2009/2010 Academic Senate

MINUTES
March 15, 2010

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:
Present: Kaufman, Lessow-Hurley, Baker,Van Selst, Meldal, Whitmore, Sabalius

Administrative Representatives:
Present: Selter, Najjar, Phillips
Absent: Lee

Deans:
Present: Parrish, Stacks
Absent: Bullock, Merdinger

Students:
Present: Armendariz, Orr, Starks, Ortiz
Absent: Pulu, Gonzales

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):
Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Lin, Fujimoto, Sivertsen

CASA Representatives:
Present: Kao, Schultz-Krohn, Fee, Hendrick
Absent: Correia

COB Representatives:
Present: Campsey
Absent: Roldan, Jiang

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Kimbarow
Absent: Smith

ENGR Representatives:
Present: Gleixner, Backer
Absent: Du

H&A Representatives:
Present: Desalvo, Brown, Brada-Williams, Fleck,
Absent: Butler, Van Hooff

SCI Representatives:
Present: d'Alarcao, Hamill, Silber, McGee, McClory

SOS Representatives:
Present: Ng, Heiden, Von Till
Absent: Lee

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

Senator Buzanski made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the minutes of February 8, 2010, were approved as written with 1 abstention.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kaufman acknowledged the very successful rally in support of higher education that occurred about 10 days ago. Members of the faculty, student body, and staff participated. About 700 people marched to City Hall, around downtown, and back to the campus. Senator Najjar had a chance to speak and he spoke about advocacy being important not just at the march, but also in the future. Chair Kaufman identified resources that were available to

Senators including an email campaign that you can find a link to on the Senate blog. At last count 750 faculty had sent over 2,000 messages to state legislators advocating for higher education. Also, on the university website there is a link for advocacy that takes you to a similar sort of process that includes suggestions for what you should write. Chair Kaufman asked Senators to encourage their friends and family to participate as well.

Chair Kaufman made the following announcements from the Senate Chairs' meeting a few weeks ago:

Chancellor Reed commented that it was unclear whether furloughs would happen this coming year. There may possibly be a scaled back version of furloughs. It was unclear whether the Chancellor was talking about faculty or staff furloughs by those unions that are facing layoffs this year. Given the current state of the state budget, anything is possible. Although, the Chancellor did agree that furloughs were intended for 1 year only, in order to allow us time to adjust to the permanent decrease in our budget.

Several Presidents and Provosts from the CSU System have formed an Ad Hoc group that is looking at general education (GE) in the CSU. The Chancellor commented that no other large university system in the nation has an upper division GE program, so why do we. There are 7 items on the Ad Hoc Committee's agenda as they look at GE CSU system-wide. They are:

- Ensuring all GE taken at one CSU campus is transferrable to other CSU campuses
- Mandating that students awarded an AA degree have completed the GE requirement for the CSU system
- Decreasing the number of lower division GE units from 39 to 30 units
- Moving the American Institutions requirement into the existing GE
- Charging an additional fee when students get above 120 units
- Eliminating upper division GE

Chair Kaufman commented that charging an additional fee when students get above 120 units "doesn't sound like a GE thing, it sounds more like a get people down to 120 units thing." They are also looking into eliminating the upper GE requirement from the CSU. Chair Kaufman further commented that the Senate would have to look into whether this would be mandatory for all CSU campuses as the Ad Hoc Committee moves forward. Chair Kaufman will post the 7 items on the Ad Hoc Committee's Agenda to the Senate Blog for Senators to review.

B. From the President of the University –
President Whitmore commented that he had recently been down in Long Beach and had heard the same things that Chair Kaufman mentioned earlier. However, President Whitmore is under the impression that the Chancellor is trying not to have furloughs, unless we get into a much worse financial situation then what is anticipated. Also, furloughs would have to be approved by the unions. The unions only approved 1 year of furloughs. The Governor did propose $300 million back to the CSU. The budget proposed would put us in a "more shallow hole, or a less deep hole. We wouldn't get out of the hole, but it would be very helpful." However, most people think that we won't get that much, and if we do that we should really celebrate. The

university is planning for the same kind of stable negative budget situation that we are currently in. The budget will probably not get a lot worse, or a lot better. We will not have next year's budget until mid-summer or later. We have to plan on what we think is the best scenario. We have a good plan in place. We will have to adjust it up and down.

President Whitmore was told that our enrollment targets are holding at this point. If the CSU got the $300 million maybe we could back off of that, but it is unlikely we will get that much. Right now the enrollment target is about 2,500 students lower than this year. Senator Phillips commented that they anticipate 2,200 transfer students, and 2,800 freshmen. The president is hoping his push to get more super seniors graduated pays off, but he will not know until after graduation.

President Whitmore commented that advocacy is something we all need to be involved in now. The president encouraged everyone to write letters to state legislators. The primary message is to fund the Governor's budget, because that would be $305 returned to the CSU system and is the best we could hope for.

President Whitmore announced that SJSU students would be going to Sacramento on March 22, 2010. President Whitmore thanked Senators, and their colleagues, for the peaceful and orderly message they sent on March 4, 2010. It got the attention of the whole state. The president was particularly proud of the quality of the event, and of the news coverage.

President Whitmore announced that there would be a concerted effort by the CSU, the UC, and the community colleges in Sacramento on April 27, 2010. The college presidents want to show unity in their call for funding for higher education. There is another event on May 24th, but the president was not quite sure what that event entails. The point is that there is ongoing advocacy that will continue until we do have a budget. The president is also getting alumni and Tower Board members in on this.

President Whitmore announced that the VP for Student Affairs search has been launched. Senator Najjar is chairing that committee. The search committee has hired a search firm. A very nice brochure has been created about the job. The president hopes to have final candidates for faculty and staff to meet by this summer.

President Whitmore will be returning to Long Beach tomorrow and will let Senators know if he finds out anything further.

Questions:

Senator Lessow-Hurley commented that last spring the Senate passed a resolution that revised the Strategic Planning Process. The resolution that was passed directed the Provost to chair a newly created Strategic Planning Board. That board has never been convened, despite the fact that there have several inquiries at the Senate Executive Committee meetings and assurances that the board would meet. There are rumors that strategic planning has been sidelined for the moment due to the lack of resources and the fact that much of Vision 2010 has yet to be realized. No one has ever contradicted those rumors. Senate Lessow-Hurley commented that

she would be "disturbed to find out that the authority to run the university had been delegated to the deans," and she feels that "true strategic planning would be very helpful at this time." There is a possibility that the budget could get worse and we could be looking at layoffs and program closures. Senator Lessow-Hurley commented that, "These are very difficult decisions, and a list of agreed upon priorities might be very useful at this time." Senator Lessow-Hurley raised this issue at the CSU Statewide Senate. Senator Lessow-Hurley stated that, "If you have a list of priorities budget cuts won't be easier to deal with, but will be clearer." Senator Lessow-Hurley asked the president if he supported strategic planning and if he did, could we move this along and convene the board.

President Whitmore responded that he did indeed support strategic planning, but they had been very distracted this year with things like enrollment management that weren't in the strategic plan. President Whitmore does not believe we have broken with the strategic plan that currently exists, but he does believe that we need to continue the strategic planning process. President Whitmore announced that it would be a good idea to have a meeting of the board in the near future.

Senator Baker asked if the President had had an opportunity to review the resolution that Associated Students had sent to him regarding AB 540? President Whitmore commented that he had looked it over, and they had discussed it at their cabinet meeting, but nothing had been determined at this time.

Senator Brada-Williams wanted to know if there was any special grading of student qualifications coming in since we are limited in our enrollment? President Whitmore commented that there was, and that there were 3 tiers of admissions and that it is very complicated. Senator Phillips commented that there are a dozen programs under impaction and that all of those programs have higher admissions standards. What is under consideration for 2011-2012 is an increase in the number of programs that are impacted. This is based on our experience this year, and is under consideration right now. Senator Brada-Williams commented that we have told high school students that if you are in the top 30% of your school, you will get into the CSU and she isn't sure that is true any longer. President Whitmore responded that the 30% is in play for students that live in Santa Clara County. Senator Phillips added that admission to the CSU means admission to one of the CSU campuses. President Whitmore clarified that it doesn't mean you can choose the campus 100% of the time.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

February 8, 2010 – no questions.
February 22, 2010 – Senator Buzanski asked what was meant in item number 4. Chair Kaufman responded that the CIO came to the Executive Committee to give them information on the conversion of the SJSU email system over to a Google-based service. Senator Buzanski asked whether faculty email addresses would change, and Chair Kaufman replied that there would be no changes in the email addresses. Senator Silber asked whether broadcast emails would be eliminated. Chair Kaufman announced that he had already sent a list of questions in this regard to the CIO. He has not yet heard back from the CIO. Chair Kaufman encouraged

Senators to send their questions to him, and he will forward them to the CIO. Senator Meldal commented that there was a survey sent out to all department Information Technicians (IT) asking what services their email provider offered. Senator Meldal believes the purpose of the survey is to ensure that Google provides all the services that everyone on campus currently uses.

Senator Lessow-Hurley commented that she had raised the issues of convening the Strategic Planning Board, and requiring laptops for all SJSU students at the February 22, 2010 meeting, but it was not in the minutes. Senator Gleixner commented that Senator Lessow-Hurley had made these remarks at the March 8, 2010 meeting, and those minutes were not in this Senate packet. Senator Silber asked if the decision to switch over to gmail had been decided by a committee with broad representation from across campus. Chair Kaufman commented that this had been brought up in the Executive Committee meeting, but that there had not been broad enough representation on that committee. Chair Kaufman has expressed his concerns to the CIO. Chair Kaufman also noted that the Spartan Daily had went to the CIO and asked why we didn't have a policy on laptop usage and that is where the laptop story came from. The CIO did not ask for laptops for all students. Senator Buzanski asked why the minutes of March 8, 2010, were not in the Senate packet. Eva Joice, the Senate Administrator, responded that the Senate Packet must be sent to the AS Printshop 1 week before the Senate meets in order to get the copies back in time for the Senate meeting. The minutes of March 8, 2010 were completed, but had not been edited by the Wednesday morning deadline for sending the Senate packet to the AS printshop. However, the minutes of March 8, 2010 have since been completed and up on the Senate website.

B. Consent Calendar – A motion was made to approve the consent calendar. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as written.

C. Executive Committee Action Items –
Senator Von Till presented ***AS 1436, Policy Recommendation, Guiding Principles for Enrollment Management (First Reading).*** Senator Von Till commented that this resolution had been brought to the Executive Committee to decide whether it should be considered for a policy, Sense of the Senate Resolution, or a Presidential Directive. The Executive Committee decided it should be brought to the Senate as a policy resolution. The President's Enrollment Management Committee drafted the resolution, and that committee has strong Senate representation on it. Senator Von Till stated that the resolution has 11 principles that can guide the enrollment management decisions that must be made.

Questions:
Senator Stacks asked why there was a 4-0-8 vote by the Executive Committee. Chair Kaufman responded that he believed this was because many people did not have a strong preference for whether it should be a policy resolution, or a Sense of the Senate Resolution. It was not a vote of no interest in the general idea, it was more whether it should go forward as a policy or Sense of the Senate. Senator Stacks suggested that the Executive Committee should sort this out, because it does seem to have more of an issue as to what kind of a resolution it should be instead of structure problems.

Senator Van Selst commented that there are a number of SJSU and CSU policies that deal with enrollment management, and he did not see any of them in the whereas clauses. Senator Van Selst asked the committee to consider inserting them. Senator Van Selst also commented that, "What is Enrollment Management?" is not a guiding principle, but it is listed in the guiding principles.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Backer presented ***AS 1430, Policy Recommendation, Merger of Affirmative Action and Faculty Diversity Committees (Final Reading).*** Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to strike, "and Affirmative Action" after Faculty Diversity and before Committee wherever it occurs in the resolution. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment passed. Senator Buzanski made a motion to call the question. The Senate voted and the motion passed. **The Senate voted and AS 1430 passed as amended**.

Senator Backer presented ***AS 1431, Policy Recommendation, Revision of the Policy for Selection and Review of Department Chairs (Final Reading).*** Senator Backer commented that based on the last Senate meeting, the PS Committee has rewritten Section IV and V.

Debate:

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented an amendment to strike, "Associate or" in Section IV, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the amendment failed.

Senator Meldal presented an amendment to section IV to remove the 1st paragraph, and expand the 2nd paragraph to read, "Every 4 years the department faculty shall identify 1 or more nominees for department chair. The nominees for chair must be tenured faculty in positions of Associate or Full Professor or equivalent. Procedures for nomination. The faculty shall elect a Nomination Committee consisting of at least 3 faculty members. The Nomination Committee shall invite all faculty members to submit names of candidates to be put on the nomination ballot. The names of the members of the Nomination Committee cannot be placed on the ballot. The faculty shall then identify nominees by secret ballot by following the procedures outlined in F02-4. The Nomination Committee shall manage the ballot process, tally the ballots, and record the result to the faculty, and shall recommend the nominee receiving the most ballots to the President via the college dean." The amendment was seconded. Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to Senator Meldal's amendment to change the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph to read, "The Nomination Committee in conjunction with the Dean's Office shall manage the ballot process, …." Senator Stacks presented an amendment to the Meldal amendment to strike the 3rd line of the 1st paragraph rather than striking the whole paragraph. The amendment was seconded. Senator Meldal commented that the 1st paragraph should actually end after the 1st sentence and not the 2nd sentence. Senator Backer commented

that the 2nd sentence, "All faculty (tenured, tenure-track, temporary) may suggest names to appear on the ballot for the election of a Department Chair," had to remain in the resolution or it would be in violation of the California Faculty Association (CFA) contract. Senator Stacks replied that her amendment would then be to keep the 1st line of paragraph 1, but to add a 2nd line that read, "The Nominating Committee shall invite all faculty members (tenured, tenure-track, and temporary) …." Senator Van Selst commented that according to the CFA, the tenure and tenure-track faculty vote gets reported separately from the temporary faculty vote. This is not reflected anywhere in this resolution, and there is not a process for how the temporary faculty versus the tenured faculty votes get assessed in terms of the Nominating Committee recommending a nominee. Senator Backer responded that there is a whole paragraph in F02-4 about this. Senator Van Selst replied, "Except in this case, we are asking for a particular individual and I don't know if that is in conflict with the CFA contract." Senator Backer replied, "Unfortunately, Senator Merdinger is not here, and the reason F02-4 was enacted was because our original policy on the review and appointment of department chairs was in violation of the CFA contract. That is why F02-4 was enacted. This would have to be looked at again to be sure it doesn't violate the CFA contact." Senator Van Selst suggested that if the Senate does not know how the tie breaking process will work, that the resolution be sent back to committee and brought back to the next Senate meeting. Senator Van Selst clarified that the issue is that the current policy states that the tenured faculty vote will be reported separately from the temporary faculty vote. This resolution suggests that the department will recommend the nominee. Chair Kaufman clarified that the vote that is on the floor is to remove all of the 1st paragraph except the 1st line, and to add "(tenured, tenure-track, and temporary)" to the first line of the first bullet of the Meldal amendment. The Senate voted and the Stacks amendment passed with 1 abstention. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Meldal amendment to change the 3rd bullet to read, "The Nominating Committee shall manage the ballot process, tally the ballots, and report the results to the faculty and the President via the college dean." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment to the Meldal amendment failed. Senator Stacks presented a motion to return the resolution to the committee to ensure that the resolution is not in violation of the CFA contract, because we are compelled to report both the tenured and temporary faculty vote. The motion was seconded. Senator Buzanski made a motion to call the question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed. **The Senate voted on the Stacks motion to return the resolution to committee and the motion passed with 3 abstentions**.

B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No report.

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) – No report.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –
Senator Gleixner presented ***AS 1429, Policy Recommendation, Removal of Mandated ABC/NC grading for English 1A and 1B (Final Reading).*** Senator Fee made a friendly amendment to strike, "Amends University Policy F99-7" from the title. **The Senate voted and AS 1429 passed as amended**.

Senator Gleixner presented ***AS 1433, Policy Recommendation, Inappropriate Sexual Behavior Policy (Final Reading).*** Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to divide

the first whereas clause into two whereas clauses so that it would read, "Whereas San José State University is committed to supporting a healthy sexual and social climate, and. Whereas, San José State University is committed to creating an environment safe from sexual violence and any inappropriate sexual behavior as defined by federal and state law, and." Senator Kimbarow presented a friendly amendment to strike, "that may violate federal and/or state law from the 3rd and 4th sentences of the 1st paragraph. Senator Fee presented a friendly amendment to strike, "California Penal Code Sections 261 and 243.4, and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 46 (Resolution Chapter 105, passed into law on September 14, 1987)." of the 3rd paragraph and replace it with, "federal and California state law. Senator Phillips presented a friendly amendment to change "Executive Order 970 (February 2, 2006)," at the top of the 2nd page to read, "Executive Order 1043 (August 3, 2009)." Senator Meldal presented an amendment to change "California State University Chancellor's Office Executive Order 1043 (August 3, 2009)." with "relevant Executive Orders." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Meldal amendment failed. Senator Backer presented a friendly amendment to move the last paragraph on the 2nd page to the rationale. Senator Meldal presented an amendment to insert a new paragraph after the last paragraph on page 2 to read, "The University Police Department (UPD) is directed to at least once a year make available to the student body a reference list of the appropriate legal statutes and Executive Order material that is relevant to this policy. Senator Silber presented a friendly amendment to the Meldal amendment to change the Meldal amendment to read, "The University Police Department (UPD) be directed to at least once a year make available to the faculty, staff, and student body a reference list of the appropriate laws, regulations, and Executive Orders that are relevant to this policy." The Senate voted and the Meldal amendment as amended by Senator Silber failed. Senator Buzanski made a motion to call the question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed. **The Senate voted and AS 1433 passed as amended**.

E. **University Library Board (ULB) –** No report.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

Open Access Task Force Report by Celia Bakke and Joel West:

Celia Bakke and Joel West are co-chairs of the Open Access Task Force. The Open Access Task Force just completed their final report and Senators were provided a copy of it in their Senate packets.

In 2007, the Chancellor's Office decided they wanted to support the institutional repository effort. In 2008, the SJSU Academic Senate created the Open Access Task Force. The charge of the Open Access Task Force was to investigate whether SJSU should adopt a policy concerning open access to faculty publications through an institutional repository. There are two channels for open access. One of them is an individual repository. There are several different types of repositories. It could be an archive, or an online repository that primarily holds e-prints such as in physics, math, and other sciences. There are also discipline-based repositories that have been in existence for over 10 years. The benefits of repositories include an online searchable database, and content that is available free. This is an example of an institutional repository. Ms. Bakke commented that today is the official launch of the SJSU Scholarworks Repository consisting of student theses. Many universities around the world have institutional repositories. You may be familiar with the digital library of California which represents the scholarship of the

University of California. There are also open access journals. They have the same editorial processes as the traditional journals, including the peer review process. The articles in these journals are available online.

Professor West commented that the task force was charged with looking at open access at SJSU. The task force focused on 4 topics. Three of them had to do with the issue of what goes into the SJSU Scholarworks repository. Student theses are already in the repository, the 2nd issue concerns faculty reserving rights so that they can feature their publications with the repository, and the last issue involves the implications for the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) process. The report that the task force issued a few weeks ago has recommendations for each of these areas. The task force is asking the Senate to consider a Sense of the Senate Resolution in support of Open Access.

As of this semester, the MLK Library will no longer be archiving student masters theses in paper copy. They will be archived electronically. One problem associated with putting student theses into the repository is that publishing one piece of a team's effort could impair the ability of other members of the team to be able to publish their research at a later date. The faculty on the task force were concerned about the possibility that one student trying to graduate in December, might prevent someone from sending something to a journal six months to a year later. The other issue is that there is no guarantee of how long it will take to get a book published. If a student thesis is up on the internet and freely available, this may limit the ability of the student to preserve his or her career goals of becoming a published author. The task force recommends that that Senate look into this issue.

Another issue is faculty publications. Normally, the online repositories consist of knowledge that is generated on campus by graduate students or faculty that are publishing research. Most of the universities limit what goes into these repositories to research that has been peer-reviewed and not working papers or rough drafts. There is not an all knowing/all seeing librarian that knows what research is being done on campus, so it does require cooperation by faculty to identify and provide their research and, in some cases, to provide rights to that research. There are 2 policies the university could use. The first policy is the opt-in where faculty are encouraged to cooperate and notify, etc. The other policy requires that faculty share their research with the repository.

The third issue is that when you file a paper with a publisher you give away rights and they tell you what you are allowed to do with it. Recently there has been a movement led by the Association of Research Librarians to allow faculty to retain more of their rights. The publishers are getting used to this, and they are allowing more rights.

The last area that the task force feels needs looking at is RTP. The concern is that the open access journals date from 1997 or later. They are newer and have less of a track record. Some fields of study and some faculty feel that if it isn't a paper journal then it isn't legitimate. Journals also vary widely in quality. Many universities, including Berkeley, have said that you should evaluate the quality of the publication. If you are going to use the journal as a measure, don't assume that it is of good or bad quality just because it is a paper journal or an online journal. The task force recommends that the Senate look into making sure that the RTP process

is neutral in regard to journals. The task force also recommends that any policy developed or amended in this area be distributed to RTP committees.

In conclusion, the task force has completed their work. The task force requests that the Senate do two things. First, endorse open access through a Sense of the Senate Resolution, and second take the four issues that the task force identified and send them to Senate policy committees for action.

B. Report by the Social Entrepreneur in Residence, Jane Leu:
Ms. Leu is the founder and former CEO of Upwardly Mobile. Upwardly Mobile was started in Ms. Leu's kitchen, and grew to be a national organization in 3 states with a budget of $3 million. Ms. Leu is SJSU's first Social Entrepreneur in Residence. She has spent the last 6 weeks getting to know students and faculty, and learning about their interests around social entrepreneurship. Ms. Leu is a role model for students as far as how you can create a career around social impact.

Social Entrepreneurship is identifying a problem at its root and creating a solution that has a broad scale impact. SJSU has a broad initiative around sustainability. If sustainability is the what, then social entrepreneurship is the how. Ms. Leu was hired to assess the demand and establish social entrepreneurship as a viable career field at SJSU.

Ms. Leu visited 16 classes. At the beginning of the classes Ms. Leu would distribute questionnaires to students. What she found is that 67% of students would like to be more involved in social entrepreneurship. About 83% planned to do something that benefits society after they graduate. Around 38% planned to start an organization and focus on social impact. About 30% of students wanted to focus on local issues, and another 30% wanted to focus on global issues. Students were passionate about the environment, health, and education. Some ideas that SJSU students had for social impact jobs included a Nutrition Personal Trainer for people with Diabetes, and a specialized fitness center for seniors.

Last week on Thursday, March 11, 2010, a career fair for students interested in social entrepreneurship was held in Engineering 285/287. There were 8 organizations that had jobs they were recruiting for. The companies that came felt that SJSU students were really well prepared. About 130 students attended the career fair. Ms. Leu has noticed that many of the students at SJSU are older, and consequently are ready to start a career in social entrepreneurship right away. On April 7, 2010, Eloise Stiglitz will host a meeting for all of those interested in being involved with how to move this initiative forward.

Senator Gleixner announced that she was going to move AS 1434 and AS 1435 to the next Senate meeting in April as final readings, and she asked Senators to review the resolutions and send her any suggested amendments.

VIII. New Business – None

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

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No report.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs –
Senator Phillips announced that the enrollment packets for Freshmen and transfer students were distributed in late February. Shortly thereafter the Next Steps website, which captures the intent to enroll from both groups, went live. As of this morning there were 1224 transfer students and 611 Freshmen that have told us they intend to come to San José State University. Both Freshmen and transfer students have until May 1st to let the university know this information, so it is remarkable that they are moving so quickly.

C. Associated Students (AS) President –
Senator Baker commented that AS is working on a resolution for AB 540 students, and hopefully it will be passed by AS in the next week or so. In addition, AS now has a full board again after losing 6 students over the break. AS President Baker asked for the Senate's help in finding 1 Graduate Student and 2 Undergraduate students to sit on the Strategic Planning Board. Senator Baker asked that Senators let her know if they have any students that are interested. AS will also be sending 3 busloads of students to Sacramento on March 22, 2010. If Senators know of any students that would like to attend, they can reserve a spot on the bus by going to the AS website. Furthermore, AS has launched a "Made in the CSU" campaign to promote what the CSU does for the state of California. They have T-shirts and flyers that state facts about what the CSU has done.

D. Vice President for University Advancement – No report.

E. CSU Statewide Senators –
Senator Van Selst announced that at the CSU Statewide Senate level it does not look like furloughs are being planned on for the CSU budget. Senator Van Selst commented that there has not been a change in the CSU Statewide GE pattern that has not gone through the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee and Senator Van Selst chairs that committee and hasn't seen anything yet. Spring Enrollment is one issue that came up. Education is one program that is getting brutalized by the once a year admission schedule.

There are several resolutions being discussed. One of these resolutions is, Private Donor Respect for Academic Freedom. This resolution states that just because a donor is giving the university a large donation that doesn't mean faculty have to teach what the donors want faculty to teach.

There is another resolution that opens up the accountability process in graduate special business programs. This is the special fee for business graduate programs. The resolution is a request that faculty be involved in the accountability effort. There is an

Executive Order that asks for a one-time report on where that money goes. The CSU Academic Senate is asking that this report become an annual report, and that the faculty be involved in the processes that are used.

The CSU Statewide Senate did not want to ask the Board of Trustees to go directly to the Governor about the lack of a Faculty Trustee, but rather drafted a resolution that bemoans the lack of input from a Faculty Trustee.

A resolution was passed on accommodation for President Emeritus Gehrt. This is a former president of the CSU that is being paid to write a book about the history of the CSU. Senator Van Selst recommended the book.

A resolution was passed that promotes faculty involvement before IT decisions are made. Finally, there was a resolution requesting a second Faculty Trustee that was tabled because it was so controversial right now.

F. Provost –
The Provost announced that the university's plan for the Graduation and Retention Initiative is now linked to on the Provost's website. You can view the entire plan, or a 1-page summary.

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