

2004/2005 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
February 28, 2005**

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Nellen, Van Selst, Kassing
Absent: Sabalius, Greathouse, McNeil

CASA Representatives:

Present: David, Fee, Gonzales, Hooper

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Sigler, Lee
Absent: Ashton, Phillips

COB Representatives:

Present: El-Shaieb, Donoho
Absent: Campsey

Deans:

Present: Breivik, Wei, Stacks
Absent: Meyers

ED Represent:

Present: Parsons, Maldonado-Colon, Lessow-Hurley

Students:

Present: Lam, Stillman,
Nguyen, Bjerkek, Kelly
Absent: Gadamsetty

ENG Representatives:

Present: Singh, Pour, Choo

H&A Representatives:

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

Alumni Representative:

Present: Thompson

SCI Representatives:

Present: Veregge, Bros, McClory, Kellum, Scharberg

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Propas, Von Till
Absent: Hebert

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames, Liu, Yi

SW Representative:

Present: Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –

The Senate minutes of December 6, 2005, were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Nellen said, “Welcome to our first meeting of the Spring 2005 semester. This spring we can look forward to having Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) and General Education (GE) policy revisions; a final Resource Planning Board (RPB) structure; and goals and visions from the Goals Advisory Council (GAC).”

Chair Nellen said, “Please note on your agenda that there is an additional meeting of the

Academic Senate called for Friday, April 29, 2005. This meeting will be in Engineering 189. If it turns out that we don't need this meeting, then it will be cancelled."

Chair Nellen said, "I do want to welcome back Senator Liu who is returning from sabbatical last semester. Also, I'd like to welcome our two new Senators Lloyd Thompson, and Maureen Scharberg."

Chair Nellen said, "We are in the process of having our general election this spring. There are open seats in the General Unit and all the colleges, except Social Work. There are two open seats in both the College of Humanities and the Arts, and the College of Science. Nominating petitions are due in the Academic Senate Office on Friday, March 11, 2005."

Chair Nellen said, "Two weeks ago, we held our first Academic Freedom Forum co-sponsored by the California Faculty Association (CFA). About forty-five people were there, and I thought it went extremely well. I want to thank the CFA for providing brunch, and to thank Interim President Kassing for his participation and remarks. We also created a website, and you can link to it from the Academic Senate website."

Chair Nellen said, "A couple of weeks ago I attended an Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) conference in Atlanta, Georgia on GE and Assessment. Gail Evans, Emily Wughalter, and I presented a workshop on what it means to be an educated person." Chair Nellen noted that, "The Senate needs to send committee members to appropriate conferences regularly."

Chair Nellen said, "Just a reminder, there is a budget forum on Thursday, March 3, 2005. This forum will focus primarily on the division budgets with a brief overview of the University's budget."

Chair Nellen said, "Last spring we passed a resolution to create a taskforce on intercollegiate athletics to look at a few areas, one of which is should we join the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). The COIA is a coalition of Division 1A governance groups. Only three Western Athletic Conference (WAC) schools have joined so far. The task force is still working on this, and we will probably make some recommendations for some minor improvements here regarding our role in Athletics."

Chair Nellen said, "On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday of this week we are having GE forums. You have information at your tables about them. Please let your colleagues know. The focus of these forums is to give the Board of General Studies (BOGS) input on their proposed GE changes. The proposed GE changes are linked to the Academic Senate website. Please take some time to review them."

Chair Nellen said, "The AACU says that an effective GE program is purposeful; is understood and accepted by all constituencies; is coherent; is engaging for the students and extends throughout all four years; has good leadership; is the responsibility of the faculty and the faculty must agree on the purpose, structure, and content of GE; and an effective GE program must enjoy sufficient resources to achieve its purposes."

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Kassing said, “I’ve just got a few comments. The Compact, which is the budget strategy the California State Universities (CSUs) put together last summer with the Governor, was honored in the Governor’s budget in January. Now the budget moves into the different committee hearings. It is a good budget, especially compared to the budget we’ve had the last two years. I would encourage you to come to our Budget Forum this week.”

Interim President Kassing said, “The CSU system is seeking authority to offer applied doctoral degrees. The University of California (UC) system is not particularly responsive to our requests for certain types of doctoral programs at certain campuses. We would be one of those. There has been a decision made to ask for authority through legislation to offer applied doctoral programs. This may be very controversial.”

Interim President Kassing said, “There was an effort started in the Fall to assemble information on the CSU impact on the state of California (economic and social impacts as well as the number of students we educate). There are a series of forums planned. The first forum was held on February 4, 2005 in Fresno, and was directed specifically at the agricultural industry. It went quite well. There is one tentatively planned for San José in October, 2005.”

Interim President Kassing said, “It looks like we will be 2 to 2 1/2 % down on our annual enrollment target. A combination of things are affecting enrollment. The enrollment target that we have was actually set and adjusted in July, 2004. We were supposed to get 1.87% additional enrollment, but we didn’t get it. This will probably have some impact on our budget. We are anticipating some shift in our fee revenue based on enrollment.”

Interim President Kassing said, “I’d like to personally thank (Carmen) Provost Sigler and the GAC for the work they’ve been doing over the last few months. I got a preview of it Friday afternoon and they are working hard. The GAC will have something for the Academic Senate to look at probably in the next six to seven weeks.”

Interim President Kassing said, “One of the issues that the Chancellor’s office and the Presidents are terribly interested in is graduation rates.”

Interim President Kassing said, “The last comment I have is to complement (Annette) Chair Nellen on the Academic Freedom Forum.”

Questions:

Senator Breivik said, “When the issue of joint doctoral programs came up in the Council of Dean’s meeting, the Library’s major concern was that the Chancellor’s office understand that we can’t support the programs we have now much less doctoral programs.”

Interim President Kassing said, “Good point, they are talking about a fee strategy that

would imitate the UC's fees, which would suggest more resources.”

Senator Kellum said, “You said one of the concerns of the Board of Trustees was graduation rates, do you think that might translate into lowering academic standards for us?”

Interim President Kassing said, “I don't have that impression at all.”

Senator Stacks said, “Since there is concern about graduation rates, is there any talk about having a common student identification system that would, at a minimum, allow us to track students transferring within the CSU.”

Interim President Kassing said, “It didn't come up at the meeting I was at.”

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

December 6, 2005 – No Questions

January 10, 2005 – Senator Stacks asked what “ACIP” stands for. Senator Van Hooff said, “ACIP stands for Academic Council for International Programs.”

January 31, 2005 – Senator Stacks asked about item number 8 of the minutes. Chair Nellen said, “There was a 3rd Circuit decision that says there can be no military recruiting on campuses without loss of federal funding. In the Executive Committee we had discussions about how the Chancellor's office was following this from a legal perspective, since we are in the 9th Circuit, and not the 3rd Circuit. Interim President Kassing reported that the Chancellor's office legal counsel did not think this was something that would be binding on us, and it was likely to be appealed out of the 3rd Circuit.”

B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None

C. Consent Calendar – Approved with the addition of Senator Maureen Scharberg to the Curriculum and Research Committee.

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Donoho presented *AS 1265, Policy Recommendation, Implementation of an Annual Outstanding Lecturer Award (Final Reading)*. Senator Donoho presented a **friendly amendment** to change the word “criteria” to “guidelines.” **The Senate voted and AS 1265 passed as amended.**

Senator Donoho presented *AS 1269, Policy Recommendation, Dissolution of the University Information Technology Board (Final Reading)*. **The Senate then voted and AS 1269 passed with one abstention.**

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee –

i. Office hours report: Senator Thames said, “The Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (IS&A) was given a referral last year to review the office hours policy. The policy was last updated in 1968. Last year’s IS&A committee did quite a bit of investigation, and then brought some recommendations to the Senate. The Senate sent the resolution back to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee then sent the resolution back to the IS&A committee this year. We gathered information from other CSUs, the Chairs, the Council of Deans, Undergraduate Studies, and we surveyed students and faculty. After careful consideration, we came back to the Executive Committee and recommended no change to the existing policy. We believe the existing policy is flexible enough as it is, and that it allows Chairs to work well with their faculty. However, we did decide that we would like to take this time to make several recommendations in general. We believe that faculty workload should be reduced so that faculty members have more time for students. It was also suggested that the Center for Faculty Development, and International and Extended Studies (IES) work together to come up with the best online practices to increase the availability of faculty to students. And, we remind all faculty that you are required to put your office hours on your green sheet.”

ii. Senator Thames presented *AS 1273, Policy Recommendation, Academic Qualifications for Student Office Holders (First Reading)*. Senator Thames said, “This is one of those situations where we have been following this policy for several years, but we haven’t had an on-campus policy that interprets the Chancellor’s office policy. The Chancellor’s office policy allows each campus to go beyond the minimum Grade Point Average (GPA), or to adopt their minimum requirement.”

Senator Thames said, “The IS&A committee has had consultation with the Associated Students Board of Directors, with the Vice President for Student Affairs, and with Student Life and Leadership. We have also done a survey to see what other campuses are doing.”

Questions:

Senator Singh said, “I would consider any student with a 2.0 GPA to be a low performer, don’t you think we are setting our standards too low.” Senator Thames said, “The IS&A committee was concerned about this also. However, when we did our survey of the other CSUs, we found that fourteen of them have kept the 2.0 GPA. We decided that we would keep it at 2.0 for right now while we start a new

task force. The task force would study how we could better support our student leaders, so that they aren't forced to choose between doing well in their leadership role and doing well academically. If we feel like we are doing well supporting our student leaders, then we may raise our GPA."

Senator Stacks said, "I wondered whether the committee had considered saying that certain sections apply to certain circumstances? I think that when you see such a long policy, you may not always read all of the sections. The other question I have is a more specific one and deals with section 6.1.3, residency. Did you mean that if you had been a baccalaureate student at San José State University, you could right away as a Graduate or Credential student, initiate holding office." Senator Thames said, "I believe it was, but I need to check with Meredith Moran."

Senator Donoho said, "Do you have any idea what the GPA is for any of our student leaders right now?" Senator Thames said, "Well, we have several of our student leaders here right now." Senator Nguyen said, "All of our Associated Students board members have GPAs above 2.0." Senator Thames said, "We have asked the Associated Students board members to give the Academic Senate a presentation on the amount of work that they do. It is pretty amazing, and there are tremendous demands on them."

Senator Van Selst said, "Did the language in 4.2.2.1 come from the Chancellor's Office?" Senator Thames said, "Yes." Senator Van Selst said, "Then I believe it should say "150 CSU-eligible units."

Senator Buzanski said, "Regarding 6.2.3 where it states that this requirement does not apply to the summer and winter terms, aren't we under a mandate to convert to year-round classes and shouldn't this language be changed to reflect this?" Senator Thames said, "Yes."

Senator Kassing said, "I'd like to speak in support of the resolution. However, I might offer one word of caution regarding the GPA. There are some people that are average in their GPA, but excel in the real world. I would be cautious that we don't limit their opportunities to lead."

Senator Scharberg said, "Getting back to section 6.1.3.2, credential students are only here about three semesters, and this section calls for (6) semester units of continuous attendance." Senator Thames said, "I will have to check on this and get back to you."

B. University Library Board – Senator Heisch said, "One of the things I need to remind the body is that the University Library Board is the single most interesting committee in the University. This committee is the liveliest, and has the best membership. And, we really need a member from the College of Social Science."

Senator Heisch said, "The committee will be sending a policy revision recommendation to

the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) having to do with the library resources support for new academic programs. This obviously has to do with the issue of the Library budget. At our next Academic Senate meeting, we will be bringing you a current study of the San José State University library budget. It is actually a revision of our 2003 study, and it will demonstrate the increased difficulty we are having in meeting the needs of our faculty and students. Of course this has implications for any doctoral programs, and even existing graduate programs. We are also working on a revision of the library's mission and vision statements. This is because we had an agreement with the Academic Senate to do a five-year program review. We are also working on issues such as how we do inventory, wireless technology, and information literacy. Tina Peterson will be giving a presentation on this later today."

C. Professional Standards Committee – Senator Bros said, "As you probably can figure out, the major thing we are working on is Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP). We have gotten the survey results back and we have summarized them. They will be available on the Academic Senate website very soon. The one thing I can tell you now is that most of the things the committee proposed got favorable responses. However, there were only 135 respondents, so there wasn't a big sample. After we identified an issue, we went back to the group that presented it and tried to resolve it. This approach seems to be working well for us."

D. Curriculum and Research Committee – Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "The C&R committee spent a great deal of time in the fall on requests for waivers to the 120-unit limit on majors. We handled approximately two dozen of these requests in our last two meetings. Now we will be addressing the revision of our GE policy, and that should come to the Senate probably at one of the April meetings. Our intention was not to revise the entire policy, but to look at making GE something more than just the selection of items from a list. The proposed revisions to the GE policy are posted on the "What's New" page of the Academic Senate website. The C&R committee also has a new referral regarding getting students to declare a major."

E. Organization and Government Committee –

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1271, Senate Management Recommendation, International Programs and Students Committee (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1271 passed unanimously.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1272, Senate Management Recommendation, Continuing Education Committee (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1272 passed unanimously.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1270, Senate Management Recommendation, Addition to the Charge of the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1270 passed unanimously.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1274, Policy Recommendation, Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects, Training for Investigators (Final Reading)*. Senator Van Selst

presented a friendly amendment to change the word “should” in the last sentence of section 1. a) to “must.” Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to add a new resolved clause that reads, “Resolved, that section 1. b) will be implemented by June 1, 2005.” **The Senate voted and AS 1274 passed unanimously.**

Senator Veregge presented *AS 1275, By-Law Amendment, Modification to the Role of the Senate Secretary and the Senate Administrative Analyst (Final Reading)*. Senator Norton said, “I gave this policy a lot of attention. However, there are at least one or two sentences in it that were not in the committee approved draft.” Senator Veregge asked Senator Norton, “What is it that you think was added to the draft that wasn’t approved?” Senator Norton said, “The reference to by-law section 4.1, the last sentence, where it reads “the Senate Administrator shall be a non-voting member of the Executive Committee.” Chair Nellen said, “Senator Norton is your objection an objection to what was voted on by the Organization and Government Committee (O&G)?” Senator Norton said, “Yes, I am prepared to say that that particular line was not voted on, and was in fact rejected, by the O&G Committee. Senator Veregge said, “I’d like to hear the recollections of the rest of the committee.” Senator Veregge said, “If there is a question as to what the committee agreed upon, should we take this back to the O&G Committee to discuss?” Chair Nellen asked if that was agreeable to the body, the body agreed. The motion to return the resolution to the O&G Committee was approved.

Chair Nellen said, *AS 1276, Senate Management Resolution, Modification to the Role of the Senate Secretary and the Senate Administrative Analyst (Final Reading)* should be brought to the Senate at the same time as AS 1275, so both are returned to the committee to be brought back together.

F. Budget Advisory Committee -- None

VII. Special Committee Reports -- None

VIII. New Business:

A. GAC Update:

Provost Sigler gave an update on the GAC. Provost Sigler said, “The committee first convened on January 14, 2005, and since then we have met regularly. We’ve had eight to nine meetings, including one that lasted five hours. I’m pleased to report that we have engaged in wide-ranging stimulating conversations, sometimes exhausting. I believe we are making good progress. We have identified a number of themes to guide our planning efforts. I will just mention a couple of them. For instance, we are talking about enhancing academic quality. Another theme might be strengthening community alliances, and also improving the student experience. For all these themes, we have developed broad goals. We haven’t gotten into specifics. We are identifying goals we hope will be achieved in the next five years, and we are giving instruction to the University Planning Council (UPC), and the panels that report to the UPC, to actually develop the specific plans to meet these goals. For instance the recommendation that we would make to the UPC for enhancing academic quality would be to develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan. The task force would be charged with coming up with the details of the

enrollment management plan. We are just providing the guidelines on what needs to be addressed.”

Provost Sigler said, “As for our timeline, we thought we would be done by Friday. However, it is a little bit more difficult than we thought. We have set a timeline for ourselves that is a little more generous. We hope to complete a draft by March 18, 2005, and to have our first campus-wide forum to present the draft on March 21st and March 22nd, and then another after spring break. When we get feedback from the campus on the first draft, we will be able to redefine our document. Hopefully, I will be able to present you with our second and final draft at the April 25th, 2005, Academic Senate meeting. I have to say that it has been a very rewarding experience for me, and I especially want to thank the committee members especially Dorothy Poole.”

Questions:

Senator Norton asked, “Are you going to be changing the Mission Statement?” Provost Sigler said, “We will not be changing the Mission Statement, as a matter of fact we will be incorporating it.”

B. Information Literacy Update:

Senator Breivik and Tina Peterson gave a presentation on Information Literacy. Peterson said, “We have a video to show, and then I have a short powerpoint presentation. Peterson said, “We are showing this video and powerpoint presentation on campus to Deans, Chairs, the Academic Senate, etc. to define information literacy, and also to get your support. The library also has a number of resources you can use. In addition, the Center for Faculty Development has a number of presentations on information literacy, and this e-literate video is available for download and is on video in the Information Resource Center (IRC).”

Peterson said, “The definition of information literacy is the ability to find, to evaluate, to use, and to communicate information in all formats. This was developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1989.”

Peterson said, “Information literacy is critical on campus right now. Critical thinking and lifelong learning are being recognized as essential skills. Students need to learn to make choices based on valid information, and I think the video you saw demonstrates some venues where that needs to happen. Some of you may have seen the New York Times editorial a week ago Sunday called, “*Teaching Students to Swim in the Online Sea.*””

Peterson said, “Also, “WASC makes student learning outcomes a priority and information literacy outcomes can be folded into those. The CSU is known in the United States for having information literacy as a priority, and it has done a lot of work on information literacy. One of the most important things the CSU has done is to provide grant money to fund information literacy. The Biology, English, and Art Departments have gotten grants.”

Peterson said, “The Provost’s Retreats for the past three years have identified information literacy as an important campus priority. And, the Academic Senate has done its fair share by passing University policy S04-9, *Infusion of Information Literacy into the SJSU Curriculum.*”

Peterson said, “We had a consultant on campus this year from the University of Minnesota to establish priorities for enhancing student learning. Communication was the first priority, and the second priority was information literacy. What comes next is assessment. We need to develop specific student learning outcomes for information literacy, and assessment for that.”

Peterson said, “We have a couple of projects on campus that we are working on. One important one is the ETS-CSU partnership. This is information and communication technology literacy for higher education. We are beta testing this through the library.”

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

A. Provost – Provost Sigler said, “Last Monday, February 21st, was the last day to add classes. Although our enrollments are up from last spring, we are not going to meet our enrollment targets. It looks like we will be 2 to 2 1/2% off our target. We estimate that our FTES for this year will be 21,124. We had predicted we would have 5,000 FTES more. This summer we are giving the colleges a target of 350 FTES.”

Provost Sigler said, “Our overall graduation rate is 39.4%. We are right in the middle of where all the CSU campuses are.”

Provost Sigler said, “The only other information I have is that we are continuing faculty searches.”

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance – Moved to next meeting

C. Vice President for Student Affairs – Moved to next meeting

D. Associated Students President – Moved to next meeting

E. Statewide Academic Senator(s) – Moved to next meeting

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