

2003/2004 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
May10, 2004**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Rascoe, Kassing,
Absent: Goodman, Lee

Deans:

Present: Breivik, Gorney-Moreno,
Meyers
Absent: Andrew

Students:

Present: Greathouse
Absent: Gadamsetty, Sherman,
Torres, Paat, Lam

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Guerra

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames, Liu, Yi

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Gonzales
Absent: Palakurthi

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, El-Shaieb, Donoho

ED Represent:

Present: Lessow-Hurley, Katz

ENG Representatives:

Present: Pour, Choo, Singh

H&A Representatives:

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

SCI Representatives:

Present: Veregge, Bros, Kellum, Branz, Matthes

SOS Representatives:

Present: Baba, Von Till, Ogaz

SW Representative:

Absent: Coach

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –

The Senate minutes of April 19, 2004 were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Nellen said, "On April 29, 2004, the Academic Senate's External Relations Task Force held its Fourth Annual Briefing with Legislator's Aides. We had nine representatives from federal and California legislative offices attend. We had a very good discussion. The main

message they had for us was that we really needed to be spending our time with the Governor, because they said the local legislators really do understand the CSU budget crisis. It is the Governor that needs to hear from us more. We will be following-up on that.

Also, on May 5, 2004, Greg Wolcott, Monica Rascoe, Arash Shokouh, and myself held an orientation for the incoming Associated Students Board of Directors and Officers. The orientation went very well. The students were very interested in learning about the Senate committees, and what they had gotten themselves into by being elected. I am hoping that by having the outreach so early in the year, we will see almost all of our student senators at the first meeting of the 2004/2005 Academic Senate next week. We will continue to have discussions with them monthly so we can address any questions they have about the university, about committee service, etc. We hope this will get more students participating in our activities here. I also discovered in the Associated Students by-laws, that some of the Associated Students Board members are assigned to sit on up to four Senate committees. I will also be working with Rachel Greathouse and Greg Wolcott to get that changed, because that is setting them up for failure.

If you are thinking of chairing a policy committee next year, becoming Senate Secretary/Chair of Committee on Committees, or running for the Faculty-at-Large position on the Executive Committee, please let Eva and I know by tomorrow morning, and get your nominating statement in to us. We still will take nominations from the floor next Monday, but it is helpful if you turn in a statement ahead of time that Senators can read before the meeting.

A reminder for next week, we will have our last Senate meeting from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Engineering 189. We will have our first Senate meeting of the 2004/2005 Academic Senate from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. We will say our goodbyes then.

We have a very large agenda today and next week, so lets be very cautious in moving the agenda along, and not giving long speeches that might perhaps be unnecessary.

I am very pleased to announce that Senator David McNeil has become Chair of the CSU Statewide Academic Senate for 2004/2005.

Our incoming President, Dr. Paul Yu, is with us today and tomorrow while visiting the campus and the surrounding community, and we will be hearing from him later today. Welcome to Dr. Yu."

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Joe Crowley said, "There are just a couple of items that may or may not be of interest to you. First, this afternoon at the Executive Committee meeting we talked about the proposed Library fee increase of \$14. The Executive Committee voted in unanimous support of the fee. This increase goes toward extended hours of operation--Monday through Thursday the Library will be open until midnight, and during final exams the Library will be open 24 hours a day for three days, and after that until midnight. There will also be increased assistance for students on the upper floors of the Library. There is a lot of

technology in the \$14, along with some special collections assistance. CFAC, the President's Interns, and the student members of the University Library Board have now approved this fee. It has been taken before Associated Students and Associated Students will consider it this week. I am waiting to hear back from Associated Students, and then I will make a decision.

You may recall that shortly after I got here, I said it might be useful to hire a consultant to do a study on how we are organized, or not organized, to do information technology at SJSU. We did bring a consultant in, and we have a draft report from the consultant. When we get the final report, we will be talking with the Senate and other parts of the university about what needs to happen. I won't be here, but Dr. Yu will.

With regard to budget, the Resource Planning Board (RPB) is close to hammering out a budget that will take us as far as we can go until we know more. We should know more about what the Governor proposes by the end of the week. If that May revise the Governor does makes significant changes to the bottom line, which means there is a further decrease in general fund support for the CSU, then we will have more work to do on the RPB. And, then of course, we have to wait until the legislature takes action. I believe that didn't happen until August or September last year. If we get a bottom line that looks like what we got in January, then the RPB should have the budget worked out. We shall see how that goes.

Finally, let me talk a little bit about transition. Dr Yu will be here in the middle of July. I will be out of here before he gets here. I will be here until the end of May full-time. In June, I will be here periodically as needed, maybe a day or two a week. Then I may be here a day or two in July, if I'm needed. We don't foresee any problems with the transition.

From the Incoming President, Dr. Paul Yu:

Chair Nellen introduced incoming President Yu. President Yu said, "First, let me say what a pleasure it is to join this community even though I'm not quite here yet. I'm looking forward to mid July when I'm here 100%. I need to wind up my duties at another university, so I won't be back until mid July. For the two days that I'm here, my schedule has been sliced up into 135-second pieces, so I am going to be leaving you shortly to go somewhere else. Before I leave, I wanted to talk with you very briefly, and informally, about a couple of things. You will recall that during the time I visited the campus I talked about maintaining perspective, and I'm going to urge that on you again. I will be a little more specific about that than the last time. The first conclusion I draw as I look over the landscape at many things, is that our threats to the university and its community are mainly external. There is no question that cuts to the state budget, hostility or at least skepticism on the part of the public, and competition from other universities, are all external threats and those are the main dangers we have to deal with. The second conclusion follows from the first one, that this is obviously the case. Therefore, in order to be effective in dealing with these issues, we have to come together as an institution. We must marshal all our resources and direct them against these external threats. Does this mean that we would ignore internal disagreements? Of course not, we are an academic community, and we are going to deal with these issues the way an academic community deals with disagreements, collegially and carefully, while not

making these issues into things that damage the university as a whole. These are the most important things to keep in mind. It is very easy in the heat of the moment to overstate some things, and to overact, which can cause damage unintentionally to the institution as a whole.

Among the strengths I hope I carry with me are one—a strong faculty background. To coin a phrase, I feel your pain. I really do understand and share the same values you do. My second strength is that I have only one agenda. The agenda is to make SJSU as strong and proud as I can. I don't have any other agenda. I think that my job will be fairly easy. The difficult part will be to convince everybody else that I really mean that."

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

April 12, 2004 – No questions.

April 19, 2004 – No questions.

B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None

C. Consent Calendar – None

D. Executive Committee Action Items –

Senator Katz presented *AS 1252, Sense of the Senate Resolution: Expressing Our Appreciation of Joe Crowley (Final Reading)* for the Executive Committee.

Senator Buzanski proposed a friendly amendment to include an additional whereas clause stating that Senator Crowley has been most instrumental in creating a new fundraising foundation. Chair Nellen will get specific language from VP Ashton. *The Senate voted and the resolution passed unanimously.*

Senators Veregge and Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1245, Policy Recommendation: The Planning and Budget Process at SJSU (First Reading)*. Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "I would like to begin by giving you a little history about this resolution. You will recall that the Senate's role in budgetary matters for some years was accorded to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). The issues the BAC dealt with were largely budget priority items that would be funded from lottery funds. In the course of some discussion at the Senate retreat, we were made aware of a budget process/document that emanated from Long Beach, that I think Senator Brent provided for us, that gave us some insight into a very different kind of budget process with a far higher degree of transparency than we have enjoyed on budget matters on this campus. And, while I think that transparency was certainly at the heart of what we were doing, I don't think any of us knew exactly what it could look like. At the request of Chair Nellen, Interim President Crowley went to Long Beach and came back and was very supportive in encouraging us to rethink the way we thought about doing and analyzing the budget on this campus, especially in view of the drastic cuts we have all been suffering. As a result of this, we created the Resource Planning Board (RPB). The RPB really only got rolling in January, because we needed to pass a policy and get people appointed. There has also been an enormous learning curve for those of us serving on the RPB. As a result, we have only just reached a point where we can think rationally about a

budget. This is a very complex campus with lots of different units, and the budget picture is constantly shifting. There is an education process that has to happen before you can begin to really think about all those pieces and where that makes sense. The one charge of the RPB is to sort out the matters related to the budget, and another charge has been to look at itself and decide if it was properly constituted and how it might be continued and so on, and what transparency would look like if we had it on this campus. We gave that a lot of thought and came up with the budget policy you saw in the first reading, which was seriously detailed. As a result of that first reading, and in conversation with Interim President Crowley and incoming President Yu, it became clear that this was an inappropriate time to nail down quite so much detail. We felt that the committee was not at a point to make recommendations about its own structure, and since our incoming President has made it clear that he is very open to a consultative process and continuing the effort in some form, we felt we should leave some flexibility for the RPB and the incoming President to think about what the RPB should actually look like. We took all the detailed recommendations and re-crafted them as a report with recommendations. We recommended that the RPB be continued until a new budget policy is established, or until May 31st of next year."

Questions:

Senator Norton asked, "Did the committee consider any language for the RPB such as that currently in the bylaws pertaining to the BAC. Specifically, bylaw 14.1c states that proceedings of the BAC will be reported to the Senate in summary form similar to reports of the Executive Committee. Budget Advisory proposals for Senate action shall be reported directly to the Senate. What I am concerned about here is that there isn't any formal link between the RPB or its successor and the Senate. I don't see it in the documents that you drafted. There is some general language about reporting to the university, but I don't know what that means."

Chair Nellen said, "The policy S04-1 that created the RPB does say that the RPB is to communicate budgetary information to the campus. Senator Norton replied, "Yeah, but I want the Senate to know about it, and I want a direct reference to the Senate. I also think the RPB should have a place on the agenda for reporting." Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that Senator Norton propose that as an amendment during the final reading.

Senator Branz asked, "On page 8, Accountability and Reporting, section 4.4, where it says "college deans each year shall," have you considered writing college deans and the Dean of the Library?" Chair Nellen said, "That would be something you'd have the option of proposing when we get to the final reading." Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "That paragraph is actually from the F91-1." Chair Nellen said, "This is something that we will need to address when we do the new budget policy."

Senator Brent asked, "For those members of the Senate on the RPB, can I ask how is it going?" Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "I think it is going very well. I think it is taking an enormous amount of time to begin to understand how to read all the documents and figure out what all the pieces are on this campus that contribute to the budgetary picture. And, I think that Senator Kassing has been enormously helpful in educating us. I also think that we

are really moving along." Senator Katz said, "For those of us that are not budget experts, in the early stages getting piece by piece by piece of the budget was quite confusing. We were also sworn not to talk about anything involving possible faculty cuts. Only once we got a sense of the whole, could we get down to business. So, we really couldn't get down to business until May. The other thing I feel is very, very positive is that there has been a commitment between the Administrators to do everything possible not to cut into the instructional academic budget." Senator Veregge said, "The level of detail that we are getting on the RPB is probably ten-fold what they got on the BAC. The budget process has been opened up more fully, and we have the opportunity to ask more questions and get more information." Senator Kassing said, "This is a small city with a \$360 enterprise. There are a lot of pieces to it. The faculty on the RPB have really dug in, and have been very patient. We have tested their patience in February and March. We like the process on the administration side. It has opened the process up a lot."

Senator Brent presented *AS 1242, Senate Management Resolution: Creation of a Task Force on Intercollegiate Athletics (Final Reading)*. Senator Greathouse proposed a friendly amendment to change the 3rd resolve clause to add, "1 student member of the Athletics Board." Senator Branz proposed a friendly amendment to change the 3rd resolve clause where it reads, "1 faculty member of the Athletics Board," and "1 student member of the Athletics Board," to read "1 faculty member of the Athletics Board chosen by the Athletics Board," and "1 student member of the Athletics Board chosen by the Athletics Board." **The Senate voted and AS 1242 passed.**

Senator Brent presented *AS 1250, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Request to President Yu to Create a Task Force to Consider the Appropriate Athletics Program for SJSU (Final Reading)*. Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to add a new first Whereas clause to read, "Whereas at the April 19, 2004 meeting the Academic Senate passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution calling upon the administration to reduce to 1.8% the amount of the general fund going to Athletics by 2005/2006." The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment failed. Senator Buzanski proposed an amendment to add a new Whereas clause to read, "Whereas, a faculty referendum is currently underway...." The Senate voted and the Buzanski amendment failed. Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to strike the 3rd and 4th line of the 1st resolve clause. The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment failed. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to add a resolve clause to read, "Resolved, that the task force shall provide a report to the Senate by January 2005." The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed. **The Senate voted and AS 1250 passed with no amendments.**

V. **Unfinished Business - None**

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

A. **Budget Advisory Committee - None**

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

Senator Pour presented *AS 1231, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Office Hours (Final Reading)*. Senator Branz presented an amendment to change the 2nd paragraph of the

"Scheduling Office Hours" section to read, "As a general rule for Unit 3 teaching faculty, one hour of office hours per week for every three WTU of teaching courses is adequate." **The Senate voted and the Branz amendment passed.** Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to remove the last sentence of the paragraph under the section "Absence" that reads, "When scheduled office hours must be cancelled, faculty members should provide other office hours, at a designated time, by email, or by appointment." **The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment passed.** Senator Shokouh presented an amendment to remove the last line of the "Online Consultation" section that reads, "If it serves students' needs, faculty members, who teach courses other than online courses, may designate up to fifty percent of regular office hours for on-line consultation." **The Senate voted and the Shokouh amendment passed.** Senator Branz presented an amendment to change the 3rd paragraph, 2nd line, under the section "Scheduling Office Hours" to read, "A faculty member who serves as a program coordinator (or director) or a department chair (or school director) is expected to schedule additional office hours, by appointment, for consultation of students on the matters not related to the courses he/she teaches." The Senate voted and the Branz amendment failed. Senator Brent presented an amendment to add a new 2nd paragraph under the section "Scheduling Office Hours" that reads, "Regardless of how many WTUs they teach all full-time faculty will hold at least 2 hours of in person office hours per week." **The Senate voted and the Brent Amendment passed. Senator Donoho presented a friendly amendment** to change the "Online Consultation" section, 1st line to read, "Faculty members who teach online or off campus courses should provide one hour of online consultation per week (at a certain time) for every three WTU of online teaching." Senator Van Hooff presented an amendment to change the title of the policy to read, "Policy Recommendation: Faculty Office Hours devoted to Teaching." The Senate voted and the Van Hooff amendment failed. Senator Stork made a motion to return the resolution to the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee, after a review by the Executive Committee. **The Senate voted and approved the Stork motion.**

C. University Library Board –

Senator Branz said, "I'd like to give a really short report on the Library. Visitors to the Library are up 67% from August to April. University patron checkouts are at 90%. This is almost double what we had a year ago, and I'd like to remind everybody that staffing has not increased 90% in the Library. SJSU is the 2nd lowest of the eight large CSUs in terms of dollars spent per FTES for library expenditures. There will be an 18% overall cut to the collections budget this year, and a 37% cut to the non-electronic print collections. A little bit of good news, the Library will be open extended hours during finals this year."

Senator Branz presented *AS 1244, Modifications to SJSU Library Policy S03-5, Regarding Transition: Reference Collection (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1244 passed.**

D. Professional Standards Committee –

Senators Bros and Katz gave a presentation on the Status of RTP Policy Changes. Senator Katz said, "When I took over the Organization and Government Committee a number of years ago, Ken Peter told me that the Chair decides where to put the focus of the committee. A colleague also reminded me, some thirty years ago, that the quality of

leadership is largely determined by who sits around the table. I have had the good fortune to have some very good people on the Professional Standards Committee. I would like to acknowledge them—Senators David McNeil, Nancy Stork, Ram Singh, and Swathi Vanniarajan. We also had a subcommittee that worked specifically on RTP. I would like to acknowledge them also—Joan Merdinger, Peter Lee, Senator Abdel El-Shaieb (who is chair of that subcommittee), Senator Shannon Bros, Michael Gorman, and Senator Debra David. This subcommittee has held about five forums, and has put an extensive amount of time into RTP. Please join me in expressing your appreciation for the work of this Professional Standards Committee."

Senator Bros said, "What I wanted to talk to you about today is proposed changes to the RTP. Over the past year, under the direction of Senator Katz, we have tackled RTP. We have collected a lot of information on this process. We got some information from previous committees, and we also conducted several different forums. We conducted them with the Council of Chairs, the College RTP Committees, the Council of Deans, the current University RTP, and also the Academic Senate. We asked two questions at these forums. What are your concerns with the RTP process? What are your feelings about the documentation that goes along with RTP? We got a lot of results, but I'm just going to share some of the top concerns.

One of the major concerns was that the needs of the departments and colleges were too diverse for a one-size-fits-all model. A lot of people felt that decisions about RTP should be made at the department or college level. Most people felt there was way too much documentation involved in the process, and that the standards in use are currently ambiguous. Everyone felt that the Peer Review process was inadequate. People also felt there were too many levels in the RTP process. People felt the University RTP Committee had too much to review, and not enough time to do it. People also felt there wasn't any mentoring in our process. These are just some of the major concerns. What we decided right off the bat was that the Peer Review process involved different policies than RTP and was really complex, so we were going to leave that until the next time.

Our new idea is that the department work in conjunction with the college to come up with guidelines and standards that would be appropriate for that college. Once these guidelines and standards have been generated, then they have to be approved by Professional Standards. The Senate would develop the final policy, so there is no difference in the way things are done there. The major difference is that the guidelines that are developed by the departments and colleges right now are optional. Under the proposed policy, guidelines would not be optional. They would be required.

We are proposing that every year the candidates develop a Professional Development Plan. This plan outlines what the person did over the past year, what their accomplishments were, and also their plan for the future in terms of teaching, scholarly activity, and service. This is actually generated by the candidate. Every year the candidate goes over their plan with their Chair. The Chair works with them and helps them make sure the plan is viable in terms of the contract, etc. In addition, the plan is reviewed every year by the department RTP Committee and the Dean of the College. The idea here is to create a process that is more

open, a lot more people are involved, and it is done every year.

We are proposing that the Performance Reviews are done on the 3rd and 6th years, instead of the 2nd and 4th years. The kinds of information that would be needed to meet standards in this process would be the Professional Development Plan, with comments from the Dean and department RTP Committee, the contract, and any support materials. Other than that, the system would be very similar to what it is now. It would go to the department RTP, the Chair, the College RTP, the Dean, and eventually the President and the Provost. Also, any candidate, at any review level, can request a performance review at any other year.

One of the things that we have decided to do with this is change the role of the University RTP Committee. This is another big proposal. What we have decided to do when we undergo a performance review is if there is a "no" recommendation from any performance level, the University RTP Committee will act as the body to resolve the dispute.

The ideas that are different from what we have now are that the current review period is the 2nd, 4th, and 6th years, and we are proposing only two reviews. The criteria are one of the major changes. Under the old criteria, the university policy, the letter of appointment, and the dossier were the major documents we used for evaluation. Under the new proposal, what we would be using is the Professional Development Plan, and the contract between the faculty and the college. In addition, the University RTP Committee would now be used only for disputes. We felt that this would give us fewer problems in interpreting policy, less ambiguity, less work, and a real mechanism for resolving disputes. One other piece of this was the large amount of documentation required. Since the major decisions are being made closer to the department and college level, on criteria developed by that department/college, then the need for documentation should be a lot less. We also felt that we should replace the multi-volume stuff with something a bit shorter, such as the dossier. We are proposing a small basic dossier that conforms to specifications designated by the college.

One of the things that we want to do is go back to all the people that we've had forums with and we are going to poll them about the ideas that we have. Steve Aquino has helped us design an online survey that we hoping to get out to the Deans, Chairs, and Senate by the end of the week. You can enter any comments that you want about a particular idea on the survey. Next Fall, we plan on getting this survey out to the entire faculty to see what they think. We also need to write new policy that includes examples of this Professional Development Plan. This plan is something like what is currently being used at Fullerton and Sonoma with great success. Finally, since this is radically different from what we have now, we are proposing that we also design an implementation phase."

E. Curriculum and Research Committee – None

F. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1247, Senate Management Resolution: Filling Student Vacancies on Senate Committees (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1247 passed.**

VII. Special Committee Reports – None

VIII. New Business – None

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 5:05 p.m.