

## 2003/2004 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
February 23, 2004**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-one Senators were present.****Ex Officio:**

Present: Crowley, Nellen, McNeil,  
Brent, Van Selst, Shokouh  
Absent: Sabalius

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: None  
Absent: Gonzales, Palakurthi, David

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Lee, Rascoe, Kassing  
Absent: Goodman

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Campsey, El-Shaieb, Donoho

**Deans:**

Present: Breivik, Gorney-Moreno,  
Andrew, Meyers

**ED Represent:**

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz

**Students:**

Present: None  
Absent: Gadamsetty, Sherman,  
Torres, Paat, Lam

**ENG Representatives:**

Present: Pour, Choo, Singh

**Alumni Representative:**

Absent: Guerra

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Van Hooff, Desalvo, Heisch, Vanniarajan, Stork,  
Hilliard

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Veregge, Bros, Kellum, Branz, Matthes

**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Present: Norton

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Baba, Von Till, Ogaz

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Thames, Liu, Yi

**SW Representative:**

Present: Coach

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –**

The Senate minutes of December 8, 2003 were approved as is.

**III. Communications****A. From the Chair of the Senate –**

Chair Nellen said, "The two vacant Senate seats in the College of the Humanities and the Arts have been filled." Chair Nellen then welcomed Judy Hilliard and Nancy Stork to the Senate. Chair Nellen said, "Information and nominating petitions for open Senate seats for 2004/2005 were emailed to faculty deans and directors last week, and this information is currently available on the web site. Nominating petitions are due in the Senate office on March 3, 2004." Chair Nellen announced, "There is also an open CSU Statewide Senate seat." Chair Nellen stated, "With this election, we will also be correcting two matters where we are out of compliance with our Senate Constitution--Article II, Section 1, which provides that at least two-thirds of total membership in the Senate shall be members holding office as faculty, and/or from the General Unit. Chair Nellen said, "To meet the two-thirds rule, we need to have 36 faculty Senators out of a total of 54 Senators. Somehow we dropped a Senator during the 90's, and another one last year. We are going to fix this with this election." Chair Nellen stated, "The other matter where we are out of compliance with our Constitution is that Article II, Section 3c says that one-third of the Senators should be elected each year." According to Chair Nellen, we do not have one-third of the Senators being elected this year. This was probably caused when Senators left mid-term and the new Senators received three-year appointments instead of the remaining term left on the original appointment. This election will get us back in line by staggering the terms again. Chair Nellen asked Senators to encourage colleagues to run for these open Senate seats. Chair Nellen stated, "We have open seats for the Colleges of Applied Sciences and the Arts, Education, Humanities and the Arts, Science, Social Science, and one CSU Statewide Senate seat."

Chair Nellen said that Senator Shokouh, the Associated Students President, has handed out a form to assist Senators in recruiting students in their classes for vacant committee seats. Chair Nellen said that, "Last Spring we passed S03-7 to make revisions to the SJSU policy on Academic Dishonesty, very notably we changed it to a policy on Academic Integrity, a more positive statement. I want to complement our new Judicial Affairs Officer, Debra Griffith, on releasing the first issue of the campus Academic Integrity newsletter."

Chair Nellen stated, "Over the winter break, the BAC and the Executive Committee worked on a revision to the University Budget policy. On February 2, 2004, the Executive Committee and BAC passed F04-1 establishing the Resource Planning Board (RTP). The RTP is designed to have members from the BAC and Senate involved in the budget discussions and decision-making to advise the President. The BAC won't be meeting in the Spring 2004, because we don't have much work to do, and because 10 of the 14 RTP members come from the BAC. The three faculty members that are on the BAC that aren't part of the RTP, will be included in revising the budget policy that will be brought to the Senate this spring."

Chair Nellen thanked Senators and the office staff for assisting with the Senate open house Wednesday, February 18, 2004.

Chair Nellen stated, "The Presidential Candidates, un-named as of now, will be on campus the week of April 12th. I assume it will be the same as last time where they hold open forums

from 10 a.m. until noon over the course of that week, so block out your schedules now." Chair Nellen said that she "expects the exact schedule, and candidates to be announced on March 28th or March 29th."

**B. From the President of the University –**

Interim President Crowley stated, "Last week I attended the Chancellor's Executive Council meeting. There were a number of interesting items on the agenda. You may already be aware of Proposition 55 that is the bond issue financing educational facilities. SJSU has an item that would be affected by Proposition 55--the completion of the Science Building project. This proposition has been described as being on life support. The latest polling information shows 50-51% responding favorably in the polls. If that percentage materializes at the polls then it will pass by a narrow margin. Proposition 56 seems to be on its way to defeat. Proposition 57 and 58 are paired. Proposition 58 will pass, but it won't make any difference if Proposition 57 doesn't pass. Proposition 57 went from 37% favorable to over 50% favorable, but is now at 49%. Proposition 57 is the \$15 billion deficit financing bond. If Proposition 57 doesn't pass, then we certainly expect to be getting more news about budget reductions and related matters from Sacramento soon after election day.

The Chancellor is holding what's described as a budget summit on March 10th. It is a six-hour meeting. The Senate Chair, the Associated Students President, and the Associated Students Controller have been invited along with union representatives.

On the budget, there have been some interesting developments. Our targeted enrollment has been changing. I believe since the fall we have had three different targeted/budgeted enrollment figures. That number has changed again and we will get the new number shortly. The reduction in the enrollment figure for next fall will go from somewhere around 5% to an average of 3.9%, with a range of 3.1 to 4.3%. I'm not sure where we will fall yet. Part of the flexibility that has come forward from the Chancellor's office has to do with what students can be admitted. As a result of the struggle to meet the targeted figure this year, and with the likelihood of further struggle next year, we will now have the flexibility to admit some of the *forbidden four* that couldn't be admitted, e.g. second baccalaureates, and transfer students without all the criteria for transfer."

Interim President Crowley said, "Some institutions wanted to be able to go to a fee-based summer program, as opposed to YRO, this summer. Those institutions that want to do this will be able to do so, at least for this summer. Those that want to continue with YRO for summer may also do so. We will be going to a fee-based program for the summer, however, any and all profits will go towards instruction in the fall. This is the primary reason we are doing it. The only condition is that if Lecturers teach this summer they will be able to get an SSI to help down the road."

Interim President Crowley said, "The Chancellor noted that system-wide there is about \$45 million in Lottery funds. The RPB will be looking at this along with budget cuts, etc."

Interim President Crowley said, "The Governor recommended a 10% fee increase for undergraduate students, and a 40% increase for graduate students. That is now a subject of significant interest for the system, the Chancellor, and the Trustees, so what will be proposed to the Trustees in their March meeting, as part of a comprehensive flexibility package, will be an 11% increase for undergraduate students, and that the 40% increase for graduate students not apply to post-baccalaureate students completing their teacher education requirements. Their increase would stand at 25%. That all will work out to be an even match with what the Governor has proposed."

Interim President Crowley said, "The Golden Handshake proposal has been discussed with the Governor, however, there hasn't been any response yet. The question is how to pay it back. It is in effect a loan. The Presidents at the Executive Council meeting opted for a four-year payback."

Interim President Crowley said, "The Chancellor's office has urged on several occasions that we be very careful with travel. It doesn't mean that we can't travel, but international travel, in particular, needs to be closely examined when state general fund dollars are being used for that purpose."

Interim President Crowley said, "At the last President's staff meeting they decided on a date of March 23, 2004 to have the next campus-wide budget meeting."

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**December 8, 2003 – No questions.**

**February 9, 2004 – No questions.**

**February 16, 2004 – No questions.**

**Budget Advisory Committee Minutes –**

**February 2, 2004 – No questions.**

**B. Consent Calendar – Approved as is.**

**C. Executive Committee Action Items: None.**

**D. Executive Committee Action Items:**

1. Senator Brent presented *AS 1224, Sense of the Senate Resolution – Endorsement of Proposition 55*. Senator Buzanski made a friendly amendment to remove the "he" from

"he/she" in the last resolved clause. **The Senate voted and AS 1224 passed unanimously.**

2. Senator Brent presented *AS 1225, Sense of the Senate Resolution – Endorsement of Proposition 56*. Senator Brent said there is an error in the second line of the second Whereas clause. The date should be "June 15th" and not "July 1". Senator Buzanski made a friendly amendment to remove the "he" from "he/she" in the last resolved clause. **The Senate voted and AS 1225 passed unanimously.**

**V. Unfinished Business - None**

**VI. Special Order of Business – Election to Extend the Term of the Senate Chair (per by-law 2.22)**

Chair Nellen announced that she is seeking a one-year extension of her term. Chair Nellen turned the meeting over to Senate Secretary, Terri Thames, to conduct the election, and left the room. Senate Secretary, Terri Thames, and the Administrative Analyst for the Senate office, Eva Joice, distributed ballots to all Senators for a secret vote. Secretary Thames and Ms. Joice collected and counted the votes. Secretary Thames announced that Chair Nellen had been re-elected for another one-year term.

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

**A. Professional Standards Committee** – Chair Katz said, "The committee is working on getting a policy to the Senate on RTP standards. We have had continuing forums including one with the deans, and one this week with members of the university RTP committee, and one final forum with people who have gone through the process recently. On March 1, 2004, we are having a 3-hour meeting to hash it out."

**B. Curriculum and Research Committee–**

Chair Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1230, Metropolitan University Scholars Experience (MUSE) New Student Seminar Program in Core General Education (GE) (First Reading)*.

Chair Lessow-Hurley said, "This policy looks at and defines the peer-review process for MUSE classes, reduces the number of general education areas for which MUSE seminars will be offered, and restricts students to a single MUSE seminar for general education and university credit." Professor Emily Wughalter, Director of the MUSE program, and AVP Bob Cooper, Undergraduate Studies, gave a brief MUSE presentation.

Professor Wughalter said, "The MUSE program planning began in the Spring 2001, and the planning phase went through the summer of 2002. A team that was headed by Senate Chair Annette Nellen and AVP Lee Dorosz, designed the MUSE idea and began the planning stages required for implementation of this new initiative. They recruited over 100 professors across eight colleges to offer courses in the Fall 2002. Recruitment of students began in December 2002, and the first class of MUSE began.

The MUSE program is developed around these two simple goals—to develop the foundations necessary to become university scholars, and to understand what it means to be a member of a metropolitan university community.

The MUSE web site provides students, faculty, and staff members with necessary information about the program for recruitment of students, for first-year students to find out how to register for MUSE seminars, to provide student resource links on campus, and to provide faculty resources to assist in their course design and development.

The MUSE experience has been supported through the investment of many people on campus from various constituencies, including, for example, the Management Information Systems department chair, and former MUSE faculty member, Steve Kwan who assisted us in developing a MUSE web site. Students can register for the workshops on the web site."

Professor Wughalter went over statistics on MUSE student's satisfaction with the program and with the instructors. There were no unsatisfactory ratings. Professor Wughalter said, "Members of the administrative faculty and staff come from all over campus including: teaching faculty, academic service providers, student life staff, counseling staff, health care staff, librarians, and administrators." Professor Wughalter said, "Most of the MUSE sections have 17 or more students."

Professor Wughalter said, that they are "looking at the year-to-year retention of the first cohort of students from Fall 2002, and the second cohort from Fall 2003." Professor Wughalter explained that there were a few limitations she would like to bring to the Senate's attention before she went over the data. "First, during the first year of MUSE, they had some problems with the recruitment of students. Students were placed into MUSE seminars during the first year, rather than allowing them to choose seminars. During the second year of MUSE, students were allowed to select their MUSE seminars. MUSE students were compared to their cohort in Science 2, English 10, Engl 1A, Business 10, Humanities 1A, LLD 1, and LLD 2. These are all first year classes students enroll in."

Professor Wughalter said, "The only cohort that had better retention data than the MUSE cohort was for those that had no remedial courses, that is the only condition where the entire cohort had better retention than the MUSE cohort of Fall 2002. The trends are exactly as we would like to see them. We also have very high retention rates in the remedial math group. When we removed those that needed remedial classes from the Fall 2002 cohort, the retention statistics for those that had MUSE classes and those that didn't were quite similar.

Professor Wughalter said, "The Fall 2003 cohort is our most exciting data yet. We had a 94.7% retention rate for that one semester, and for the no MUSE students we had a 91.1% retention rate. With this data, we would like to encourage you to support MUSE for the next several years."

Professor Wughalter said, "We have several recommendations that are in the policy recommendation before you. The first is that we would like to reduce the number of MUSE offerings in GE areas. In the original policy we offered eight areas of GE. We would like to reduce this to six because it is very difficult for us to fill areas D2 and D3, because students have other ways to fill those areas. Also, we have provided for you a new revised peer review process for reviewing our proposals to make sure we are meeting those GE objectives. There are many things that we do to try and do that. Also, because of our practical experience, we feel that students should only be allowed to take one MUSE seminar during their stay at SJSU. This is a cost saving measure and there is enough repeated in each seminar, regardless of the GE area, that a student would get too much repetition. Our final recommendation is that students be allowed to academically renew their MUSE seminar in a GE course in the same GE area as their MUSE seminar. We hope that this doesn't happen too often, but we know that it has and will probably continue to happen."

#### Questions:

Senator Andrew asked if costs had been taken into consideration. AVP Cooper stated that "a substantial amount of consideration had been given to costs. The experience of other universities has been that the number of units-to-degree drops dramatically for students in first year programs like this. We don't have that information for SJSU yet, but about 83% of four-year colleges and universities now have first-year experience programs. Those that have had long enough to look at the implications for graduation rates and the number of units-to-degree, predict that our cost per degree will go down as a function of having MUSE seminars."

Senator Veregge asked, "If we are not going to overlap between area E and the MUSE goals, how is that going to be dealt with?" AVP Cooper said, "There is overlap between area E and the MUSE goals. In fact, in the original discussion of where MUSE should be located, there was a group advocating that all of MUSE classes be located in area E. Although there is some overlap that is considered to be enough for a full area E GE class. The concern about making them all area E was that some faculty members would have a very difficult time composing both a course that had a topic they were passionate about that would also fit into area E. I suspect that is an issue that will come up again when the GE policy review comes to the Senate in 2005."

Senator Brent said he had a question about the role of the General Education Advisory Panel (GEAP). Since GEAPs were never established by university policy, and I believe this is the first time they have ever been referred to in a Senate document, are they thinking about giving the reviews to a group that actually has no official recognition by any group, and what would the workload be? I guess being a member of the GEAP, I'm concerned that I would be assigned to multiple panels, and I would have to be reviewing 5 times as many classes as I was before." AVP Cooper said, "Actually, you just told me something I didn't know, and I'm surprised by it, because it was my understanding that the American institutions courses are only approved by the GEAP." Senator Norton said, "Yeah, but they're not the GE." AVP Cooper said, "I know, but this must mean that the GEAP has some standing somewhere. With respect to the workload issue, which is one I can address, the notion is that if there are so few courses in an area that there is only one peer group within the MUSE instructors, then it will go to the GEAP. That would be at most five or six classes going to the GEAP. If there are, as there are in area D1 and E, lots of MUSE courses, then they form separate peer groups to do the initial review. The final approval is given by the opposite peer group, a notion of independence, plus the addition of one GEAP member. The one GEAP member's function is to bring to the peer review group the standards that are used in the GEAP when they review them in the conventional process."

Senator Rascoe said, "One of your recommendations is that students be able to take only one MUSE course, were there significant requests from students to take a second MUSE course?" AVP Cooper said, "Yes, there were not only requests, but an error in the registration procedure so some students did end up taking more than one MUSE section. The reason for not wanting the overlap is because the MUSE learning objectives are common across the various MUSE seminars. There are not 3 units of distinct MUSE content in the next MUSE section."

Senator Veregge said, "I am unclear, does the peer review process happen before the course is actually accepted for the GE category?" AVP Cooper said, "The peer review process happens between January and May. The reason for creating a parallel process to the typical GEAP/BOGS process is that there isn't sufficient time in that period where the faculty members go to workshop in January to learn about the MUSE program (what's expected), and also for many of them to be taught about what are the requirements of teaching a GE course. There isn't enough time to get from there all the way through a proposal that would be both recommended by a GEAP and approved by BOGS before everybody goes on summer vacation. This is a parallel process constructed to try and maintain the same standards. However, MUSE courses have to be re-approved each year unlike being approved by the GEAP/BOGS process where they give approval for four years."

#### C. Organization and Government Committee –

Chair Veregge presented AS 1233, *Policy Recommendation – Proposed Constitutional Amendment Adding the Vice President for Advancement to the Senate and Senate Executive Committee and Removing the AVP for Faculty Affairs as an Ex Officio Member of the Senate (Final Reading)*. The Senate discussed the proposed change to add to this amendment the whereas and resolved clauses from the proposal to add a department chair to the Senate. Chair Veregge will bring this proposal back to the Senate at the next meeting in the format it will go out to the campus in.

**D. Budget Advisory Committee –**

Moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.

**E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee –**

Moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.

**F. University Library Board –**

Moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.

**VIII.****Special Committee Reports –****A. Report from Department Chair Task Force**

Chair Dennis Jaehne presented the report from the Department Chair Task Force. Chair Jaehne said, "Faculty that accept the role of Department Chair face a new set of administrative responsibilities while at the same time remaining faculty. However, these new set of responsibilities set us apart from other faculty members. We now supervise support staff and have performance evaluation responsibilities. We have a separate role in the RTP process. And, we have fiscal responsibilities that other faculty do not have. In short, these duties place chairs in quasi-managerial roles, however, they are not MPP managers and so there are limits to their authority. From another perspective, they work in a critical zone of program implementation on the campus. They stand as a nexus of many interested audiences and parties in the entire academic system. For example, chairs interact with deans, students, staff, faculty, campus administrators, off-campus community, and alumni."

Chair Jaehne said, "Every piece of correspondence that comes to you had to cross the department chair's desk, and most of it has to be signed as well. In short, we are a bottleneck in the system. The CSU has been slow in recognizing the increasing burdens that have been building up in that bottleneck, as the university becomes more complex in the information age. When they did begin to pay attention and conducted their survey, they were surprised to learn that the working conditions of chairs across the system had become somewhat chaotic."

Chair Jaehne stated, "There was a 20% turnover in chairs in the first year, and half of all chairs in their first three years were working for deans also in their first three years. They were also shocked to find that 2/3rds of all chairs working in the system had had zero hours of formal preparation and training for their responsibilities. This is ironic in a system that is so heavily freighted with meticulously organized performance evaluations and job descriptions for everyone else in the system, but chairs have been below the radar for a long time. No wonder then that the survey uncovered morale problems and high turnover, and I suppose we should have some gratitude that we do have the cadre of talented and dedicated chairs that we do have considering what they have been facing."

Chair Jaehne said, "We took our task last June to act out of the CSU report. We identified and organized the issues into four areas that include: Job Descriptions and Evaluations, Roles and Responsibilities and Relationship Themes, Workload Assignments, and Training and Development. I want to just highlight the findings in each area.

The principle problem in Job Descriptions and Evaluations is the lack of a common standard. The campus was vaguely using a generic standard from the early 90's that few of the department chairs had ever actually seen. Furthermore, all evaluation is local to the colleges so it varies widely across colleges. There was no consistent process that linked performance evaluation to a job description. We gathered sample job descriptions from several institutions and constructed a master list of about 100 items/duties that chairs perform. A major theme arose. While chairs were responsible for ensuring that many things happened, they aren't always the ones that are responsible for doing the work to see that these things happen. Therefore, our language in the chair job description that we propose characterizes the chair's role more realistically as working with various elements of the campus and faculty to see that certain outcomes are achieved. This is a much more reasonable way to look at what chairs can be expected to accomplish. Beyond the general description of responsibilities for leadership within the unit, we organized the duties into faculty affairs, curriculum and program, student affairs, staff, community, budget, and administration. Under each of these there are four, five, or six duties that chairs are responsible for. The principle recommendation is that the campus should make this official generic job description the official job description for chairs on this campus. We recognize that unit needs vary over time. No chair would be required to do all things on the list equally well. Therefore, we recommend that deans sit down with chairs at the beginning of their term and decide, given your unit's specific needs, these should be your specific responsibilities from the job description. Then when it comes time for the evaluation, the evaluation form should be matched to the job description given to the chair at the beginning of the term. And, to complete the suite of standards under this category, we produced four evaluation instruments tailored to the four basic audiences. Each instrument reflects the specific items in the job description and there is one for each of the main audiences that chairs deal with. We recommend that the campus also adopt these instruments and that like the job description, they be held flexible and adapted locally to the chair's specific assignment. We also thought it was important to include open-ended responses in all the evaluations, and to insist if anyone rates a chair on any item below the norm, that a comment would be required in explanation."

Chair Jaehne stated, "In our concerns about the relationships between chairs and deans, we were principally motivated by general chair frustration in the system over lack of control of any resources. We surveyed the campus and found that deans generally use one of two modes for administering finances in the college. Either they turn the salary dollars over to the chairs and the chairs run it, or the deans keep it in the college office and they run it. When we studied this further we found that pretty much chairs are happy with the model they work under. Since the deans have the fiduciary responsibility for the funds within the college, we didn't think we should get in their face and tell them how to run it. So, we are comfortable

recommending that the campus stay with this model. However, we do recommend that the campus continue to provide an annual financial management training session for all the chairs. We recommend that the deans, wherever possible, make some discretionary funds available to the chairs so that they can do some creative things with the people they work with."

Chair Jaehne stated, "Workload assignments were one of the most complicated areas we dealt with. The problem is that the percentage of the chair's time that is devoted to chair duties varies considerably across units of the same size. FTEA is typically allocated on campus based on a campus formula. This formula is not sophisticated enough to account adequately for how workload happens on the ground. The formula we have been using on campus has been based only on the FTEF. However, even our own data shows that a chair that supervises 10 FTEF could have 10 faculty, or 20 faculty depending on the ratio of tenure/tenure track and lecturers. Also, number of majors, number of programs, and accreditation responsibilities were not figured into this formula, yet each contributes significantly to workload issues. We spent a lot of time on developing a more complex formula and tested it against 2002. We thought we had it pretty well worked out and then found out in November that CSU Sacramento was already using such a complex formula. We tested their formula with our data and found what our own efforts had been suggesting, that SJSU underestimates FTEA especially in the larger departments. We have three recommendations. First, we should adopt the CSU Sacramento formula for use on campus and evaluate it periodically to be sure it continues to be accurate. Second, we should go beyond the current cap of 1.0 FTEA on this campus for the larger units. The final recommendation is that the campus study the problem of assigned time being used for chairs. If you pay somebody to do something with FTEF time it shows up in your audit of the efficiency of your instructional dollars. It affects the calculation of the FSR, because someone assigned FTEF time gets that calculated into how many students they are teaching, FTEA time does not. This skews the picture we get of the total administrative workload of the university. And, because FSR is a main factor in the budget calculation, it has potential to affect how the budget comes to campus. We recommend that the campus study this problem more thoroughly and take a considered position on it."

Chair Jaehne stated, "Finally, on training and development, you've probably already grasped that chairs are really administrative professionals. As administrative professionals they require the same kind of training that any other managers or administrative professionals would receive, but because of their faculty status, this point has been obscured. No faculty members were ever trained to be chairs as part of their academic training. They learn on the job, and the learning process can be quite steep. We believe in an institution of higher learning, this process should be able to be improved. This campus has already done better than most campuses in the system, not only in terms of the establishment of this task force as a proactive move, but also in terms of the recent activity of the Council of Chairs and Directors, and the Provost's support for a new one-year program called "Chair in Residence," which I am proud to occupy for the first year. We urge that the campus continue to support these efforts, and that the university consider giving the Council of Chairs formal status on a par with the Council of Deans. We have also suggested several resources such as a "Best Practices" manual, a listserv, and a web site. We also recommend support for chairs transitioning back to full faculty status. Perhaps in the form of a full dedicated line for sabbaticals or lottery funds for professional development as they retool back into their academic career."

Chair Jaehne said, "We believe that a central cause of chair frustration is the lack of understanding and appreciation from others on campus about what chairs actually do. This is complex because many do not understand the significant tension at the center of the chair assignment. Chairs have considerable responsibility in multiple areas, but they limited authority to accomplish these things. We do recommend some strategies to change this including campus-wide recognition for outstanding chair work. Perhaps some training sessions for faculty on the chair's role. In general terms, the university should work with the larger campus community to make the role and work of chairs transparent to the constituencies they serve. I will just conclude by praising the Academic Senate on this campus. We stand out among the campuses for the work we have already done. We urge the Senate to continue this good work by adopting and implementing our recommendations. We hope that our report will be useful for making some significant and long overdue changes in the institutional treatment of chairs and directors. Thank you and I would be happy to take questions now."

#### Questions:

Senator Singh said that some chairs still aren't that good even with training, and should be removed.

Chair Jaehne said that providing chairs with training will help with some of the problems, but there are some people that aren't good with managing numbers, or people, etc.

Senator Breivik said, "I applaud the task force. The important role of chairs has even been recognized by the American Council on Education. I'm not sure if they are still doing it, but they used to have an excellent training program."

Chair Jaehne said, "We would love to send our chairs to that training, but it costs about \$700 plus the cost of getting there and lodging, and the campus hasn't been able to afford to send people there. The CSU has some training opportunities such as a one-day event in Long Beach, but even that costs."

Senator Katz said that "it is difficult to remove a chair that is doing very badly. How can we get feedback to them sooner if they are performing badly?"

Chair Jaehne said, "The task force has recommended that chairs be evaluated on a yearly basis, instead of at the end of their four-year term."

Senator Branz said, "There is this tension between being a faculty member and an administrator, was there any attempt to look at the historical record of how much more bureaucracy you are faced with now as opposed to 10 or 20 years ago?"

Chair Jaehne stated, "You didn't have to read the SJ Mercury yesterday to know that we are in an age of information overload. One of the recommendations in here is to have the campus take a modern look at the critical pathways of information on the campus. There wasn't much we could do in terms of assessing."

Senator Branz said, "I've never been a chair, but the information I've gotten from chairs is that the workload has increased substantially." Chair Jaehne said, "Absolutely."

Senator Veregge said, "The task force needs to be recognized for their extraordinary efforts."

#### **IX. New Business –**

##### **A. Advancement 101 Presentation by VP Robert Ashton:**

VP of Advancement, Robert Ashton, gave a presentation on University Advancement. VP Ashton said, "There are many components to Advancement, and it is really relationships. I want to tell you about what our strategies are. As a fundraiser, what you want to do is look at where the money is. Every year they do surveys and surveys show that the big money comes from individuals."

Senator Brent said, "I was looking at the CSU's report on external giving and the campuses in the CSU that actually do get the most money, Northridge and San Di raise the vast majority from corporations." VP Ashton said, "There are a couple of reasons for this. If you are a university that is oriented towards the things that foundations and corporations give to, you'll be skewed from this. The other reason is that if you are relatively new to this, you haven't had the time to build the long-term relationships with individuals that lead to a really wholesome giving program on the individual level. So you are right, what you are seeing there is that they are more technologically that they are really new to this. Most of the CSU's have been doing this with any kind of consistency only since about 1991. So, you are absolutely right, but I think it's that change."

VP Ashton said, "On average nationwide, the most money really comes from a small percentage of individuals making really big gifts. And, it only takes one really to make a lot more than a lot of small gifts. If you look at the last quarter of the last century, you will see that a lot of money is coming from the top 1% of the population fundraising we always talk about the gift pyramid. Our goal in Advancement is to get people into the pyramid and move them up. Once people find out that we have that appeal to their interests, they are more susceptible to giving. About 85% of the money comes from about 5% of the donors. It takes 3 cents to raise a dollar at the top of the pyramid, while it takes 80 cents or more to raise that first gift from someone at the bottom of the pyramid. However, it is a pyramid and it needs a base to stand on, can't just focus on the ultimate gifts. You need to have a whole program in order to move people up the pyramid."

The other thing is that there is a time cost in this. This process is really relationship driven, especially when you are dealing with individuals. It takes time to build a relationship. Princeton did a study about 20 years ago and found that for them it took on average 17 years to get to that ultimate gift. This is why you have to look at the whole pyramid. The annual fund is at the bottom of the pyramid. With the annual fund, you get almost immediate gratification. Within a couple of weeks you know if your annual fund letter is working or not. You may not get a lot of your potential money there, but you do get money there. It is also useful in convincing people to join and become part of the pyramid. This is the strategy.

When top donors were asked why they gave, they said "they were asked." This is where building a relationship comes in. The donors wanted to know about the leader and what their business plan was. They also wanted to know if the leadership knew how their business was changing in the future, and whether they were prepared for it.

I believe the most successful books you can read for fundraising are marriage-counseling books. The reason for this is that communication is the key in these books. The most important part of communication for an institution is to be consistent and repetitive. You have to have regular open communication channels with donors. You communicate with donors even when you don't need to maintain contact. The other thing is what you communicate about. The important message is who our lead is, what our mission is, where we want to be next, and how we are going to get there.

The other thing is that within the university, we have to reinforce each other's efforts, not compete with each other. The way we currently ask for money makes us look like we are on a different page, and are competing with each other. What I am recommending that we do is screen who is asking who for money when, and limit approaching donors at a certain time. We have also set up a new foundation to receive all philanthropic funds.

I am also suggesting that we invest in university advancement to bring us up to the top half in investment in Advancement within the CSU in the next 6 years. Right now we do not have the staff to assist Deans when they want to do fundraising. Our pledge back to the institution is that we will raise \$30 million a year. Right now we raise \$10 million a year. Silicon Valley has a lot of philanthropic dollars out there, but we need to be competitive to get our share. If we don't invest in Advancement then we are going to fall further and further behind."

#### **X. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

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

#### **XI. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**