

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES
November 2, 2015

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

Ex Officio:

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

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Martin, Blaylock, Feinstein,
Larochelle, Lanning

COB Representatives:

Present: Sibley, Virick, Campsey

Deans:

Present: Green, Hsu, Jacobs, Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Mathur, Laker

Students:

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

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Bacich, Grindstaff, Khan, Riley

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

SCI Representatives:

Present: Kaufman, Clements
Absent: White, Beyersdorf

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Curry, Wilson
Absent: Coopman

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Medina
Absent: Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of October 5, 2015 were approved as written (45-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kimbarow welcomed Senators and announced the Chancellor will be here Wednesday, November 4, 2015, for an open forum from 11 a.m. to noon in the Student Union.

The position description for the new President has been finalized and Chair Kimbarow asked the Chancellor to send it to everyone on campus. If the Chancellor doesn't send it out, Chair Kimbarow will.

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Martin announced that she had moved into the President's house and

had over 1,000 trick or treaters on Halloween. It was a lot of fun to be a part of that.

The President and her cabinet are working on safety, critical facility, and classroom issues this year including what can we get done, what must done, and how we pay for it.

The President and the Provost are also looking at enrollment targets and are challenging these. There are some real bottlenecks in class availability for students delaying graduation. The Chancellor will be here on November 4, 2015, and the President and Provost will be speaking with him about this.

The President is also taking a look at fundraising.

The President and her cabinet will focus on strengthening the team, getting things done, and trying to enhance the campus as we move forward this year.

Questions:

Q: You mentioned trying to get some resources to deal with bottlenecks, can you explain exactly what you mean?

A: Money. We need about \$2.7 million. The Provost commented that the average unit load is about 12.4 units, and he and the President would like to see this increase to 13 units. You can't graduate in four years with 12 units. One of challenges in fixing this is the artificial cap on FTES. The Provost and President will speak with the Chancellor about this. The Provost hopes to increase the FTES allocated to our students by 1,000, but keep the headcount the same. However, we would not get any additional funding for this and would have to pay for it ourselves, so we are looking at what our priorities are on the campus. Interim President Martin commented that we have over 10,000 students that have over 90 credits.

Q: Do we have a good handle on how many students are taking classes that are not moving them towards graduation?

A: Provost Feinstein announced the average number of credits students have when they graduate is about 155. What this tells me is that students are taking a lot of classes they don't need to graduate. Many are probably taking classes just to keep their financial aid. Senator Sabalius noted that he was insulted by the idea that classes students take that they don't need for their degree are being considered a waste.

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

A. CSU Statewide Senators –

Senator Lee announced the CSU Statewide Senate will meet later this week and there isn't much to report at this time. However, out of the 23 campuses, 20 have a resolution on file now calling for more open Presidential Searches.

B. Provost –

Provost Feinstein announced the review committee for the AVP of Student Academic Success Services, Maureen Scharberg, has been charged. Dr. Ron Rogers was selected as the Chair of that committee, and they will have their report by the end of the semester.

The Dean of the Library staff and college nominees are due by the end of the week. The Senate Office put out a call for the two faculty outside of the Library seats on the search committee, as well as a call for nominations for a student representative. The call for nominations for the faculty and student seats has been extended through Monday, November 9, 2015. The Executive Committee will review and select these members at their November 16, 2015 Executive Committee meeting.

The Dean of the College of Business Search Committee college nominees are due Monday, November 9, 2015. The Provost is also looking for a faculty member outside the college, and he would like that faculty member to be a Senator. Interested Senators not from the College of Business were encouraged to make an appointment to speak with the Provost.

The Provost Office has a new Academic Spotlight blog. Provost Feinstein asked Senators to sign-up for the blog and to participate in it.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) –

Interim Vice President Josee Larochelle announced that over 95 staff members were honored at the Staff Service Awards last Thursday in the Student Union. There were five staff members with 35 years of service.

The Run, Hide, Defend Workshops on campus will continue to be offered every semester.

Interim VP Larochelle is working with the University Police Department (UPD) and Facilities, Development, and Operations (FDO) on a Safety Master Plan.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –

Vice President Blaylock announced that the Career Center and Alumni Relations will offer the Linked-in Bus on November 4, 2015. The Linked-in Bus only attends a few campuses per year. Our students will have the opportunity from 10:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. to take head shots and get free profile advice. This service normally costs between \$250 and \$400, but our students will be able to attend for free.

On November 9, 2015, the on campus Veterans Office will celebrate Veteran's Day.

On November 3, 2015, the second of two conversations called Community Conversations—Creating a Safe and Inclusive Campus Climate will be held in the

Student Union Ballroom from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

There is a meet and greet summit in which 55 colleagues from 12 of the local community colleges will be on campus this Friday, November 6, 2015. They will be here all day and we will be learning about updates to our supplemental applications to transfer students, articulation conversations, academic services, etc.

Questions:

Q: Would it be possible to have the information about the Linked-in Bus sent out via email to Senators?

A: VP Blaylock will send this information to Senators.

E. Associated Students President (AS):

Senator and Vice President of Associated Students, Josh Romero reported that AS had their Second Annual Haunted House. There were over 1,000 students in attendance and the line went from the front of the AS House to the Event Center at one point.

The two Homecoming Queens this year are Diana Garcia and Drew Warmlesley.

The first students selected to receive the Gold Point Cards to take a faculty member to lunch have been selected.

AS is working on their AS Government restructure and hope to finish this by the end of the semester.

F. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA):

The Tower Foundation Board Retreat was held last month and one of the top priorities for next year is identifying the next generation of board members. UA is actively seeking board members from the current membership, local community, our donor base, alumni, etc. The same is true for the Alumni Association Board.

UA is looking into firms to do an assessment and feasibility study for a future comprehensive fundraising campaign that will focus on both endowment building as well as capital needs.

UA recently hired a Senior Development Director for the College of Business and his name is Bradley Bartan. He will begin working November 16, 2015.

UA is just now launching a search for a new Director of Planned Giving.

The next issue of Washington Square will be distributed throughout the campus by the end of November/beginning of December.

There are 56 new “My Story” Banners coming out that feature student, alumni, faculty, and donor stories. Stories associated with the banners will also be posted on the website.

The Student Union will also get additional artwork delivered in December in anticipation of the opening of the rest of the Student Union in early Spring.

V. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Exec. Minutes of September 28, 2015 – No questions.

Exec. Minutes of October 12, 2015 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar of November 2, 2015 was approved (45-0-0).**

Senator Peter introduced Dean Walt Jacobs a new Senator from the College of Social Sciences.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No Report

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

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

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to change lines 132-134 to read, “San José State University defines cheating as the act of obtaining credit, attempting to obtain credit, or assisting others to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means.”

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to lines 355 and 356 to read, “Academic standing shall revert to the standing that would have existed if the sanction had not been imposed.” The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Kaufman amendment passed (45-0-0).**

Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 143 to read, **“1.1.3 submitting work simultaneously presented in two or more courses...”**.

Senator Sibley presented an amendment that was friendly to change lines 144-145 to read, **“prior approval of all course instructors or by the departmental policies of all departments;”**

Senator Heiden presented an amendment to line 345 to read, “determined by the BAFPR, a request to the President, Provost or appropriate vice president can be made by the

student, faculty member, or chair to expedite the resolution.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Laker presented an amendment to the Heiden amendment that was friendly to change line 345 to read, “determined by the BAFPR, a request to the President, Provost or appropriate vice president can be made by the BAFPR Chair and/or student.” **The Senate voted and the Heiden/Laker amendment passed (45-0-0).**

Senator Heiden called the question on debate. **The Senate voted and the motion passed (45-0-0).**

The Senate voted and AS 1582 passed as amended (45-0-0)

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1589, Policy Recommendation, Attendance and Participation (First Reading)*.

One of our oldest policies still in effect is F69-24 called “Attendance,” and it says attendance can’t be used as a means of grading students. Despite this policy being on the books, the Student Fairness Committee (SFC) has seen a number of cases in which students are graded on things that require students to be in class without clearly stating what percentage of the grade, or how it will be assessed, etc. This referral came to I&SA for us to update the Attendance policy to clearly reflect that participation is different than attendance, and that if you are going to grade on participation you have to be clear about how you are going to do so such as by specifying what percentage of the grade will be based on participation.

Questions:

Q: I know a faculty member that grades on participation and participation is “showing up” so how is that different than attendance?

A: That would be specifically not allowed by this policy and your colleague should not do this. The existing policy states that attendance by itself cannot be used as an item for grading.

Q: Would the committee consider allowing attendance as something that can be graded on, and if not, why not?

A: To the best of my knowledge, there is nothing in Title V, statute, etc. that says we cannot grade on attendance. However, it has been a 46 year policy at this campus. This referral was to make a determination on the difference between attendance and something gradable. The committee will consider this.

Q: For instance, how can you gauge participation in large classes? I think grading on attendance in those classes would be something you might like to use.

A: In our large classes, we use clickers to get feedback and identify participation in the class.

Q: Has the committee considered putting in sample language that might be acceptable?

A: Yes, in an earlier draft we had example language, but we decided that we don’t have written lists that say what things you can use to grade on, so why should we have

examples of participation you can use to grade on.

Q: If my greensheet indicates that ½ of all examinations are based on the assigned reading and the other ½ is based entirely on the lectures and class activities, is that legal according to the new policy?

A: My understanding is that it is.

Q: Am I correct that students would have the right to challenge it if the student feels it says participation in the greensheet, but it really means attendance?

A: They currently have the right to do this, but despite that the SFC is still getting cases where you sit in a seat and the faculty member is checking off a box that you are there.

Q: Why are we rescinding F69-24 when the resolved clause re-states that attendance can't be used as a criteria for grading. Why not just modify F69-24? The reason I ask is that I use this for teaching and when students ask why they can't be graded on attendance, I tell them this goes back to when students were protesting heavily in the 1960's, some faculty were busting their chops by flunking them. That is why this policy was created. I think we are sort of gutting our institutional memory by rescinding F69-24. If you want to modify it, I would be for that and I do use participation in my grading.

A: Thank you. I was not aware of that history and will bring that back to the committee for consideration.

Q: Has the committee considered how they are defining participation, because I believe exemplars are needed?

A: Yes, there was quite a bit of discussion about this. The things that were listed in the draft were thought to be too narrow a set and the committee was unwilling to try and draft an exhaustive list, but we will certainly come back to this question in committee.

Q: With regard to participation vs. attendance, I'm thinking of oral communication classes where it is vital that they have a live audience when students are giving speeches. I think we need to be very careful in defining participation in such a way that it will be inclusive of courses that demand live audiences such as oral communication classes. I was told the origin of this policy was that there was one department giving out "A's" merely for showing up for class. There was a big surprise when it was reprinted in the catalog and people thought it was a prohibition on subtracting from the grade for lack of attendance. I was told it was the Physical Education Department at the time that just graded on attendance alone. For decades I have heard that the intent of the original policy was misinterpreted.

A: I'll have to defer to others on that. The referral came to us specifically from the SFC because cases were coming to them of faculty grading on just being in the seat. My reading of F69-24 is that you cannot be graded on just being in the seat. We now seem to have two origin stories for this policy.

Q: We have a credit hour policy on the syllabi that requires that students attend classes as 1/3rd of the credit for university coursework mandated by the federal government. The

other issue is student success where we know that attendance in class is a fundamental ingredient for success at a university. This policy, the old one, has always upset me as a faculty member, because I can't give credit where credit is due. The new policy doesn't upset me as much, but it does still upset me. I'm wondering if the committee would consider just rescinding the old policy?

A: The committee will consider it, but I can't tell you how the committee will respond.

Q: I wonder how this policy corresponds with the policy we just passed in terms of being able to get credit for coursework simply by exam which seems to imply that one does not need to participate. There are a range of students and methodologies that are available to the students and there may be alternative ways of getting information other than just by attendance, except where the faculty member does believe that participation is a very integral part of the class. Was it one of the things that was under consideration by C&R when they were thinking about the courses you could challenge that they were under the purview of the department as to when you need participation and when you do not?

A: It did not come up in C&R discussions at all.

Q: I had a class where they did grade on participation, but it was a Kinesiology class and there wasn't much else to grade on. You started with 100 points and lost 2 points every time you missed a class.

A: So if you have showed up for the classes and didn't dance, would they have done the same thing?

Q: If you just said your name and you were there you got two points.

A: That sounds like it is outside of policy. I would hope you would get credit in a course for more than just showing up.

Q: Does the current or proposed policy preclude a situation where a course has participation as a grade criterion, but the student that is on the cusp of the next higher grade is given that grade because they showed up, or would that situation run afoul of the current or new policy?

A: I think it would run afoul of the policy, because just showing up is not gradable.

Q: I can't help but recall the establishing a committed presence in a class policy and how strange this is that in terms of refunds, tuition, and financial matters we have a policy stipulating you must show up, but we can't grade on attendance.

A: As far as the committed presence policy is concerned, a significant chunk of that is to make room for students that want to get into the class, and there is someone that shows no interest in being in the class.

Q: Did you consider that when Senator Stacks asked the question about credit by examination that those students don't get any unit credit and that makes a lot of difference if you are getting unit credit for a course to which you are enrolled then you should show up?

A: I believe that question was asked during the debate over the credit by exam policy. It was not something that was in the purview of I&SA, but that is a fair point.

Q: Has the committee considered that when it comes to students and attendance, if the student doesn't want to go to class it should be their choice?

A: The point of this policy is to say that if you are going to grade on being in the classroom, you need to make it clear this is the case. This way students can make an informed decision about whether to show up or not.

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

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1591, Senate Management Resolution, Amend Senate Standing Rule: Senate Meeting Agenda (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 41 to add, “of the rules” after “meeting with a suspension.”

The Senate voted and AS 1591 passed as amended (45-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1592, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Graduate Studies and Research Committee Membership (Final Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Have you considered changing the acronym of “GUP” to something else?

A: The office is called Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. The Provost will consider this.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to change the vote to 5-0-0.

The Senate voted and AS 1592 was approved as amended (45-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1586, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Membership (Final Reading)*.

Senator Backer presented an amendment that was friendly to add commas where appropriate to lines 80-82 to read, “(4) When there are multiple applications for any seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential IRB-HS members, attention should focus on the person’s research skills and...”

Senator Backer presented an amendment that was friendly to remove “CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative)” from line 71-72 and line 74. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Backer amendment that was friendly to replace “online CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative) with “approved” on lines 71-72 and “approved IRB reviewer” on line 74.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to replace “attending the” on line 75 to “voting at their.”

The Senate voted on AS 1586 as amended and it passed (45-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1587, Senate Management Resolution, Dissolving the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1587 was approved (44-1-0).

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

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to add another resolved clause at line 46 to read, “Resolved: That SM-S03-1 be rescinded since reporting responsibilities are part of this policy recommendation.”

The Senate voted and AS 1579 was approved as amended (43-0-2).

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

Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to the last sentence in line 44 to change “policy recommendation” to “policy.”

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to add a new section 1.4.6 to read as follows:

“1.4.6. The Board may appoint General Education Advisory Panels (GEAPs). Each GEAP shall be focused on a specific curricular requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the Board. The creation of GEAPs shall be at the discretion of the Board, except for the American Institutions GEAP which is required.

1.4.6.1 Purpose. A GEAP shall provide the Board with advice drawn from disciplinary expertise and may assist the Board with the workload associated with reviewing and assessing courses associated with a particular curricular requirement.

1.4.6.2 Membership. The membership of Advisory Panels shall be determined by the Board but shall be no less than three persons, and shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience relevant to the particular curricular requirement.

1.4.6.3 American Institutions. The American Institutions GEAP shall include, at a minimum, a representative with a doctorate in Political Science who specializes in American and California Government, a representative with a doctorate in History who

specializes in United States History, and a representative who has taught American Institutions requirements in an interdisciplinary context outside of the Political Science and History departments. The AI panel may advise the Board on the GE content of curricular proposals that seek to meet both AI and GE requirements. The AI panel shall make the determination whether such proposals meet AI requirements.”

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the Peter amendment to add “specific proposals pertaining to certification or continuing certification” in line 249.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to change the Peter/Shifflett amendment to section 1.4.4.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to lines 253 and 254 to strike the last sentence that reads, “The AI panel shall make the determination whether such proposals meet AI requirements.”

A motion was made to postpone debate to the next meeting. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion was approved (45-0-0).

E. University Library Board (ULB) – None

VIII. Special Committee Reports –

Interim VP of Administration and Finance, Josee Larochelle gave the University Budget highlights presentation for 2015-2016 and introduced Bradley Olin, the new University Budget & Risk Management Director

The state fully funded the CSU support budget for this year to the tune of \$216 million. This was a tremendous feat for the CSU. It has been about a decade since the state fully funded the CSU support budget as requested. This amounted to about \$96 million more than what was in the Governor’s original budget proposal.

Questions:

Q: Could you explain what the support budget is for those that haven’t attended one of these budget presentations before?

A: Sure, the support budget is the amount of funds requested by the CSU Chancellor’s Office and Board of Trustees from the State of California as part of the State of California appropriation to support higher education as provided by the CSU.

What this meant for SJSU is that we did receive 3% enrollment growth for this fiscal year. Also, the CSU was able to fund compensation increases for this year. This year our self-supporting programs also have good financial footing. Self-supporting programs are programs that charge a fee for a something such as housing, parking, student health, and counseling. This means they have a balanced budget and they have some funds available to be put aside for improvements, deferred maintenance, expansion, etc.

In the 2014-2015 fiscal year, the state legislature provided a new capital financing framework for the CSU. Each California State University is now responsible for maintaining our capital infrastructure—our buildings. We no longer participate in the state general obligation bond program. With that responsibility, we now have the authority to create a campus reserve program. In the past, that reserve program was restricted and monitored significantly because the state prohibited CSU campuses from creating what appeared to be huge cash reserves without an intended purpose. Now that the state is no longer financing CSU infrastructure directly, we can increase our reserve to support buildings on campus, whether it is maintenance, repair, or new construction.

The campus priorities that were funded for this fiscal year include putting aside funds for our buildings and infrastructure as well as \$2 million in one-time funds for the campus reserve. We have over a \$300 million operating budget and we do not have any designated reserves. Base funding on this campus is permanent reoccurring funding. One-time funds are just that, one time funds provided for a specific purpose or intent. These are not funded every year.

Questions:

Q: Could you explain the Athletics funding of \$1.6 million?

A: The campus funded \$1.6 million identified as total cost of attendance for Athletics. What this really should say is funding to support our student athletes. The \$1.6 million in one-time funds are only for this year and is dedicated to funding scholarships for student athletes to reflect the full cost of attendance. The full cost of attendance includes items over and above the financial aid component previously there. It pays for things like additional meals, books, driving time, etc. NCAA has modified and increased the cost that should be provided to student athletes based on the limited time these students have outside of meeting academic and athletic obligations..

Q: Why is it one-time? Is the cost going to go down next year?

A: No, however, Athletics has been challenged with fundraising in order to support this permanent need. Athletics is working with UA to see if they can increase their financial support from our donor base for our athletes.

Q: If they don't increase their fundraising, then will they have to have another \$1.6 million next year?

A: Correct.

Q: In one of the previous slides you show that the percentage of the operating budget going to Intercollegiate Athletics is at 2.8%. Is that \$1.6 million in addition to the 2.8%?

A: It is included in the 2.8%

Q: Why is it 2.8%? Weren't we supposed to stick with 2% maximum?

A: There was a past agreement with a past President and the Academic Senate that discussed that 2%. We have not been at the 2.0% since before Interim VP Larochelle's arrival at SJSU.

The last slide is a pie chart that identifies the percentages across the division of our operating fund.

Questions:

Q: We have a policy recommendation coming before the Senate today to establish a Budget Advisory Committee. Let's say that passes and we put a call out this semester and it convenes in January 2016, what will they be working on as far as the budget is concerned? What can they weigh in on?

A: They will be able to weigh in on the budget this year and next year. If the BAC gets started in January, the President's cabinet will be working on finalizing the budget plan for the next fiscal year, 2016-2017. The BAC members would be able to understand what our priorities are as well as what our budgeted and targeted student enrollment will be.

Q: I have several questions. Where did the money come from for the severance package that was given to President Qayoumi? Where did the money come from to pay for the \$500,000 to \$1 million in stolen Information Technology equipment? Is there any clarification about the Superbowl team practices on campus and whether that will generate any income for us?

A: The University projects and estimates the number of students we will teach during the year as well as the state appropriations we can expect from the Chancellor. Then we have an expenditure plan associated with that plan's revenue. This is where the funding for President Qayoumi's severance package came from. This was an unplanned expenditure that had to be appropriately paid for out of the operating fund budget. Is your second question who pays for the lost equipment?

Q: Yes, my understanding is that IT equipment that was part of the CISCO agreement and amounted to between \$500,000 and \$1 million that was delivered to campus then stolen. Do we have insurance to cover this?

A: Yes. The original purchase of the equipment totaled \$28 million and came partly from the the operating budget and some CERF funds. We are still negotiating with the insurance company on reimbursing us. We are hopeful we will recover some of our funds.

Q: Has any of the original equipment been recovered at all?

A: No, and the individual charged with the crime is still incarcerated.

Q: Why do we not get a printout of the budget any longer? It is difficult to explain my questions without the report. Please go to page 25. The Athletics Division has a total budget of about \$26 million. The Athletics Division earns about \$10 million of this budget, so where does the other \$16 million in subsidies come from? It comes from the operating fund, which was supposed to be limited to 2% but is now almost 3% at about \$8 million, and the student fees, which account to another \$8.25 million. We should be outraged by these numbers. The Athletics Division costs us so much money. The reason we had the old agreement limiting the amount of funds given to the Athletics Division to 2% was because we had a group called "Spartans for Sanity" led by Dr. James Brent, a former Senate Chair. We had a campus referendum asking whether we should pull out of Division 1A football to save the campus money. Over 3/4 of the faculty voted for it. In order not to go to that and have a student referendum and have to explain to the students that each student pays about \$260, if not more, for Athletics, the President and the Senate agreed that the Athletics budget would not exceed 2% of the operating fund. It is an outrage that we subsidize the Athletics Division to the tune of \$16 million each year. The budget for our largest college is only approximately \$20 million. Then on Page 28, which lists the SSETF fees, you see that out of the \$10 million collected from students, \$8.25 million goes to Athletics. If I were a student I would think this is not right. My first question is where the \$8

million in one-time funds comes from? My second question is: where is the breakdown of the how the Athletics funds are spent? They can't possibly end each year at exactly \$0. Either we should stick to our 2% cap on the amount of the operating fund that goes to Athletics, or we should reopen this matter and inform students how much of their money is going to Athletics.

A: When Athletics started this year, they had a balanced budget. The past few years have been a challenge for our Athletics Director and our Athletics Program. This is the first year out of the past four years that they do not have a planned deficit at year end and hope to end the year at \$0 balance. The one-time funds are generated by excess enrollment or over our target. We budget fees as one-time for any student over our base targeted FTES.

Q: By the time President Kassing left, the percentage of the operating budget given to Athletics had went up to 2.3%. President Kassing had come to the Senate with the justification that the cost of tuition had went up and that was the initial .3% increase. That was many years ago. The increase from 2.3% to the 2.8% is probably due to the increase in the cost of attendance for students. For those not familiar with cost of attendance, this is a nationwide thing that recognizes that athletes do not have time to take part-time jobs. They were running at a deficit, because they were putting in a lot of hours without the part-time job and had lots of expenses related to attendance that were not covered in their scholarship, so they extended the scholarships to include additional things like meals and transportation. With the SSETF, it is important for everyone to know that the students had extensive consultation and meetings about SSETF fees and their distribution and they made pretty specific recommendations which were followed. Part of the confusion here comes from when the SSETF was lumped into one fee. The IRA and course support fees have always been there. The first four listed on the chart are new fees. The IRA and course support fees should not be listed as if they are new SSETF fees. The IRA and course support fees were agreed to by students many, many years ago.

Q: While I share the outrage over the funds given to Athletics, I am really outraged that the state of California only subsidizes the CSU at 42% and students are forced to pay 51%. That is outrageous and the students should rebel against this.

Q: Why is it that we are spending so much money on Athletics when students can't get the classes they need? Next semester one of my classes only has one section. Why can't some of this money be spent on additional classes?

A: SJSU has participated in NCAA Division 1A Athletics for many years and as an institution if we support Athletics Programs then we must provide support for them. Whether or not to have a Division 1A program would be a different question to ask.

Q: Why do we need to fund students that are athletes so they don't have to work, I have to work full-time and go to school full-time? It is ludicrous that we are giving Athletics \$8 million.

Q: Last year's pie chart showed that the amount given to Intercollegiate Athletics was only 2.1% of the operating fund while this year's percentage is 2.8%. I can't believe we jumped that much in one year. One of the charts must be wrong.

A: There is the \$1.6 million in one-time fees.

Q: There is another set of numbers provided by the Intercollegiate Athletics Division to the NCAA for last year, and those figures report higher amounts of operating fund and student fee

support than we were told. There is a \$2 million difference. Here we are again a year later and we have another disparity between what the Athletics Division is telling the NCAA and our budget report. Why is there a disparity?

A: These two reports are different in how they are generated. The difference has to do with one being a budget and the other being actuals. The NCAA also has the university report on university-funded items, such as the student athlete insurance. This isn't part of the Athletics budget and would appear under the University-Wide or Admin & Finance budget, but the NCAA wants to see that number.

Q: So what you are explaining is that parts of the budget allocated to other divisions outside of Intercollegiate Athletics is used to support Intercollegiate Athletics and the NCAA captures that from our reports?

A: Correct.

Q: On page 22, there is over \$19,000 for Study Abroad Programs. Is this \$19,000 distributed across all Study Abroad Programs, or is \$19,000 going to each Study Abroad Program?

A: Interim VP Larochelle will go back and get additional information regarding the Study Abroad Programs.

Q: What can the student government do going forward as related to limiting the SSETF Athletics fees? Should we survey the students?

A: There was a student survey done last year on SSETF fees.

Q: Yes, but it wasn't about the Athletics fee.

Q: Is there some kind of shift this year in the funds across divisions?

A: We did create a new division this year called the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. There are more funds going to Academic Affairs (AA) this year than last year. Last year AA got 56.6% and this year AA got 64.3%. Student Affairs got 5.9% last year and this year they got 6.5%. Administration and Finance got 12.3% last year and 13.7% this year. University Advancement (UA) got 2.1% last year and 2.3% this year. University-wide got 20.5% last year, and this year got 9.5%.

Q: So everyone went up except for this ambiguous category of University-wide.

A: Interim VP Larochelle will look into exactly why that happened and get back to the Senate with detailed information about this category.

Q: My understanding is that we get paid on an FTES basis by the CSU. Is this correct, or do we present a budget to the CSU?

A: No, we don't present a budget to the CSU. They give us what they think we should have. It is predicated on enrollment, but there are other things like compensation and benefits.

Q: We are one of three schools in Division 1A right? So, does the CSU give us more money per student because we are participating in an activity that requires stadiums, etc.

A: No.

Q: I just wanted to present a point of clarification. I think it is important for new Senators and Student Senators to be aware that the students voted previously on the SSETF fees, and the SSETF funds cannot go to increase classes. It is a designated fund and one of the conditions of

that fund was that it cannot be used for additional classes or to hire faculty, unless the Chancellor has changed this.

Chair Kimbarow announced to the Senate that he is considering a separate Senate meeting devoted entirely to the Budget next year to allow for more time for questions and discussion.

IX. New Business – None

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