teach their students and everyone else's students that take their classes.

Q: One of the concerns over the last couple of years in my department is that we get refugees from other colleges. When taking in these refugees, we are actually harming ourselves because we could have admitted higher quality better prepared students. Instead, we are spending additional resources training these refugees up. This ends up being costly for us.

A: This is a valid concern. It is something we will have to talk about in enrollment planning circles.

The next slide is a breakdown of the increased FTES to colleges. You will see that the breakdown is two-thirds non-resident and one-third resident students. The financial penalty for being overenrolled has been withdrawn by the Chancellor's Office. However, the Chancellor has asked Presidents to stay within 3.5% over enrollment.

The college of Business has been overenrolled for years and they are trying to encourage four-year graduation rates. In order to do so, we are going to have to increase their ICLM for this effect.

SSETF (Student Success, Excellence & Technology Fee) started in Fall 2012. It subsumed two fees including IRA (Instructionally Related Activities) fees and course fees. Then in Fall 2014, we unbundled our student success fee and reduced it. Now we have SSETF-Student Success fees, SSETF-Course Support fees, and SSETF IRA fees. The course support fee is \$31 per term and is now being managed locally in the Academic Affairs Division. When SSETF was implemented, the Senate and UCCD wanted the course fee distributed to the colleges with some basis for enrollment and inflation. Academic Affairs has done this. The colleges this year received adjustments based on enrollment levels and an inflation adjustment.

Questions:

Q: What about courses that are lab-based since we don't have lab fees any longer? How are funds allocated for these lab-based courses?

A: The only growth in SSETF-Course Support revenues will come from enrollment growth and inflation adjustments; these will be small. It will be a big challenge to fund course support needs from SSETF. We are looking to other sources, like the Operating Fund. First, we need to determine what the needs are. SJSU has been through many years of budget uncertainties, so we don't have a good reference in history for adequate course support levels. We will be consulting widely with people on FTES models we can use, and also using one-time funding to replace large equipment that is obsolete or at end-of-life.

Q: You said the ICLM predicts the FTES needed based on past behavior, but needed for what?

A: It isn't based on demand for specific courses, because we do not use wait-list data in ICLM. Instead it is based on the students successful in getting into classes.

Q: The only way to know that a student will take a certain Economics or Business course is based on previous behavior, so then FTES is being calculated strictly on the basis of past student demand. Then where do the non-demand factors such as resource effectiveness, interdependence, contribution to the academic field, and alternative forms of instruction fit in to this budget model?

A: They are reflected in the actions of the colleges and the decisions they make about course offerings within the college.

Q: Are the dollars per FTES different per college?

A: Yes.

Q: Is the amount given different based on whether the student is undergraduate or graduate?

A: Not in the dollar amount given, but FTES are weighted for graduate students, so there is a differential funding level.

Q: What is the difference between goal FTES and target FTES?

A: Target FTES represents two things. For resident students the target FTES is set by the Chancellor's Office. We have no control over that number. When it comes to non-resident students, the target and the goals are not set by the Chancellor's Office. The target is the number we think we can safely achieve, and the goal is the additional enrollment we think we can achieve. The goal FTES is everything that is over our target FTES.

Q: We have seven colleges and their budgets range from the lowest budget of \$8.5 million to the largest budget for the College of Science at almost \$20 million. The Athletics budget is about three times larger than the College of Education's budget, two times larger than the College of Business budget, and 20% larger than the College of Science budget. Two-thirds of that money is subsidies that go to Athletics to the tune of \$15-\$17 million. This would fund another large college. How does Academic Affairs feel about this and is there anything you can do about it?

A: Point of order, we haven't even been given the Athletics budget for this year yet.

Q: I am using last year's budget of \$24 million for Athletics, and previous years budgets were always over \$20 million. I doubt that these numbers will have changed that drastically this year.

A: I have to say that the Provost is a member of the cabinet and has a voice at the table. I'm sure he has expressed any concerns to the group. I believe we have to respect the decisions made by the campus leadership.

Q: Your document states non-resident enrollment does not impact our resident enrollment levels. When I am handing out add codes, I don't ask if a student is resident or non-resident, so how can you say it doesn't impact resident enrollment?

A: I definitely sympathize with the faculty who face this situation. The problem is that we have an imbalance in the headcount of students versus the FTES target. I think we have too many headcount students right now. In the long run it will be very important to improve our graduation rates. It is a two-step process. We need to admit the right number of students so that our student body is in balance with our FTES target, but we also need to address bottleneck courses. These are issues we are thinking about and need to address.

Q: For non-resident students my college, the College of Social Sciences, was allocated 4 FTES and the College of Engineering was allocated 417, why?

A: It has to do with the fact that a lot of our non-resident students are Engineering Graduate students.

IX. New Business – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.