

2003/2004 Academic Senate

MINUTES
March 22, 2004**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty Senators were present.****Ex Officio:**

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

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Gonzales
Absent: Palakurthi

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Lee, Rascoe, Kassing,
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
Absent: Singh

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Guerra

H&A Representatives:

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

Emeritus Representative:

Absent: 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 February 23, 2004 were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Nellen said, "I just have a few announcements since our agenda is so full today. First, all the seats were filled for the 2004/2005 Senate in this year's general election. And, in the College of Humanities and the Arts, there is an election underway for two of the seats. Also, Mark Van Selst was re-elected as a CSU Statewide Senator." Chair Nellen said, "Eva has done a great job of updating and improving the Senate Handbook. The changes are on the web site. We will have a new copy of the handbook for you in the fall after final changes are made." Chair Nellen announced, "The presidential candidates will be on campus the week of April 12th. An open forum will be held from 10:15 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. each day the candidates are here, in Engineering 189. The schedule will probably be announced right after spring break stating exactly who will be here on what day that week. Please block off everyday the week of April 12th from 10:15 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. to come see and hear the candidates."

Chair Nellen said, "On March 10th, Senator Crowley, AS Controller Rachael Greathouse, and I attended a Chancellor's Budget Summit in Long Beach. The emphasis was to educate and send a message to our legislators of the need to properly fund the CSU, so that access can be maintained. Today, Senator Crowley is not here, because he is at the Alumni Legislative day in Sacramento. The Senate's External Relations Task Force is going to continue the tradition of holding a Legislative Staff Briefing on Thursday, April 29th from 8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. in Administration 167. We are in need of a few students to join us that morning. Please let me know if you can participate. We are also working with Janet Redding's office to hold a meeting of all parties on campus that interact with legislators in some way, so that we can coordinate our efforts. That meeting will be held April 8th in the afternoon."

Chair Nellen announced, "Many CSUs have an Ambassador's program. Our program is called "Ambassadors for Higher Education." The CSU started these in about 1996 and now, because of the focus on getting us interacting with our legislators and sending a message of the need for funding so that access can be maintained, they are really trying to enlarge the number of Ambassadors that exist. What is expected of an Ambassador is just a few minutes of your time out of the year to visit legislators, send a letter or an email, or to call as directed by our Government Relations office on campus. The more Ambassadors we have, the stronger a message we can send. You can go online and it takes only about 30 seconds to fill out the form to become an Ambassador, or you can fill out a hard copy of the application."

Chair Nellen announced, "There is a new FAQ list on the senate web site of frequently asked questions about committee membership. Secretary of the Senate/Chair of Committee on Committees, Terri Thames, and the Committee on Committees put together this FAQ. These are typical questions people ask when they are considering joining a committee."

Chair Nellen stated, "Finally, as is typical of Spring, we have a very full agenda for the rest of the spring semester. Lets be sure we aren't being repetitive in our comments on resolutions, and that we are asking questions and not giving speeches, particularly on first reading items."

B. From the President of the University – Not present at today's meeting.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

- A. Executive Committee Minutes –
 February 23, 2004 – No questions.
 March 1, 2004 – No questions.
 March 15, 2004 – No questions.

B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None

C. Consent Calendar – Approved as is.

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Brent presented *AS 1237, Policy Recommendation: Substantive Change (Final Reading)* for the Executive Committee. **The Senate voted and AS 1237 passed unanimously.**

Senator Katz presented *AS 1238, Policy Recommendation: Repeal of S78-10, Student EEO* for the Executive Committee. **The Senate voted and AS 1238 passed unanimously.**

Senator Katz presented *AS 1239, Sense of the Senate Resolution: Report Regarding Athletic General Fund Budget (First Reading)* for the Executive Committee. Senator Katz said, "Chair Nellen, Senator Brent, and I were charged with updating the General Fund Athletics Report, and the decision was made to follow the format of the 1993 report. I think you can see from looking at this report that a significant amount of work went into this document, and I would like to say a special thanks to Senator Brent for a lot of the research." Senator Katz asked Senators to take a few minutes to look at the report's recommendation. Senator Katz said, "A couple of really salient points in the report were that in a 1993 Sense of the Senate Resolution the Academic Senate gave guidance to the Administration on Athletics. The Senate said that Athletics should constitute about 1% of the overall university General Fund Budget. Since that time, we have gone all the way up to about 3.2%. We have spent a little under 12 million dollars. About 58% of the Athletics budget comes from the General Fund. In our early deliberations there was some talk about setting a cap of 1.8% of the General Fund Budget for Athletics. However, when we went back to the Executive Committee there was a strong feeling that we really didn't want to box in the new President with that figure. There was concern that that was inappropriate. We didn't want to do this within three years. The result was another meeting between key administrators and the three of us. What you have here is the final recommendation, which is an effort to compromise two different points of view. The compromise recommendation has three general principles. The first principle is that we should try to do better. We should over the next five years, reduce the amount of Athletics funding from the General Fund from 58% to 35-45%. Now, that may not be enough for some people, but that was our compromise. The second recommendation was that we now have in place an ambitious effort to involve faculty in the budget planning process to make the budget more transparent, and that is the Resource Planning Board. The Resource Planning Board is a new body, a new initiative to expand the role of faculty in the budgetary process. So the second recommendation is that the Resource Planning Board be involved in the decisions about planning the Athletics budget. The third principle was that the savings from Athletics be allocated to other university budget priorities."

Questions:

Senator Stork asked what happens if our budget goes up, then technically couldn't the Athletics funding increase beyond the 3.2% it is now if we leave this as 35-45% of the General Fund Budget? Senator Katz said, "This is true."

Senator Heisch asked, "Did the committee entertain the thought of leaving Division 1A?" Senator Katz replied, "In our first recommendation, we had a fixed reduction from 3.2% to 1.8% in the Athletics budget. If this reduction was not achieved, then drastic action had to be taken by the President, such as leaving Division 1A. However, we removed this language in our compromise. It is certainly within the realm of possibilities of what we could do in a budget reduction. However, we did not feel it was appropriate to dictate this to the new President."

Senator Norton asked, "Why did you compromise. You didn't have to compromise. You work for the Senate, not the administration. Chair Nellen said, "We are bringing a balanced view of the Executive Committee, and any committee would do that." Senator Katz said, "We did not want to put ourselves in a potentially adversarial role with the incoming administration."

Senator Stork asked, "Do you know if there are any plans on cutting any sports, or substituting other less expensive sports for current ones?" Senator Kassing said, "There is always discussion about this, but nothing definite."

Senator Van Selst asked, "What is the definition of the General Fund?" Senator Brent said, "The General Fund Budget is defined on the first page of the report, it is the \$7,000 per student the state gives us plus the student university fee that students pay. Those two things are General Fund, everything else is not General Fund."

Senator Branz asked, "Were any scenarios developed to see if leaving Division 1A would get us to the 35-45% we want?" Senator Katz said, "No." Senator Katz said, "The sense that I got from this was that the Resource Planning Board now has significant faculty input in that group, and that group will be defining the specific priorities for the campus. We do need a strategic plan for the campus and the long-term development of the university. We hope with

the Resource Planning Board and the new President, we will get a strategic plan. Then we will see where Athletics falls in that plan. My sense now is that there may be a disconnect between Athletics and our existing priorities." Senator Brent said, "Athletics did do a report and came up with assumptions about what would happen if we left Division 1A. I'm told that the Resource Planning Board got a copy of it, however, I'm not a member of that Board, and don't know for sure. Our take on it was that we didn't have the expertise to determine if those assumptions were indeed accurate." Chair Nellen said, "It is difficult with scenarios and assumptions, because if we left Division 1A you would also leave the WAC, and what conference we would go into is unknown and so is the amount of the budget that would go into that."

Senator Stork said, "I served on the first Budget Advisory Committee in the 90's under Ken Peter. We were told at that time that the BAC would allow us much more faculty input into the budget decisions, and yet everything we said was ignored. How will the Resource Planning Board be any different? Will they be ignored also? Senator Katz said, "At this point I'm not sure any of us can give a clear answer, because the Resource Planning Board is a new entity, and we really don't know what kind of influence they will have." Chair Nellen said, "I don't share this view on the Resource Planning Board. There is a completely different makeup on the Resource Planning Board than the Budget Advisory Committee. Senator Norton said, "Let me add that the Budget Advisory Committee was not given authority to handle details, or handle specifics. The Resource Planning Board has a broader charge." Chair Nellen said, "The Budget Advisory Committee's charge was just to give advice to the President on a very small piece of the budget, and the Lottery requests. The Budget Advisory Committee had input on less than 2% of the university budget. The Resource Planning Board is looking at the entire university budget. This is a major difference. And, so far as voting on the Resource Planning Board, there are five faculty members, and a majority of the members are from the Academic Affairs Division. I have heard comments that when it is the four VPs, Academic Affairs has one-fourth of the vote, yet 80% of the budget."

Senator Heisch said, "Just when the Budget Advisory Committee became interesting, that is to say at the very moment it began to raise substantive issues, it was collapsed into this new committee, and I am very, very sorry for that. However, as a member of the original 1993 subcommittee, I must ask a question about donations. If you drop Athletics programs, do donations decline? The overall response in the report seems to be mixed. The report seems to suggest that there is a relationship between the Koret Foundation and donations to the Library with a tie to donations to Intercollegiate Athletics. Does the committee believe that donations to the Library will spur donations to Athletics?" Senator Brent said, "I think it is historically accurate, although that's not the way it had to evolve that's just the way it did, that several years ago when the Koret Foundation made the donation for the Athletic Center, we were told that that is what the Koret Foundation does. They come in and make a bond with one part of the institution and make a donation, and then they have a tendency to donate to that institution in the future, because a relationship has already been established. Now, that is not necessarily the case that they always get their foot in the door with Athletics, but that is the way that it occurred on this particular campus. We were told that because of the relationship that was established at that time, that paved the way for them to donate to the Library."

V. **Unfinished Business - None**

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

A. Curriculum and Research Committee –

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1230, Policy Recommendation: MUSE in Core GE (Final Reading)* for the Curriculum and Research Committee. A correction was made to the Fifth Resolved clause to remove "and" from the third line. Senator Brent proposed an amendment to strike "with a member of the appropriate General Education Advisory Panel (GEAP) augmenting each peer review group to ensure expertise in GE evaluation." The Senate voted and the amendment failed. **The Senate then voted on the main amendment and AS 1230 passed unanimously.**

B. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1233, Policy Recommendation – Proposed Constitutional Amendment Removing the AVP for Faculty Affairs as an Ex Officio Member of the Senate (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1233 passed unanimously.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1240, Policy Recommendation – Proposed Constitutional Amendment Adding the Vice President for Advancement to the Senate (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1240 passed with one abstention.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1235, Policy Recommendation: Amendment to the By-Laws of the Senate Adding the Vice President for Advancement to the Senate Executive Committee (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and passed AS 1235 with three abstentions.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1234, Policy Recommendation: Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the Senate Adding a Department Chair to the Academic Senate (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1234 failed.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1241, Policy Recommendation: By-Law Amendment -- Adding a Department Chair to the Senate (Final Reading)*. Note: Since AS 1234 failed, this proposal also failed, and it was not voted on.

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1232, Policy Recommendation: By-Law Amendment – Apportionment of Senate Seats (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1232 passed**

unanimously.

C. Budget Advisory Committee –

Senator Donoho presented *AS 1228, Endorsing Budget Priorities for 2004/2005 (Final Reading)*. Senator Brent presented an amendment to add a priority stating "increasing funding for the Library collection and support services." **The Senate voted and the amendment was approved with one abstention. The Senate then voted on the main amendment, and AS 1228 was approved with two abstentions.**

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee –

Senator Pour presented *AS 1231, Policy Recommendation: Faculty Office Hours (Final Reading)*. A motion was made, and the Senate voted to make this a first reading instead of a final reading. Senator Pour said, "The Instruction and Student Affairs Committee spent a lot of time working on this policy, and there were several revisions. The committee consulted with the AVP for Faculty Affairs, Peter Lee, and also with Professor Patricia Hill of the CFA." Senator Pour said, "There are both faculty and students on the committee as well as the Interim Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, the Judicial Affairs Officer, the Director of Academic Services, the AS President, and the Senate Alumni representative. The committee currently has 17 members. The size and variety of the membership gave us a good opportunity to get feedback. The policy is based on accessibility of faculty to students outside of the classroom, for discussion and questions regarding their classes. This policy will replace a really old policy from 1968. The committee tried to see what part of the policy from 1968 still applied, and to keep what they could in the new policy."

Senator Pour said, "The old policy references 5 and 9 hours. The committee spent a lot of time trying to find the original source for these hours, but we were unable to find any. It might have had something to do with the .20 that faculty get for service. We also looked at other universities and their office hours policies as well as the collective bargaining agreement, etc. In the new policy, the committee recommends 1 office hour per WTU a week as well as 1 hour of online consultation per WTU a week for online courses. The committee also recommends that the office hours be clearly posted in the greensheet. If faculty are absent due to illness, or if they must attend a conference, the faculty member should notify their students where possible, if they can't then the department office should post a notice on the door."

Questions:

Senator Brent said he had a question regarding online consultation. "My specific question has to do with the requirement that we must have one hour of online consultation at a certain time. As far as I know, online consultation would take either one of three forms; either email, an online bulletin board, or a chat room. If I am being told I must have online consultation at a certain time, that doesn't make any sense with email, because email comes in at various times. If I say I am going to be online at a certain hour, students aren't going to be emailing me only during that hour, if they emailed me yesterday it will still be there for me to answer. The discussion group is the same thing. People post to their discussion group at different times. I have one in my online courses and posting isn't done at a certain time. The only way one could have online consultation at a certain time, is if you were in a chat room for a specific hour. I have to tell you I've done that, and it is the biggest waste of time I have ever been involved in. I'm wondering what was the thinking of having online consultation at a given hour?" Senator Pour said, "The idea was that if you have a certain time you will be checking emails, students know that if they send you an email the day before, you will be checking and getting back to them the next day at a certain time. The idea was also to give students some predictability." Senator Brent said, "Did the committee consider saying something like, 'the faculty member should respond within 72 hours.'" Senator Pour said, "Hopefully, the faculty have more than one hour of consultation a week. The committee did discuss responding within 72 hours, but it gets complicated with what happens on weekends and holidays."

Senator Von Till said, "I have had several faculty members approach me, and they are very concerned about this. Would the committee consider removing the phrase 'at a certain time,' and consider something less restrictive." Senator Pour said she would take it back to the committee to consider.

Senator Branz said, "I have always had a problem with large classes, no matter what office hours I have, I can never get to everyone. I always put on my greensheet, 'and by appointment.' Did the committee consider this? My second question has to do with the counting of units. Are office hours part of the 3 units of class, or is it part of my .20 service time?" Senator Lee said, "Office hours are part of the academic assignment and not part of the service time."

Senator Donoho asked, "What was the thinking of the committee that would justify limiting office hours because the faculty member has other department commitments? Senator Pour said, "This was actually part of the original policy that we checked with Faculty Affairs and the CFA about, and decided to leave in."

Senator Choo said the policy was unclear about student advising, and perhaps the committee could clarify this. Senator Pour said, "The problem is that it doesn't apply to all colleges."

Senator Thames said, "If I am reading this correctly, a faculty member that teaches all their classes off campus would never be required to be on campus, and any other faculty member could do up to 1/2 their office hours off campus. Is this correct?" Senator Pour said, "The main goal was the accessibility of faculty to their students."

Senator Van Hooff said she has concerns that have been expressed to her and will forward these to Senator Pour.

E. University Library Board –

Moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.

F. Professional Standards Committee –

Moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.

VII. Special Committee Reports - None**VIII. New Business –**

A. Faculty Diversity Report to Senate per SS-S03-5 – Peter Lee – Moved to next meeting due to lack of time.

B. Greek Life Task Force Final Report – Meredith Moran and John Baird – Time Certain of 2:05 p.m.

Chair Nellen said, "Last June President Caret created a Greek Life Task Force. They have finished their assignment and released their report. You can view the report from the President's web site. The co-chairs of the task force, Meredith Moran and John Baird, are here to give us a report that is more focused on the executive summary, as opposed to the whole report including looking at some of the recommendations they made, and possible policy implications for us and the university."

Professor Baird said, "I want to begin by talking a little about our charge, then our process, and finally our recommendations. President Caret appointed the task force in June 2003, in response to the senseless slaying of a fraternity member on January 22, 2003. We were very, very clear that we needed to respond to this even though it wasn't mentioned in our charge. It was talked about in great length on the task force. As we look at the charge in detail, we really took the notion of review and examination very thoroughly. It was really important for us to do this in a way that was objective and took us beyond the task force group. We wanted to provide a good written report. The report itself is 60 pages long. We are just giving you a summary today. We think this is about change. We have such a diverse student body. It is hard getting your hands around the student organization structure, and that was one of our challenges. We think it is important that the university and the students be part of defining what the governing role and structure should look like. We don't think we have the right governing model. We don't think we have the right expectations for students and their membership. We think that student organizations should be mandated to be part of a governing structure, and that that in itself will improve a lot of things. Finally, the relationship to the university is critical. That relationship has been very laissez-faire. If anything it has been more hands-off. Other universities have gotten more involved. These are the things that are key.

The task force included 21 individuals. There were alumni, students, staff, and community members. We used multiple panels to get people in and talking to us. We asked faculty members what they thought of student organizations. We asked them what do they hear about them, and what do they see when they walk down the street. We also reviewed the literature on best practices, and there is a lot of literature out there. Not all of the literature relates to SJSU, we are unique. We tried to look at those universities that kind of parallel us. However, we do feel that the Franklin Square Report, which you have attached, is a really good one. One that I am hopeful the Presidential Advisory Committee, which we have suggested needs to be formed, and Interim President Crowley has agreed to, will be able to use as a framework to move forward. Finally, we formed subgroups. The subgroups went in-depth into areas outlined in the report.

Our first recommendation is that we think it is important to preserve and enhance the Greek system at SJSU. We think it has a rich heritage, and we think it is really the way in which students get leadership development. We think there is a lot of community service, and a lot of good values within most of these organizations. Most of these organizations talked about how their national chapters say these things are important, and we think it is critical that they operate out of a value system. We also think it is very interesting that the student leaders at SJSU that come out of a lot of these organizations, often go into community leadership roles, and these are often the individuals that then contribute back to the university. These are the most active individuals, and they stay involved. We think this is very important not only from an alumni perspective, but also in terms of leadership you get back from the community. These are potential contributors to the university. The Greek organizations make up a small percentage of the student population, but they are so visible. What they do in terms of leadership that is very good, and that isn't very good, is also very visible to the community.

Our second recommendation is that the university should take a more proactive role in defining the relationship between the university and the Greek community. We spent a lot of time on these issues. We talked about the violent incident, alcohol issues, hazing, and academics. The student leaders that were on the task force talked about how these were their concerns as well. Certainly they were concerns of the national organization, but we think they need to be concerns of the university to an even greater extent. The University of San Diego has a very structured, boundary-oriented, expectations-that-are-mutual approach, and I think that is where the rest of the country is going with regard to Greek organizations. I think we need to take a stand and say it is important to get involved. The words standards and accountability come out in every best practices report. We don't think that we have that clarification by the university with Greek organizations. We think that the student organizations need to be periodically audited. The best practices universities around the country do these audits. We also think the current governance model needs to be revisited.

Our last recommendation is that we think the university should invest in the Greek system. We think it is important to spend time getting student leadership to clarify their role. We do see the advisory committee leading that process. We need to get student leadership involved in monitoring and auditing their own system. We think it is important to allocate financial resources to develop what we call a mandatory Greek Education Leadership Program. The vision of the committee is that this might start with a leadership summit and periodic meetings. We think this is very important to connect the leadership. We think frequency of interaction through councils and involvement will reduce the likelihood of violence. We think this is a preventative measure. We also have minimal staff compared to what other benchmark organizations have. We are suggesting we hire additional staff. This would include one additional full-time staff person to help with the audits, a graduate assistant, and two student interns. We think that we should begin by establishing this high-profile presidential advisory council. We believe it should include members of the faculty, the community at large, and student leadership. We believe it should meet quarterly, but initially more often to start the process of defining that relationship statement. We think we should use the Franklin Square Conference Summary. It is so well done. This is a great place to start.

Our biggest fears are that nothing will happen, business as usual. I don't feel that this can occur. This is a place where we've got to invest. This is an investment in our students, our community, and also the reputation of the university as well. Secondly, we fear lost momentum with the transition period for the new president. We are concerned with that transition. There were also concerns about economics and costs."

Questions:

Senator Norton said he "understands there are two blocks of Greek organizations. The older more traditional Greek organizations, and the newer groups some of which are minority oriented. Did you deal with both?" Ms. Moran said, "Yes, when you get into the report we talk about the specific needs of what we call the "emerging organizations" that just started on campus in the late 80's or 90's. They have formed into a fourth council, so even without the mandate from the university, we now have four governing councils. I think we are in a good place, because students are ready to participate in the process. Senator Norton asked, "Do you hope to create a single structure to deal with them all?" Ms. Moran said, "The four councils actually have some individual needs, but yes, there has got to be a way that they and the community come together."

Senator Branz asked, "Is the student body of the Greek organizations representative of students across campus, and are there any studies comparing the GPA of students in Greek organizations versus those not in these organizations, such as commuter students and those in the residence halls?" Ms. Moran said, "We do track their academics closely. Typically our Greek leaders tend to be our student government leaders and orientation leaders. Nationally,

retention rates are 28% higher for those in Greek organizations."

Senator Rascoe said, "The CSU Vice Presidents for Student Affairs have discussed this for years. As a result, a few years ago they initiated a Greek Summit once a year for student leaders. What came out of this process was a set of shared principles. Last year, 21 out of 23 campuses voted to approve those shared principles. We are the only system in the country that has such a summit."

Senator Choo suggested that the recommendations should be for all student organizations, and not just Greek organizations. Professor Baird agreed that many of the expectations could be applied to different organizations.

Professor Baird said that he would like Senators reactions/what they think about the process on the back of the handout in front of them. There will also be a link on the university web site to give feedback to.

IX. 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.**

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.