

2006/2007 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 26, 2007

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:07 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Gorman, Lessow-Hurley,
Veregge, Kassing, Gutierrez
Absent: Van Selst, Sabalius

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Sigler, Najjar, Phillips
Absent: Lee

Deans:

Present: Merdinger, Wei, Hegstrom,
Stacks

Students:

Present: Bridgeman, Reyes, Antazo
Henderson, Dresher
Absent: Patel

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Thompson

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Thames

CASA Representatives:

Present: Perry, Hooper, Canham
Absent: Fee

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Gehrt
Absent: Jiang

ED Represent:

Present: Rickford, Maldonado-Colon
Absent: Parsons

ENG Representatives:

Present: Meldal, Backer, Gao

H&A Representatives:

Present: Desalvo, Leddy, Vanniarajan, Van Hooff
Absent: Belet, Harris

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Kaufman, Hamill, Bros, Hilliard

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Hebert, Von Till

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –
Minutes of January 29, 2007 were approved.

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

Chair Lessow-Hurley announced that "the nominating petitions for Senate seats have been distributed campus-wide, and are due in the Senate Office by March 2, 2007. Committee Preference forms have also been distributed campus-wide and Senators get first preference for committee seats. Committee Preference forms are due in the Senate Office no later than March 30, 2007."

The campus conversation was a success. Chair Lessow-Hurley is in the process of compiling the responses. The biggest issue reported by the administration, faculty, staff, and students was faculty workload. Senator Meldal will assist in posting a draft of this report as a **wiki** document.

WASC will be here March 7 - 9, 2007. Senators were emailed a summary and the cliff notes version.

Senator Beth Von Till received the Outstanding Lecturer Award for 2006-2007, and Chair Lessow-Hurley congratulated and presented her with a bouquet of roses on behalf of the Academic Senate.

Chair Lessow-Hurley and Eva met with the Engineering Technicians to see if the table and chair setup for the Senate meetings could be arranged in a square so that Senators might better hear one another. Unfortunately, there are too many Senators for this design to be doable.

Chair Lessow-Hurley announced that we would be trying a new procedure for final readings of policies and resolutions at the next Senate meeting. The resolutions will be loaded on a laptop and projected onto the screen, so that amendments can be typed in and seen as they are being added to the resolution.

B. From the President of the University –

The President announced that he recently had a meeting with Mayor Chuck Reed that went very well.

The President emphasized the fact that WASC would be visiting campus very soon.

President Kassing expressed his appreciation for the Senate's consideration of the Naming policy that was going to be presented today for a first reading. The President also thanked everyone that participated in the Access to Excellence conversation.

President Kassing congratulated Senator Von Till on being selected as the Outstanding Lecturer for 2006/2007.

President Kassing announced that "we have made our annual target enrollment, although we are down a little in resident enrollment. SJSU had a higher than usual total non-resident enrollment, so the shortfall in resident enrollment (approximately 1%) should not affect us. Our total enrollment was 23,020 FTES."

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

January 29, 2007 - No Questions

February 12, 2007 -

Senator Stacks asked about the issue with the Academic Council on International Programs

(ACIP) representative. Chair Lessow-Hurley explained that after selecting Senator Gorman for the position, it became obvious that that there was an extensive time commitment. Therefore, it was decided to split the requirements between the three nominees for the position.

B. Consent Calendar – Approved with one addition.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

V. Unfinished Business - None

VI. Special Order of Business:

**A. Presentation by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Gary Reichard**

Chair Lessow-Hurley introduced Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Chief Academic Officer Gary Reichard. EVC Reichard thanked the Senate for allowing him to visit. The EVC is a historian, and he began his career at Ohio State University. EVC Reichard was the Director of the University Honors Program at the University of Delaware before moving to the University of Maryland. From Maryland, EVC Reichard moved to Florida and became the Dean of Undergraduate Studies at Florida Atlantic University. In 1994, EVC Reichard moved to CSU Long Beach where he became Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel for the next eight years. In addition, EVC Reichard served three tours on the Collective Bargaining Team while at CSU Long Beach. In 2002, EVC Reichard became the Provost at Long Beach, and then the EVC a year ago.

The EVC thanked the Senate for allowing him to visit and said his "visits to the campuses are very beneficial, because they allow him to get a better sense of what the campus is all about, and they also keep him in touch with campus concerns. EVC Reichard was given a tour of the Student Success Center and a demonstration in one of the incubator classrooms. The EVC was very impressed.

EVC Reichard emphasized the need for campuses "to connect with each other for a couple of reasons. First, campuses can do much more working together than they can do on their own in areas such as curriculum and resources. Furthermore, partnering with other campuses allows students to have access to classes they might otherwise not have access to. In addition, partnering with other campuses makes sure that the CSU is stronger than the sum of its parts." The EVC believes that "universities of higher education should be more transparent about their impact on students and the learning that occurs in them, and also be more accountable to society."

The EVC described the "voluntary system of accountability which is a template for response to what the Spellings Commission called for in terms of transparency and accountability for

higher education. There are three components to this system which was put together by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Association for State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The first component is a set of indicators that the university should report on to parents and students, e.g. graduation rates, time to degree, etc. The second component is the value we add to students, or student learning outcomes. And, the third component is the development of attitudes of engagement. One of the instruments suggested for measuring these components includes the collegiate learning assessment which measures the kind of students the CSU is bringing in, and what they look like when they become seniors. Collegiate learning assessment focuses on critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, and argument development. However, this instrument doesn't deal with some of the issues, such as transfer students, and/or the problems 2nd language students have. Another instrument that was suggested is the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) which measures attitudes and student involvement. The CSU is also fortunate to have Senator Jack Scott present legislation at the state level that is related to higher education.

A new office has recently been established called the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Initiatives and Partnerships. This function of this office is to find out what additional infrastructure campuses may need, and to help faculty connect with others. The focus is on creating partnerships across campuses." The EVC congratulated SJSU on the campus conversation, and is looking forward to getting input from the campuses.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski related some of the concerns the Curriculum and Research Committee has about the requirement to offer the Ed.D. degree in Fall of 2007. Two areas of concern include the lack of funds and qualified faculty to teach this program. SJSU also needs a library with sufficient funds to stock research materials. The Curriculum and Research Committee wants this program be high quality, and they are concerned the development of the program is being rushed. Provost Sigler commented that SJSU had been given a one-year extension on the start date. EVC Reichard assured Senator Buzanski that no campus was being asked to move more quickly than they were ready to move. According to the EVC, if an additional one-year extension is needed, it will be granted. The EVC further explained that "library resources are tied to Senate Bill 724 which does not allow the CSU to alter undergraduate education to establish Ed.D. programs.

The CSU got the Ed.D. in Education, but is required to work with the UC on a joint doctorate in Audiology. The CSU and UC have come up with an affordable 4-year Audiology degree program that would only cost students \$13,000. The fourth year of the degree also includes a paid externship which further reduces the cost. The CSU and UC have been trying to get a marginal cost rate that is equivalent to the UC marginal cost rate for Optometry. Once the CSU and UC get the Audiology degree setup, they will be moving forward with plans for a doctorate in Physical Therapy degree. If an affordable degree program cannot be worked out, then the Chancellor has said the CSU will go it alone.

Another doctorate program being considered is in Nursing. The CSU desperately needs enough faculty to teach undergraduate Nursing programs that can meet the state's Nursing demands. Last year, the CSU needed 34 Nursing faculty, compared to 27 for the UC. The CSU has hired a consultant to determine what degrees, other than a Nursing Ph.D., our Nursing departments would be willing to hire, and also to determine what campuses it would be feasible to develop these programs on."

Senator Bridgeman wanted to know if there was "any way to lobby the legislature to cover the cost of tuition increases resulting from budget shortfalls." The EVC noted that "the most effective lobbyists are students." The EVC explained that "the Governor's COMPACT funds enrollment growth and faculty/staff salary increases, and it depends upon the money equivalent to a 10% student fee increase. The student fee increase was avoided last year because the legislature bought it out. This is where student lobbying would be effective. The Governor has not proposed a buy-out for this year."

Senator Norton inquired about "the prospects for faculty workload reduction." The EVC commented that "the CSU needs to develop more online courses to assist in workload reduction. In addition, a recent study in Long Beach showed an average workload of 10.3 units as opposed to 12 units. This was largely due to innovative methods the departments have come up with to assist each other." The EVC does "not believe faculty workload will ever be reduced from 12 to 9 units, because the legislature would then believe the CSU was over funded." The EVC expressed "a need for the CSU to become creative and politically savvy in the way workload issues are addressed."

Chair Lessow-Hurley thanked EVC Reichard for coming and presented him with SJSU's 150th Anniversary coin.

B. Election for Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee

The Associate Vice Chair (AVC), Senator McClory, announced that there was only one nominee for Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee--Senator Kaufman. AVC McClory called for additional nominations from the floor. There were no additional nominees. Senator Buzanski made a motion to close nominations from the floor. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed. Senator Kaufman presented a statement of interest. The Senate voted by secret ballot, and Senator Kaufman was elected unanimously (34-0-0).

VII.

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA) Committee -

Senator Meldal presented *AS 1350, Policy Recommendation, Academic Integrity (First Reading)*. The purpose of this resolution is to separate the fairness and judicial procedures. A resolution addressing fairness procedures will be brought to a future Senate meeting. Specifically, the Ombudsman's Office is being removed from the appeal process, and a requirement for faculty to report Academic Integrity violations is being added to bring the policy in line with the current Executive Order.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski commented that "the Ombudsman is supposed to be a neutral party and help mediate in these situations. There doesn't appear to be a good reason to remove him." Senator Hegstrom explained that "the Ombudsman often steps in on the side of the individual." Senator Meldal further commented that "the Ombudsman Office is supposed to adjudicate fairness issues, and arbitrate. The Academic Integrity policy deals with cheating."

Senator Peter asked how the "new policy would handle a situation in which a student felt he/she was unfairly accused of cheating, but the incident was not reported to the Office of Student Conduct and Ethics." In the past, Senator Peter has referred students to the Ombudsman. Senator Meldal said, "Either the faculty member is in violation of both the old and new policy, or there is no Academic Integrity issue. In which case, it would be a fairness in grading issue which is the Ombudsman's turf." Senator Phillips commented that the Ombudsman attempts to get the student to work the problem out by himself/herself. If the issue involves a grade, the Ombudsman directs the student to take the complaint through the chain of command beginning with the department chair. Senator Meldal further explained that in the new policy if the instructor feels there is an Academic Integrity issue he/she must report the violation. The instructor has no choice.

Senator Backer commented that the new policy "seems less directive than the old policy." Senator Meldal said, "The previous policy said that the faculty member must report on the form provided by..., the current policy goes into more specifics about what must be reported and this is to bring it more in line with the coded memorandum 969." Senator Backer referred to item 3, but Senator Meldal commented that nothing had changed in item 3.

Senator Thames asked if the committee had considered "who would convene the hearing referenced in 5.1." Senator Meldal replied, "This is spelled out pretty clearly in the Executive Order."

Senator Phillips asked about section 3.2. The first paragraph refers to section 3.0, but it appears to mean section 4.0. Senator Meldal said, "We did not change that so I'll have to look into it." Senator Phillips suggested that the committee consider "adding the word *Academic* before sanctions in that sentence." Senator Phillips also asked the committee to "review section 4.1 where it says, *must make a recommendation for additional action*. A report must be made, but a recommendation for additional action might not be a requirement." Senator Meldal replied, "I respectfully disagree with any change to 4.1. The faculty member must either state no further action recommended, or should have an obligation to make a statement about whether further action is recommended."

Senator Veregge commented that "what the faculty recommends might not be what the Academic Integrity Officer would recommend." Senator Meldal replied, "The faculty recommendation is not the end-all of possible reactions to student behavior."

Senator Sigler asked what it means in section 1.1.4 when it says, "Using or consulting, prior

to, ... an examination?" Senator Meldal said, "I can give you an example. Some colleagues have on their greensheet that students should not consult with others about their graded homework." Senator Norton suggested changing this to "*unpermitted*, or something similar." Senator Sigler further suggested some language cleanup to 1.1.7 (...a student in the course of their...).

Senator Veregge gave an example of a "prior to" situation in which a student from an earlier class might pass on a test to a student in a later class that same day. Senator Buzanski commented that "the tests should be different." Senator Veregge gave another example where the "professor collects all the tests instead of having a separate test for each section."

Senator Leddy suggested that the committee consider revising item 2 under the section "Faculty Member Role," where it says "examinations should be appropriately proctored or monitored to prevent students from copying." It is not clear how this section would apply to take-home examinations.

Senator Stacks suggested that "strike-outs and underlines would be helpful in identifying what items were changed by the Executive Order." Senator Meldal responded that he would bring copies to the next meeting with and without track changes.

B. University Library Board (ULB) -

Senator Peter presented *AS 1351, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Library Resources to support the independent Ed.D. (First Reading)*. Senator Peter said, "The purpose of this resolution is to remind the university that we have a policy, S03-1, that requires the Librarians work with the faculty when new programs are being designed. In the past, the university library has been funded on the basis that it is not primarily a research library. Our mission is going to change if we are going to support a doctoral program. The new mission of supporting a doctoral program is going to be expensive, and the university needs to understand this and support it. I am delighted we have been given an extra year to work on the planning for the Ed.D degree. My hope is that during this year, we will take the opportunity to work out a refined budget to support this new doctorate degree with appropriate resources in our library. Attached to the Sense of the Senate resolution is a copy of the statewide resolution on the same subject. In addition, the next two pages in your packet contain a memo prepared by the CSU Council of Library Directors with a tentative estimate of expenses to support a modest size doctoral program. The ULB believes this is a conservative estimate and we will probably require more resources since we are one of the larger campuses. The discussion has been about a specialized focus for our Ed.D program. A specialized focus means specialized materials that cannot easily be shared across campuses in the CSU. The Council of Library Directors estimates \$116,000 annually as an ongoing expense. We believe it will probably be higher. We are cautioning the campus to engage in the planning to appropriately estimate and fund support for the Ed.D from the library."

Senator Norton asked if it wouldn't be "more appropriate to say *should* instead of *shall* in the first Resolved clause."

Senator Buzanski asked, "Has the committee considered asking SFSU how much they spent on their library? This data could be useful."

Senator Stacks asked for clarification as to whether the analysis of library needs in the first Resolved clause could be the basis for rejecting new programs. Senator Peter said, "Yes, I think we should not create programs that can't be adequately supported."

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) - None

D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) - None

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) -

Senator Hebert presented *AS 1352, Policy Recommendation, Repeal of S00-4, Policies and Procedures for Naming of Colleges, Schools, and Other Academic Entities at San José State University (First Reading)*. The Executive Committee was asked to review the current Naming policy at the January 29, 2007 meeting. Senator Thames and Senator Hebert rewrote the policy in consultation with VP Najjar. Senator Hebert then took the policy to the O&G Committee for review and approval. In addition, Senator Hebert researched how the University of Washington, the University of Minnesota, and Pennsylvania University handled their Naming opportunities. O&G incorporated the best ideas from each of these universities into this revision.

Questions:

Senator Peter asked, "Have you considered expanding (for purposes of these discussions) the Executive Committee to include one or two Senators from the affected academic unit. The Executive Committee won't always have someone on it from the unit being named." Senator Hebert said, "Yes, I did but I decided not to include it at this point. I really wouldn't have any objection to seeing where we could work this in. Two of the universities I looked at specifically involved faculty from the entity that was up for the naming honor." Senator Peter replied, "I would sure hate to name the college of "X" without having anyone from that college involved." VP Najjar said, "The Dean of the college involved is included in the preliminary discussions. We were trying to streamline the process through the Executive Committee." Senator Peter commented that although the Dean was involved, the faculty of the college might not be.

Senator Gao asked about the length of time the university would have to use the name. Senator Hebert responded, "If the college is named after an individual, the name remains until the college or program is nevermore. If it is named after a corporation, the length of time is contractually negotiated at the time of the donation. However, the Trustees can remove a name for unethical behavior and things like that."

Senator Thames said, "Although my name is at the top of resolution, I was only involved in some of the preliminary work. In item 4.4 it refers to the Executive Committee becoming involved in establishing a minimum donation amount, when we met with VP Najjar he

indicated that some of the donation amounts are set by the Chancellor's Office as well as current economic conditions, and that this is a fluctuating number. I'm concerned about the workload for the Executive Committee. I'm not concerned that the administration won't get as much money for us as they can. Can you talk a little bit about the rationale for this." Senator Hebert said, "Yes, I think there is a misunderstanding about what section 4.4 is doing. It is not establishing a dollar amount for an academic entity before VP Najjar can talk. By the time we arrive at section 4.4, we are almost at the end of the process. I'm thinking one or two months away from the deal being made. It is establishing a minimum for this academic entity, for this donor, to name it this. If the amount were \$5 million, it would be VP Najjar's responsibility to convince the Executive Committee that \$5 million is a fair amount."

VP Najjar said, "One of our interests in bringing this issue to the Executive Committee in January was to create a policy that is more workable, and would allow us to gather a lot of energy in fundraising. You will see much bigger numbers in the coming year. I have a couple concerns with this policy revision. I am not aware of too many campuses that have established minimum levels [of donation], and I would prefer that that be an opportunity for me to look at what the market is, and that I not be restricted to a list of approved levels. I am trying to create a system where we can get some momentum around fundraising. In general, I appreciate the ability to bring Naming opportunities to the Executive Committee to get the process moving. However, as many of you may know, sometimes you don't get that much lead time to get a gift, and the donor is offering a certain amount. And, sometimes I know the amount ahead of time, and sometimes I don't." Senator Hebert said, "I think you are referring to the preapprovals. One is by the entire Senate and that is an entity with no dollar figure attached. Is that what you are concerned about?" VP Najjar said, "Right." Senator Hebert said, "What the Senate would approve is a list of entities that are eligible to be named. There is no dollar figure in the 4.2 section. The dollar figures would only come in about three or four months out from the time it's submitted to the Trustees."

Senator Backer said, "When I read 4.3 it appears to partly contradict 4.2. In 4.2 it says there would be a list of things that could be named, then 4.3 says with respect to donors the first requirement of a naming opportunity...the Academic Senate has to be consulted. That does not say if it is not on the list, so it doesn't make sense to me and it creates a bottleneck. If something is on the list why does 4.3 even exist. Am I misinterpreting what 4.3 means?" Senator Hebert said, "These are two different steps in the process. In 4.3 advancing an opportunity for naming for a prospective donor is notifying the Executive Committee that something is up--we have a prospect." Senator Backer said, "It doesn't say that. Section 4.3 says, "will gain approval of the Executive Committee" that is different than notifying. I thought the whole purpose of 4.2 was to get preapproval of a list of names to save time." Senator Hebert said, "I will take a close look at the language and let you know."

Senator Thames said, "I had the same question, but I think 4.2 is a list of entities and 4.3 is referring to donor sources. However, it does look like a two-step approval process, and I really appreciate that we are trying to streamline this and that there are so many steps that it has become cumbersome for the VP of Advancement, the President, and the Board of Trustees. I think this revision has taken a lot of the cumbersomeness out of it, and it just

needs a little tweaking." Senator Hebert said, "Section 4.3 is really a donor without a donor. To maintain confidentiality, the VP of Advancement is notifying the Executive Committee that there is a prospect who may be interested in this academic entity. A real name is not attached to that prospect until the next step in section 4.4. Section 4.3 is more informational stuff and an opportunity for the Executive Committee to have a clue that these things are coming down the pipeline."

Senator Bros said, "It seems to me that the second sentence in 4.3 about prospective donors is an alternative to 4.3.1, is that an either or situation?" Senator Hebert said, "No, all I was thinking with 4.3 was that if the prospect that the VP of Advancement is talking with, at a stage way earlier than the VP for Advancement ever would have guessed that this person would be interested in a Naming opportunity goes, *Well, how about naming this academic entity after me in exchange for a donation*, then the VP of Advancement would have to notify the Executive Committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting." Senator Bros said, "What I was getting at is that in 4.3.1 you've got an automatic approval process whereas in the previous section, you are requiring the VP of Advancement to get the Executive Committee's approval." Senator Hebert said, "The preapproved list pertains to the academic entity. The prospective donor in 4.3 refers to a person or corporation." Senator Bros asked, "What is the role of 4.3.1?" Senator Hebert said, "What if the Senate wanted to rule out the possibility that Tower Hall would ever be renamed, but it is not on any preapproved list anywhere. That would require explicit approval by the Executive Committee. If on the other hand, it was on this preapproved list, the VP of Advancement would just notify the Executive Committee."

Senator Wei commented that donors are smart, and that they have their own calendars for donations. Sometimes they want to donate right away, for example if there is a merger, or they may wait until year-end for tax purposes. Senators need to keep in mind that this may be a very short time frame." Senator Hebert said, "Under section 4.7.1, it states that "the VP of Advancement is responsible for informing the prospective donor of the Guidelines for Naming (Section 3.0), the types of documentation required, the bodies or offices that must approve of the naming honor and the minimum timeframe required by each body or office to make a decision," and then in 4.7.3 it states that "University officials in contact with the donor should be careful to avoid creating a belief in the donor that any step in the naming proposal approval process is unimportant or a "mere formality." It is the responsibility of the office of Advancement to inform donors that they can't expect to donate \$10 million on Friday and have something named after them on Monday. They need to be informed of the process."

Senator Backer said, "I think what you have done is to streamline the process, but it is still a three-step process and that creates problems. I agree with Senator Hebert about the minimum donation required, but I think the Executive Committee and the faculty really have no awareness of what the right level of a gift should be. This is an unnecessary roadblock or bottleneck in the process. Couldn't some of these steps be combined? Why is it necessary for it to come to the Executive Committee twice, when it could come once?" Senator Norton said, "This is an area for debate."

Senator Sigler said, "I have a question about 4.2. I don't understand the purpose of having a preapproved list. Wouldn't everything that doesn't have a name be eligible for being named?" Senator Hebert said, "What section 4.2 is doing is saying that the Academic Senate at SJSU has the right not to name an academic entity after anybody. Which I think is a good thing."

Senator Buzanski said, "Why are we debating this. We should send it back to O&G for more deliberation." Chair Lessow-Hurley asked Senator Buzanski if he was making a motion to return it to O&G. Senator Buzanski said, "Yes." The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion failed (14-16-0).

Senator Thames said, "There is no real explanation of the impact on the workload of the Executive Committee. What kind of report are you talking about in 4.7.2?" Senator Hebert said, "I purposely did not specify what would go into this report. I was leaving that up to the wisdom of the Executive Committee. It doesn't have to be a large report."

Senator Campsey said, "If someone was dying to give us money immediately, with no strings attached, we could later go back and honor that person with some kind of naming. Is there anything in this resolution that would prevent that?" Senator Hebert said, "That is one for the lawyers. According to CSU policy, each proposal for naming shall be considered on its own merits. [The policy also states that] opportunities for naming these programs are for fundraising purposes only."

Senator Veregge asked, "How do other universities deal with someone that wants to donate on December 29th? Clearly, the Board of Trustees can't respond because they need the proposal six weeks before their meeting." Senator Hebert said, "At Pennsylvania State University they can take the money and tell the Trustees later. At other universities it is not addressed."

VIII. Special Committee Reports – None

IX. New Business –

A. Student Center Facilities Project Presentation:

(See attached powerpoint presentation by VP for Student Affairs, Veril Phillips)

Chair Lessow-Hurley introduced VP Phillips. VP Phillips said, "Let me invite my colleagues Cathy Busalacchi, Eloise Stiglitz, and Roger Elrod to join me while Eva is setting up the powerpoint presentation. We made a similar presentation to the Executive Committee recently.

In December we had a student survey and I am going to show you some of the results of that survey having to do with the Student Center Facilities Project, and what students want and might support. We had more than 13% of the student body respond to the survey.

An email was sent to 30,000 students inviting them to participate in the survey between December 4th and 13th. There were 3,755 surveys returned. Twenty-one students received prizes, the top prize was payment of tuition and fees for one semester. The other twenty prizes included \$100 gift certificates, IPOD shuffles, and parking passes for one semester. The various groups we have made a presentation to include: the Executive Committee, the Associated Students, the Student Union staff, the Student Affairs leadership team, the Peer Mentors, the Orientation Leaders, the Student Housing leaders, the Student Union Board of Directors, the Greek System Presidents, and the Associated Students staff.

The vision for the facilities has three components to it. The first component is the Student Union. The current Student Union is old and isn't the right kind of facility for today's students. The Student Union opened in 1969. The student body has grown a great deal since then. There are many improvements that need to be made to it. The Sport Club and Event Center renovation and expansion is the 2nd component. And, the third component is the Student Health Center. The Student Health Center was built in 1957, and is also very old, and too small for the current student body.

With regard to the Student Union, 11% of the student body does not use the Student Union. That means 89% do use it. That number would increase to 98% if changes are made. The number of minutes per week that students spend in the student union would increase from about 52 to 110. The number one change students would like to see is more study areas. The number two area is food service, the third is appearance and atmosphere of the building, the fourth is more space, the fifth is awareness of activities and programs, and so forth. Let me say at this point that if we do go forward with this project, and certainly we must go forward with some part of the project, the real question is what is the scope that we will go forward with. The next step will be a programmatic study to determine exactly what components go into each of these three projects we are describing. This is the initial survey. We can use this in focus groups in the coming year.

Of those students that live on-campus, 39% exercise exclusively on-campus. Of those students that live off-campus, 57% exercise exclusively off-campus. And, about 15% do not exercise at all. Some students exercise both on and off-campus. Students are interested in more awareness of programs and activities, better equipment, more equipment, evening hours, increased hours throughout the day, and appearance and atmosphere of the building. Forty-eight percent of our student body have an off-campus fitness membership at the present time. This was a big surprise to me. This membership costs them \$288 per year. If we make the changes requested in the Sports Club, the increase in usage will be substantial.

As for the Health Center, students would like to see more variety of services, increased hours of operation, increased quality of services, and easier parking near the building. Some of the services students would like the Health Center to offer include massage therapy, dentistry, optometry, mental health, and acupuncture. At the present time we can't do massage therapy because we have no room. We need additional facilities to do

it. This is something that would be available for faculty and staff as well on a fee basis. The Student Health Center is currently not used by 62% of the student body. That would decrease to only 24% if we make some of the changes students are requesting.

One of the things we were interested in in the survey is if we have to prioritize, what is the top priority project among these three projects. Thirty-three percent of the student body said the Student Union should be the top priority project. However, this percentage is not substantially different from the Sport Club and Student Health Center percentages. You could say roughly one-third wanted each of them as the first priority project. What we are actually considering is going forward with all three projects. That is a very ambitious and bold vision, but we think it will help us a great deal in some of the vision on this campus.

For these projects, there is a total fee increase that would be involved. Before I go into more detail about this, let me comment that the fees collected for instructional purposes cannot be used for these kind of facilities. There are separate fees that have to be levied for these type of projects. The Student Union and the Student Health Center are revenue generating organizations that are run by the state, but have separate fees for their programs.

What we are envisioning is about five years from now, the fee increase would amount to about a \$240 per semester increase. That would be a \$40 per semester increase each year for four years, and an \$80 per semester increase for the fifth year which would be the year these three facilities would open. Between now and then we are considering many options to provide services for students that will be paying for the next four years and not still be here in the fifth year, the year of opening. There are some ways of doing that.

As a reminder, currently 42% of our student body is paying \$288 per year on fitness centers off-campus right now. There will also be some naming opportunities for these facilities as well. We do intend to look at that possibility. Naming opportunities could reduce some of those fees to students.

The Student Union renovation would occur in its current location. I also want to mention that a seismic retrofit would be included. The expansion of the Student Union will be at the site of the Old Cafeteria building. The Recreation Center would be at the site of the current Event Center coming out at 7th street and going up. The Student Health Center would be in the parking lot where the modulars were removed at 10th and San Antonio, and would accommodate possibly parking and the Student Health Center. A building design has gone forward to the Chancellor's office for a self-support building at that location that is envisioned as a five-story parking structure. The first one, two, or three floors could be used for the Student Health Center. All of this is yet to be decided.

The new Student Union would have an outdoor plaza where programming could take place that does not have to end at 1 p.m. Outside there is a lot of space possibly for eating facilities, a big screen, and a lot of openness. Inside there would be a modern food court and a 24-7 [24 hours a day, 7 days a week] cyber cafe. There would also be new

meeting rooms. Club organizations have indicated that they need organization space. The current location of the Event Center might also be able to be enclosed to make a multi-purpose theatre, and there would be more ballroom space. The Recreation Center would be open more hours of the day, have more equipment (including weight lifting equipment), and have more space for martial arts and yoga classes. There would also be an indoor running track. The wellness connection will be associated either with the Sport Center or the Health Center.

The Student Health Center would be very open and inviting with modern exam rooms. It would also have a pharmacy that could adequately serve our students. There is also considerable interest in the Healthy SJSU 2010 project.

On April 20, 2007, there will be a SJSU Day of Service. This is a partnership with San José State University, Communiversity, and the City of San Jose to provide a day of service. Faculty, staff, and students will be working together on all kinds of projects such as painting, and cleanup. We are hoping for 800 volunteers.

Questions:

Chair Lessow-Hurley said, "When we discussed this, we had some conversations about including some kind of accommodations for faculty dining. In a follow-up conversation, I proposed the notion that these facilities might include a dedicated meeting space for the Academic Senate to share with Associated Students to solve some of our technical and acoustical problems." VP Phillips said, "We think that having facilities for dining is a very important component for the community and connections and the learning and belonging model we have in association with Vision 2010. I think there is no question that those type of facilities will be included in the Student Union that we envision here. I also think that having some facilities for this body and Associated Students to meet would be quite appropriate. I do have to say that the needs of the two bodies are different. Nevertheless, I think it is certainly possible to arrange for that facility to accommodate this group."

Senator Bros asked for clarification as to when the new student fee would go into effect, and also asked if the groups VP Phillips has talked to have been receptive to the fee increases. VP Phillips said, "These are facilities students want, and they are willing to step up and pay the piper so to speak."

Senator Peter asked, "How will this increase be approved?" VP Phillips said, "The fee increase is being considered through a consultation process that is taking place right now. The presentation will be made ultimately to the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC) which is scheduled to meet March 16, 2007. By that time, we will have consulted with a number of student organizations. We will also have two town hall meetings. The first is on March 15th at 6:00 p.m. Eventually, it will be decided by the President in consultation with the Chancellor." Senator Peter asked, "So, we are not going to have a campus-wide referendum?" VP Phillips said, "That is correct. This is a large project and we are trying to scope the project." Senator Peter said, "If your survey

data is correct, why not have the election?" VP Phillips said, "If we were to have an election, the most expedient method would be to include it with the Associated Students election on March 20th. We felt that would be a very divisive thing, and inappropriate for the student leaders."

Senator Bridgeman inquired if this was the best time for the fee increase considering the 10% increase students are already facing. VP Phillips said, "Can we afford to wait? It is really going to get costly both in terms of bond and construction costs if we wait. The total construction cost of these three projects is about \$150,000,000. The fee increase supports not only the construction costs but also the soft costs which are the costs of programming design, the architectural drawings, and that sort of thing."

Senator Hebert said, "After five years do the student fees go back down?" VP Phillips said, "No, it would be about 30 years after the bonds are paid off."

Senator Peter said, "Have there been provisions for increasing financial aid to offset the increase in fees." VP Phillips said, "There haven't been any separate provisions put in place, however, the financial aid itself has two components. The first component is the ability to pay, and the second component is the actual cost of education. The fee increase would be included in the actual cost of education." Senator Peter said, "There once was a provision that one-third of all fees would be set aside for financial aid, but I believe the Trustees lifted that." VP Phillips said, "That is correct, they did." Senator Peter said, "So is one-third of the \$240 being set aside for financial aid?" VP Phillips said, "No, this is a separate fee. That is part of the state university fee."

Senator Veregge said, "Was the last student fee increase voted on by students, and along those same lines, when is something considered appropriate for students to vote on?" VP Phillips said, "Executive Order 740 has provisions for two consultation procedures, and the procedure we are using is one of the two identified in the Executive Order."

Senator Gorman asked if there had been any consultation with graduate students. VP Phillips said, "Twenty-five percent of the students that responded to the survey were graduate students. We are talking with a whole variety of students. I don't know that we have any particular graduate organization in our sights. I don't believe there are any." Senator Stacks confirmed the lack of Graduate Student Organizations.

Senator Bros said, "For several years students will be paying for services they can't use. Have you considered partnering with outside agencies to get students what they need during this time?" VP Phillips said, "We have thought about that, and it is something we will be looking at during the programmatic phase."

Senator Bridgeman said, "A good percentage of our students are middle class and many are working two jobs to pay for their education now. A lot of these students don't qualify for financial aid. How do you think this increase is going to affect them?" VP Phillips said, "That is the group of students that will be hit harder than other groups. I don't see any way around that in a plan such as we have in the CSU."

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

- A. Vice President for Student Affairs - None**
- B. Vice President for University Advancement - None**
- C. Statewide Academic Senators - None**
- D. Provost - None**
- E. VP for Administration and Finance - None**

XI. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.