

2002/2003 Academic Senate**MINUTES
March 17, 2003****I. The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty Senators were present.****Ex Officio:**Present: Caret, Brent, Peter, Van Selst
Shifflett, Nellen, Martinez**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Gonzales, Yen, David, Palakurthi

Administrative Representatives:Present: Kassing, Rascoe,
Goodman
Absent: Lee**COB Representatives:**

Present: Donoho

Deans:Present: Breivik, Gorney-Moreno
Absent: Andrew, Meyers**ED Represent:**

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz, Rickford

Students:Present: Tsai, Yuan, Tran
Absent: Greathouse, Ortiz
Trujillo**ENG Representatives:**Present: Singh
Absent: Pour, Hambaba**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Guerra

H&A Representatives:Present: Williams, Sabalius, Desalvo,
Vanniarajan, Van Hooff**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:Present: Boothby, Matthes, Veregge
Absent: Stacks**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Present: Norton

SOS Representatives:

Present: Ray, Ogaz

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Main, Liu

SW Representative:

Present: Hines

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –
Minutes of February 17, 2003—will review at the next meeting.****III. Communications****A. From the Chair of the Senate –**

Chair Brent gave a brief report on the CSU Budget Summit he attended last week in Long Beach. All campus Presidents, Associated Students Presidents, and Academic Senate Chairs were invited to attend. The first part of the meeting was a series of presentations outlining the magnitude of the problem facing us. Chair Brent said that he would not bore everyone with the specific numbers because they are subject to change, except to stress that the CSU firmly believes that the Governor's budget, the one you've been reading about in the paper which calls for up to a 10% cut in the CSU budget, is the best possible budget we can hope to receive.

Jolene Koester, the President of CSU Northridge, made the most interesting presentation, hair Brent said. Koester compared the current budget crisis to the budget crisis the CSU experienced in the early 1990's. She said that the budget cuts we are facing today are comparable in dollar amounts to the budget cuts we experienced at that time. However, there are several differences today that will make these budget cuts more severe than those in the early 1990's. For example, in the early 1990's the budget to the CSU was cut, but the state only expected campuses to serve those students that were currently enrolled. The state is expecting us to accommodate enrollment growth of approximately 7% on top of the budget cuts this year. In addition, Koester stated that the legislature and the public's expectations of accountability/assessment have increased. One participant said, "we are increasingly being called upon to show that we are providing a quality education to our students, at the same time the state is making it more difficult to provide a quality education." Koester indicated that there are several costs that either didn't exist back in the early 1990's, or were significantly lower than they are today. These costs include risk management (insurance and lawsuit costs), energy costs that are significantly higher than they were ten years ago, and unfunded mandates from the state. According to the CSU, we have been forced to absorb almost \$800million in unfunded mandates over the past several years.

Chair Brent said the afternoon session consisted of breakout groups in which individuals were invited to brainstorm about their ideas for dealing with the budget deficit. Some of the ideas that came out of these sessions include: urging the state legislature to have student fee increases phased in over time and tied to the consumer price index, rather than having them stay flat for years and then jump 35% in a single year; pushing for a graduate fee differential; if the student-faculty ratio is increased, then having the legislature include a sunset provision stating that it is only temporary; freezing administrator, faculty, and staff salaries; salary cuts; reducing faculty assigned time; eliminating the state-supported summer session; eliminating, or reducing athletics budgets; reducing the number of administrators; encouraging FERP faculty to go on a voluntary one-year furlough; reducing the number of units needed for graduation; outsourcing services; diversifying funding sources; and giving campuses as much flexibility as possible in deciding how to implement budget cuts.

Questions:

Senator Tran asked about the discussions on reducing administrator salaries. Chair Brent said that he indicated that we needed to ensure administrator salaries increased no more than faculty salaries by percentage. When he said this, several of the university Presidents laughed and stated that this would be a bigger increase than they got this year.

Chair Brent then turned the meeting over to Senator Shifflett to give a brief presentation about WASC accreditation. Senator Shifflett said there will be a campus wide meeting related to WASC's accreditation review of SJSU on April 15th. She encouraged Senators to attend campus meetings.

B. From the President of the University –

President Caret apologized for having to leave for Sacramento before the SOTE debate.

President Caret briefly summarized the way the CSU system has been planning on handling enrollment growth by using technology, hiring more faculty, extending hours, offering courses on Fridays, offering courses in the summer, offering courses in the late afternoon again, building some new buildings, and hoping the economy bounces back.

President Caret stated that the state still has this dream of being able to provide almost free education, but they can't afford it.

President Caret said some of the reasons why there are more administrators today than there were ten years ago include: having to have somebody because of the Patriot Act; having to have more people in Financial Aid to counsel students on debt; having to have many more auditors than previously required; needing more police; having to have risk management people that we didn't have to have before; having to have more lawyers than we needed in the past; having more people in assessments than we had in the past; having more people in community service and outreach efforts; and having more people in technology and technology support networks than we've ever had before. If you add all these people up, there is no way around the need for more administrators than we had in the past.

President Caret said the area where he would like to see more money spent is on hiring development officers. According to President Caret, we bring in over 700% on every dollar we spend on fundraising. "Only the insane would not invest at a 700% return on their investment," President Caret stated.

President Caret said Chair Brent had done a great job of summarizing the CSU Budget Summit. If we look at all the alternatives if the budget gets worse, we would have to consider furloughs. A furlough is another way to take your salary, but give it back by taking a couple of unpaid days off. It all depends on what happens with our budget, and when we can see what we are going to be facing. The President said he put out an email saying that we can go through the rest of this year without any changes in staffing, other than the normal changes we experience in a year, unless somebody does something else to us. In addition, if we get the Governor's budget, we should be able to go through the 2003/2004 academic year without any changes in staffing, except for perhaps a few less sections and a few less lecturers than we've had in the past. However, if we don't get the Governor's budget, or something equal to the Governor's budget, we would be in trouble. Then the CSU will be looking at \$150 million in additional cuts, President Caret stated. All we can do is inform the legislature of the situation, and let them know that we will not be able to continue to do this in the future, President Caret said. At a meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Presidential Representatives, the only state that was currently happy with their budget was Wyoming. Maryland is already into furloughs and layoffs. Virginia is very, very close to layoffs and furloughs, the President said. Our community colleges have been devastated, they have already sent out pink slips on March 15th warning people that they may be terminated. President Caret said that he expects whole programs

may be terminated at the community colleges. If we get the Governor's budget, the CSU system is looking at about a \$250 million cut this year, President Caret said. If we don't get the Governor's budget, that cut could be much, much higher—maybe even \$400, \$500, or as high as \$600 million. We have this cut to worry about, but we also have huge unmet needs on our campus such as: the faculty and staff salary lag which totals about \$130 million; and extreme needs in the library for instructional equipment that totals almost \$700 million. We have hundreds of millions of dollars in needs that we are trying to meet as if we were getting a normal budget. "This is going to be tough, and these cuts aren't going to be invisible," President Caret stated.

Questions:

Senator Shifflett asked if there had been any coordination between the various campus Presidents in trying to come up with universal ways of dealing with some of these issues? President Caret said where campus presidents have worked best together has been in the area of enrollment management. In addition, President Caret said there are times when the campuses help each other out with short-term loans, etc.

Senator Peter said the phrase he keeps hearing over and over is "if we get the Governor's budget," this is a pretty big "if" and we may not know whether we get this budget until well after the semester is started. What provisions have we made in the event we don't get the Governor's budget? President Caret said if we are in the middle of an academic year, and then find out that we are getting much larger cuts than expected, we would be in a catastrophic emergency situation. We might have to look at things like fee increases in the middle of the year again. In addition, President Caret said, you would use all your political clout to try and get enough funding to get through the end of the year. Once you are in a semester there is little you can do except ride it out, according to the President. However, one of the nice things about a large budget, whether it is our budget or the system budget, is that there is money to borrow against, so there are ways to work together on a short-term basis, President Caret stated.

Most of our growth right now is in our Graduate programs. We have more control over graduate admissions than undergraduate admissions. The law does not require us to take every graduate student that walks in the door, whereas we must take any qualified undergraduate student, the President stated.

Senator Singh asked how an increase in fees is approved in the CSU system. President Caret said that our board has the constitutional power to raise state university tuition. However, it is such a political issue in California, that they really can't raise fees without getting at least an informal nod from the Governor and the legislature. Senator Singh said that in the past we have raised and lowered fees. President Caret replied that in the past when tuition was cut, the legislature gave us the monetary difference in the general fund. If we had kept the student fees going up by the consumer price index (CPI) each year, then we wouldn't be looking at a 35% increase this year.

Senator Shifflett asked if it had been impressed upon the legislature that we could not continue taking new students without adequate funding. President Caret said that they may not have been aware that most of our budget (70%) is labor costs, and that only 30% is operating costs. There is only so much money that can be eliminated from the operating costs, before you have to consider reducing labor costs.

Senator Palakurthi asked President Caret whether he had considered what programs might have to be cut if we sustained budget cuts higher than expected. President Caret said what he has been doing first, is having a hiring freeze over the past year. In addition, each of the Vice Presidents has been asked to consider where they would cut anywhere from 2 to 15% of their budgets if it became necessary. President Caret said he hasn't asked his Vice Presidents to write this down, he has just asked them to brainstorm where they could make the cuts. If we get the Governor's budget, we don't have any intention of eliminating any programs, according to President Caret.

Senator Singh asked about the possibility of limiting enrollment to a better quality of student. At the present time we can't do that, President Caret said. We are bound by law to take the top third of high school graduates.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

February 24, 2003 – deferred to next meeting.

March 10, 2003 – deferred to next meeting.

Budget Advisory Committee Minutes –

February 17, 2003 – deferred to next meeting.

March 3, 2003 – deferred to next meeting.

B. Consent Calendar – Approved as is.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1199, Senate Management Resolution: Creation of a Task Force on Department Chairs (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1199 passed unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee – None

B. University Library Board –

Chair Branz presented *AS 1201, Sense of the Senate Resolution: SJSU Library Budget Study Report and Recommendations (First Reading)*. Chair Branz gave a

brief description of the resolution. Chair Branz said that every area of the university has been struggling with budget cuts, however, the library has been suffering disproportionately. The library has done some comparison research with the six large CSU campuses on library staffing per 10,000 FTES. According to Chair Branz, even if you take the most favorable comparison, SJSU's library is 8% lower on staffing. For Journals and Books, the SJSU Library is about 18% lower than the six large CSU campuses. If you total all library operations, the SJSU library is about 10% lower than the other six large CSU campuses. Chair Branz said that graduate programs require the greatest amount of library resources, and as President Caret said, we have a large graduate population. Chair Branz said that the slide that impressed him the most was the one that shows SJSU's total budget versus the library's budget. Chair Branz stated, "As you can see in 1991/1992 both budgets suffered considerable cuts. However, the university as a whole has come back about 20% since that time, whereas the library has not." Chair Branz also stated that the decline of purchasing power is greater than the rate of inflation. The University Library Board has several recommendations in this proposal. Chair Branz said the first recommendation is that the Academic Senate keep this issue on the front burner so that we have no further slippage, and that we try to get the library back up to an appropriate level with state funds. The second recommendation deals with ways of convincing the state legislature or the CSU as a whole to try to get some more external state dollars. The third recommendation deals with external non-state dollars and ways of establishing endowments. And, the last recommendation deals with some operation and accountability items. Chair Branz said there is no timeline associated with this resolution, and that the University Library Board recognizes these are hard budget times.

Questions:

Senator Singh asked about the recent fundraising for the library. Chair Branz said the \$2 million raised was for the building only.

Senator Donoho said that she did not believe that F98-5 required the library to do a program planning review. Senator Donoho said that the program planning reviews are only required of instructional units. Senator Breivik said that there is language in the policy that that calls for a review. Senator Donoho asked how the University Library Board expects the Senate to vote on a future recommendation for budgeting, with no current monetary figures. The budget data shown in this report is from 1997/1998, and that information is too old.

Senator Norton stated that this resolution is asking the Academic Senate to earmark funds for the library as a permanent priority. Senator Norton said, it is not a good idea to earmark funds for the future.

Senator Peter asked if the University Library Board knew why the library did not recapture its losses as the university did between 1991 and 1998. Senator Breivik said she had asked Linda Bain during her job interview about this, but Linda didn't know.

Senator Shifflett suggested that the University Library Board not ask the Academic Senate to endorse, or set specific targeted goals. Senator Shifflett said we need flexibility.

C. Professional Standards Committee –

Senator Katz presented *AS 1189, Policy Recommendation: Procedures to be Followed when Administering SOTEs (Final Reading)*. Senator Peter presented a one-page amendment to change section 6.0 of the policy as follows:

6.0 Universal Application of the SOTES

6.1 Normally, every class taught for credit granted by SJSU shall be evaluated using the SOTE instrument.

6.2 Only those SOTES selected in accordance with the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) shall be placed in an employee's personnel action file. These courses shall be selected prior to administration of the SOTES in accordance with the CBA (a minimum of two annually jointly determined by the faculty member and the chair/department) and the results returned to the faculty member and the personnel file as per existing practices. Departments or equivalent units may continue to require that all members evaluate all classes for the personnel action file in provision with the CBA.

6.3 All SOTE evaluations that are conducted that are not selected to be included in the personnel action file shall be returned to faculty members for their personal and exclusive use with the exceptions that these SOTE ratings can

6.3.1 be used along with other SOTES for purposes of establishing department, college, and university norms.

6.3.2 be used for purposes of academic development or other assessment provided that anonymity is maintained.

6.4 Implementation date. This full section (6.0) shall be implemented in Fall 2003 for purposes of establishing baseline norms. Section 6.1, requiring evaluation of all courses, may be suspended for up to two years if the President determines that the cost of implementation is inappropriate given the budget climate. The policy will become fully effective in Fall 2005.

The current section 6.2 as listed below was deleted.

~~6.2 The passage by the Senate of this policy recommendation and its acceptance by the President shall be understood to constitute "an agreement by the administration and faculty to evaluate all classes" in fulfillment of conditions listed in the CFA/CSU MOU (May 14, 2002-June 30, 2004) and any successor agreements that carry this language.~~

A new section was inserted after the final resolved clause as follows:

Financial Impact: \$18,250 per semester. When adjusted for the already funded Research Technician position, it's estimated that the costs for universal implementation will be in the range of \$7,000-\$10,000 per semester.

The Senate debated this issue at great length. It then voted on the Peter amendment and the amendment passed by voice vote.

Senator Martinez presented an amendment to add a section 3.4 that says, "After SOTEs have been collected and sealed faculty will promulgate a brief discussion during the class period. The proctor will write down class comments and give feedback concerning the clarity of relevance of the evaluating instrument and process. These student responses will then be forwarded to the Professional Standards Committee." Senator Peter made a motion to send the Martinez amendment back to the Professional Standards Committee for inclusion in the basic policy. Senator Peter withdrew this motion after debate. The Senate then voted on the Martinez amendment and the amendment failed. **The Senate then voted on AS 1189, as amended by the Peter Amendment, and it passed.**

D. Curriculum and Research Committee – No Report

E. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Liu presented *AS 1197, Policy Recommendation: Writing Requirements Committee Composition (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1197 passed unanimously.**

F. Budget Advisory Committee –

Senator Nellen presented *AS 1200, Sense of the Senate Resolution: Urging the CSU to give Campuses the Maximum Flexibility in Dealing with the Budget Crisis (Final Reading)*. Senator Martinez made a motion to extend the meeting 5 minutes. The Senate voted and the motion passed. **The Senate then voted on AS 1200 and it passed.**

VII. Special Committee Reports – deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time

VIII. New Business – deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time

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

- A. Vice President for Administration – deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time**
- B. Vice President for Student Affairs – deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time**
- C. Associated Students President – deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time**
- D. Statewide Academic Senate – deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time**
- E. Provost – deferred to the next meeting due to the lack of time**

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

