

**2010/2011 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
May 2, 2011**

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-five Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Sabalius, Van Selst,  
Lessow-Hurley, Kaufman,  
Kolodziejak, Kassing

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Semerjian, Fee  
Absent: Kao, Correia

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Lee, Laker, Bussani  
Absent: Selter

**COB Representatives:**

Absent: Jiang, Nellen, Campsey

**Deans:**

Present: Parrish, Stacks, Merdinger  
Absent: Chin

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Kimbarow, Smith

**Students:**

Present: Khan, Starks, Mansour,  
Salazar, Solorzano, Beilke

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Gleixner, Du  
Absent: Backer

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Van Hooff, Frazier, Mok, Miller, Brown, Desalvo

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Silber, d'Alarcao, McClory, McGee

**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Absent: Norton

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Von Till, Heiden, Ng, Peter, Lee

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Kauppila, Lin, Peck

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**

The Senate voted and the minutes of April 18, 2011 were approved as amended with one abstention.

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Kaufman made the following announcements:

A picture will be taken of the 2010-2011 Academic Senate at the end of the next Senate meeting, May 9, 2011, at 4 p.m.

The Chair noted that the Senate agenda for today is very busy. There are five resolutions coming for a first reading, and one resolution coming for a final reading.

The Senate welcomed President-elect Mohammad Qayoumi.

Professor Jonathan Roth will be giving a presentation at 2:30 p.m. today on the Veterans to College Program.

The Senate congratulated Senators McClory and Lessow-Hurley for 30 years of service to SJSU.

Chair Kaufman attended the Honors Convocation last Friday evening, and said it was a “wonderful event that honors our high achieving students.” In addition, Steve Lopez gave a “fascinating talk on the state of higher education in California.”

**B. From the President of the University:**

**President Kassing made the following announcements/comments:**

President Kassing spent two hours with Steve Lopez after the Honors Convocation and commented on what a wonderful event it was.

President Kassing and the senior team have been working with President-elect Qayoumi over the past two weeks. President Kassing is confident that the transition on July 1, 2011 will go smoothly.

The President has asked the Executive Committee to act as the Budget Advisory Committee this summer. The Senate will hear more on this later today.

The candidates for Vice President for Administration and Finance will be on campus this week and President Kassing encouraged Senators to meet them.

President Kassing commented that the one thing he has always been able to count on is the great leadership in the Senate.

**President-elect Qayoumi made the following announcements/comments:**

President-elect Qayoumi commented that it was great to be home (at SJSU), and he thanked President Kassing for his help with the transition.

President-elect Qayoumi commented that he has always believed in the role of shared governance in university systems and considers it the “hallmark of excellence.” President-elect Qayoumi further noted that he had served with Senator Buzanski on the Curriculum and Research Committee in 1986.

President-elect Qayoumi told Senators that he was looking forward to working with the Senate, and he would see everyone again on July 1, 2011.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

April 25, 2011 –

Senator Van Selst asked what the plan was for the faculty-wide vote referenced in item 3 of the Executive Committee minutes of April 25, 2011. Chair Kaufman responded that the faculty-wide vote would be conducted in the Fall 2011, and that he had already informed the CSU Statewide Senate of this, and they were fine with it.

**B. Consent Calendar –**

AVC McClory noted that the Executive Committee had selected Preston Rudy to serve a one-year term as a Senator representing the College of Social Sciences [as called for in bylaw 1.6.2.c.]

Senators were given a list of the vacancies on Senate committees. Senator McClory noted that there were very few vacancies left on Senate committees for 2011-2012.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Senator Heiden gave an update on the proposed Smoking Policy. Santa Clara County has received a grant that may help with the funding for programs such as smoking cessation, signage, etc. Senator Heiden will continue working on the resolution over the summer.

**V. Unfinished Business - None**

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

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

**B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

Senator Ng presented *AS 1456, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Office Hours (First Reading)*. Senator Ng noted that the committee had looked at the office hours policies at many other universities. These policies ranged from the policy at San Diego State that just states that faculty are expected to hold office hours, to other policies that require one office hour per class per week with one hour of alternative access.

**Questions:**

Senator Peter asked what the policy would be for a faculty member that doesn't use email. Senator Ng responded that the expectation is still that the faculty member must hold two physical office hours per week, but he/she could hold more. The faculty member could also use the telephone in place of email. Senator Ng commented that the committee recognized that most of the faculty spend a lot more time than just one hour answering emails.

Senator Du asked if the committee had considered class size, and Senator Ng responded that she would make a note of this and bring it back to the committee. Senator Kauppila responded

that members of the PS Committee had found that very few faculty members had students come to their office during established office hours, and that the PS committee did not think class size would pose a problem. In addition, the PS Committee found that the majority of communication between students and faculty was done via email.

Senator Silber commented that he had taught classes of 245 students and even the day before a Chemistry exam, there were very few students coming to office hours. However, Senator Silber did have a lot of questions by email. Senator Silber feels very strongly that 2 physical office hours are more than enough.

Senator James Lee asked if faculty teaching more difficult classes could have more than two physical office hours under this policy recommendation. Senator Ng responded that they could.

Senator James Lee noted that the old policy said that faculty would establish office hours in consultation with the department chair and the new policy recommendation does not. Senator Ng responded that this policy recommendation did say that the faculty member would consult with the department chair in section II.D.

Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that the current policy was passed in 1968 and had not been revisited since then. Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested the committee consider creating a requirement that the policy be revisited every five years.

Senator Starks commented that a previous university he had attended, the faculty had moved to online “chat” hours with students. Senator Starks suggested the committee look into whether this was a possibility for SJSU. Faculty at Senator Starks old college preferred this method of communication.

Senator Buzanski noted that the 1968 Faculty Office Hours Policy was a tremendous improvement over what existed before that, which required all faculty to be at work from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. In addition, office hours were to be held between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., and you were allowed one hour off for lunch.

Senator Kauppila suggested that the committee consider amending section II.D. to say “physical” office hours.

Senator Van Hooff noted that when you reduce the office hours for faculty, you increase the office hours for the chair of the department. This is because if the faculty member is not there, then the student goes to the chair. Senator Van Hooff suggested that the committee consider language that requires the faculty member to be in the office for the duration of the office hours time frame.

Senator Frazier suggested that the committee consider changing section II.D. so that instead of “a more limited schedule of office hours,” it could be more like “a variation on office hours.”

Senator Peter asked if the committee had considered the difference between those departments

that designate an academic advisor and those that spread those duties across all of the faculty in the department. The reason Senator Peter asked is because there could be a difference between the number of office hours needed to advise in the major and the number needed to advise on a faculty member's own classes. Senator Ng responded that advising in the major was usually accompanied with course release time and there were expectations along with that. Senator Peter responded that about half of the departments don't give any release time.

Senator Silber suggested that department chairs be required to send out messages to all students that having access to email 24 hours a day, seven days a week did not mean that faculty had to respond to their emails 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Senator Peck asked how much consultation had been done with students regarding this policy. Senator Peck said that she hears complaints from students that say that they go to the faculty member's office during office hours and the faculty member is not there.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if the committee had considered having office hours by appointment. Senator Ng asked if that was acceptable to the Senate and it was.

Senator Khan asked for clarification if the amendment would mean that faculty members would have two office hours each week, available by appointment. Senator Ng asked Senator Khan if the committee substituted language that required faculty members to be available via appointment, in addition to having the two physical office hours, would be acceptable to her and the Senate. The amendment was acceptable to Senator Khan and the Senate.

### **C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**

Senator Heiden presented *AS 1455, Policy Recommendation, 2.0 GPA Graduation Requirement for SJSU Studies (areas R, W, & V) (Final Reading)*. Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change the title to read, "Policy Resolution—2.0 GPA Graduation Requirement for the GE Portion of SJSU Studies (areas R, S, & V)." **The Senate voted and AS 1455 passed as amended with 1 Nay, and 1 Abstention.**

Senator Heiden presented *AS 1460, Policy Recommendation, ABC/NC Grading, Amends University Policy S09-7 (First Reading)*. Senator Heiden informed Senators that a policy had been passed last year that removed CR grading for English 1A/1B, and replaced it with full letter grading (A-F). This policy recommendation would also remove CR grading for English 100W and replace it with full letter grading. This policy recommendation has been endorsed by the Board of General Studies (BOGS), the Writing Requirements Committee, and the Curriculum and Research Committee.

Senator Heiden informed Senators that there was a mistake in the resolved clause at the bottom of the first page. University policies S99-6, S95-5 Section F, and F88-6 were modified by S10-2, and can be removed from the resolved clause.

**Questions:**

Senator Ng asked for clarification as to what would improve the situation for students if A-F grading was allowed in the 100W. Senator Ng currently teaches the 100W. Senator Heiden responded that students tend to repeat the class more when they have the no credit option.

Senator Silber asked whether he had the option of A-F grading for capstone courses. Senator Heiden responded that this proposal would change grading for the 100W to A-F, but it would still be optional for capstone courses. Senator Silber responded that he did not feel no credit was an acceptable grade for capstone courses, and suggested the committee consider this.

Senator Peter asked for an explanation as to why a “D” and an “F” are worse grades than no credit. Senator Heiden responded that no credit is not computed into the grade point average (GPA). Senator Peter noted that in this case then a “D” would then be worse than a “F,” because the student could still pass the course and this resolution would weaken existing policy. Senator Silber suggested that all capstone courses should be changed to specify that the student must get a “C” or better to get credit in the course.

Senator James Lee inquired as to whether an instructor might decide to give a student a “C” instead of the “D” that they earned, because they don’t want to punish the student if they are going to have to repeat the course anyway. Senator Khan responded that she had “not come across a professor yet that was willing to give a student a “C” they didn’t earn.”

Senator Miller noted that she supported the resolution, because in the English Department she often sees students that disappear halfway through the course knowing that they will just get a NC, when other students were frantic to get into the course at the beginning of the semester.

Senator Ng asked if the committee had considered the problems that students will have if they get a “D” and have to retake the class. These students will not be allowed to register for that class until after everyone else has registered. Senator Heiden responded that the idea was that if the consequences are high enough then students will take the class more seriously the first time.

Senator Fee inquired as to whether the committee was cognizant of the poor access for students that must retake the course. Senator Heiden responded that this will have to be addressed if the policy passes.

Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies Stephen Branz responded that the current policy is that any student that gets below a “C,” or gets NC, cannot advance register. These students will still have to register on the first day. The only class that currently is supposed to have ABC and CR/NC grading is the 100W. However, Undergraduate Studies was unaware of this policy until last year and allowed a number of capstone courses to have ABC and CR/NC grading. If this policy is not passed, Undergraduate Studies will go back to those departments that have these capstone classes and tell them they must go to full letter grading.

Senator Gleixner asked the committee to consider replacing S99-6 with F88-6, in the 4<sup>th</sup> Whereas clause. Senator Gleixner explained that the way she reads the policy, they are not in violation of S99-6, but are in violation of F88-6. Senator Gleixner also asked if the committee had looked into whether or not there were any graduate thesis courses with ABC/NC grading.

Senator Stacks responded that she believed there were some thesis courses in the Electrical Engineering Department that gave ABC/NC grading

Senator Frazier suggested that the committee consider making two separate policies. One for capstone courses and one for the 100W courses. Senator Heiden responded that she believed the intention was to cleanup across the board.

Senator James Lee commented that the logic behind having CR/NC was to allow students to repeat courses they are likely to mess-up on, and asked if the committee had considered the effect this policy would have on retention by grading these classes more harshly than they were before.

Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that the committee consider wider consultation with all departments if this policy is going to include capstone courses.

#### **D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) -**

Senator Kimbarow presented *AS 1458, Policy Recommendation, Membership, Student Success Committee (First Reading)*. Senator Kimbarow noted that since there is now an Associate Vice President for Student Success, it seemed logical to add that person to the committee. There was also a change to an existing title. In addition, the Director for Academic Advising and Retention Services reports to the AVP for Student Success and the committee did not feel it was right to have two votes coming from the same area. Therefore, this seat was made ex-officio.

#### **Questions:**

Senator Gleixner asked why the whereas clause was written in such a manner that it made it unclear as to why the Director of Academic Advising and Retention Services is being chosen to be made ex-officio and non-voting, and suggested the committee clarify this.

Chair Kaufman asked if it would be possible for the same person to occupy both the voting and non-voting seat as the designee for the AVP of Student Success Services, and also the Director of Academic Advising and Retention Services. Senator McClory, Chair of the Student Success Committee, clarified that the AVP of Student Success Services indicated to her that she would like to be the one serving on the committee. Chair Kaufman asked the committee to consider adding language in the final resolved clause that clarified that some other member of Student Success Services, other than the AVP, would be the ex-officio non-voting member. Senator Lessow-Hurley responded that she did not see where this was a problem, because Student Success Services would not be getting two votes either way.

Senator Van Selst asked if the committee would consider attaching a list of the new membership of the committee when it came back for a final reading. Senator Kimbarow

responded, “Certainly.”

**E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1457, Policy Recommendation, Continuous Enrollment Requirement for Report in Progress (RP) Units (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner explained that this was a way of requiring enrollment in some form for students that are working on their thesis.

**Questions:**

Senator Stacks asked for clarification as to whether the current policy states that students that have signed up for a 299 thesis class and get the RP grade can still enroll for one additional semester before having to pay additional fees. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct and gave the following explanation. The current practice on our campus is that students can miss one semester without having to file a formal leave of absence. Senator Gleixner noted that I&SA Committee members were concerned about whose fault it was that a thesis didn't get completed on time. In some instances it is the reading committee's fault, so this extra semester gives a buffer before blame is put on who was the hurdle.

Senator Van Selst inquired as to whether a student that took a one unit course in the winter, could then take the spring and fall semester off and still be considered continuously enrolled. Senator Gleixner responded that this was not the intent, and the one-unit language was meant to be fall and spring through special session. The reason it is done through special session is to avoid the large 0-6 unit fee. It will overlap spring and fall, so there wouldn't be a requirement for them to register for winter or summer.

Senator Sabalius inquired as to whether the students that enroll have to pay for the other student fees at a fixed rate like the athletics fee. Senator Gleixner responded that through special session they do not. Senator Sabalius asked if they were only paying for their units. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct.

Senator Stacks asked if there had been discussion with the Registrar to determine how that would be implemented. Senator Gleixner responded that the Registrar did not like the grace period, and had said that it would be much easier to implement this policy without the grace period. Chair Kaufman recognized the Registrar, Marian Sofish. The Registrar commented that implementing this policy will create a lot of hardship for her. Registrar Sofish suggested that a friendlier solution would be to allow graduate students working on their thesis to apply for a leave of absence. The Registrar expressed concern over how opting out for one semester would be monitored, and noted that there were additional variables to consider. For instance, notifying students to register for RP units is put on the program advisors.

Senator Stacks inquired if the committee had considered building in some guidance as to timelines for the appeals process. Senator Gleixner responded that they had not.

Senator Heiden inquired as to whether students had full library access if they took a leave of absence. Senator Gleixner responded that the idea of a leave of absence is that they are not

working on their thesis. Senator Kauppila commented that the MLK library deals with graduate student access in the summer on a case-by-case basis. Graduate Students just need to contact the library.

Senator Van Selst noted that according to the catalog, continuous enrollment is considered at least one unit per academic year. This resolution is talking about continuous enrollment in a different way that makes it very confusing. Senator Van Selst suggested that the definition of continuous enrollment needed to be strengthened in the policy resolution.

Senator Miller said that number 3 states that “students that enroll in classes with the RP option will be notified by MySJSU of this policy,” and she inquired as to what happens if they don’t receive a grade. Senator Gleixner responded that in this case they would be fine. If they get a grade of some kind in the class then they are done.

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1459, Policy Recommendation, Freshman Housing Requirement at SJSU (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner explained that this is the Senate version of the Housing Policy that exists already in the impact plan.

**Questions:**

Senator Buzanski asked if the committee would consider changing section III.A. to read, “The Housing Exemption Committee is an administrative agency authorized by the Academic Senate, but not reporting to any Academic Senate committee, but reporting annually to the Academic Senate.” Senator Gleixner said the committee would consider this.

Senator Beilke asked if the committee would consider adding a “parental exemption” under section II.C. Senator Gleixner responded that section II.C. already has an exemption if you are living with your parents.

Senator Laker asked for clarification as to what was meant by “personal principles” in section I.B.2. Senator Gleixner responded that there were people on the committee that strongly felt that they could not regulate adults and felt that if an adult had strong principles against living on campus then they should have a voice and be heard. Senator Frazier, a member of the I&SA Committee, commented that he could not bring himself “to require adult civilians to live anywhere, and therefore this was in the spirit of compromise.”

Senator Heiden asked if the committee would consider further clarifying “personal principles” before bringing it for a final reading.

Senator Lessow-Hurley said that she believed it was a “violation of federal law” to discriminate based on marital status and suggested that the committee consider eliminating this item from II.C. Senator Gleixner responded that the committee had searched the housing policies for other universities and found it was a very common practice to have marital status as an exemption. Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that this did not mean they were not violating the law.

Senator Laker asked what the timeline was for bringing the resolution for a final reading. Senator Gleixner responded that she planned to bring it back in the early fall.

Senator Kimbarow expressed concern about having a cutoff age for making the decision to live in housing, because lots of adult students may want to live off campus and this runs counter to the intent of the policy. Senator Kimbarow asked what the rationale for the cutoff age was. Senator Gleixner responded. The cutoff was inserted because some of the committee members were strongly opposed to requiring students to live in housing, and this was a compromise. At the very least, these committee members felt that these students should be able to have someone hear their argument.

Senator Lin asked if this policy would be implemented in the Fall 2011. Senator Gleixner responded that it would not, but would come for a final reading in the fall.

Senator Buzanski informed the Senate on parliamentary procedure and said that any resolution not finished in this Senate would have to be brought back to the next Senate as a first reading. Chair Kaufman noted that this discussion was at least bringing out issues that could be fixed before it was brought back in the fall for another first reading.

Senator Peter noted that although the rule may be that it should come back as a first reading in the Fall, the Senate has on many occasions brought these items back as final readings. Senator Peter further noted that “personal principles” sounded a bit like the “conscientious objector” category, and suggested that students be required to present some form of evidence for the exemption, such as was required with conscientious objectors, e.g., an essay, etc.

Senator Van Selst commented that having an exemption for “personal principles basically guts” the intent of the policy, and suggested that the committee consider removing this exemption.

Senator Khan asked for clarification as to the current occupancy rate in student housing. Senator Laker responded that it is around 80%, but ideally they will be at 98% for next year.

Senator Parrish asked if it wouldn’t be better for students that had “personal principles” issues to consider attending another university.

Senator Frazier commented that he did not believe allowing the “personal principles” exemption was the same as gutting the policy. The expectation is that all incoming students will live on campus. If they would like to raise objections with this, then they have to go through a process. They have to live in housing or they have to “opt out.” This is not the same as not having a policy.

Senator James Lee asked for clarification as to what would happen to a student, such as a transgender student, without the “personal principles” exemption. Senator Gleixner responded that this was a good point and the committee could look at this. Senator Laker responded that it was not necessary to have a category for this, because Housing Services can and does have

the means to deal with this when assigning student housing.

Senator Kauppila suggested the committee consider changing the “troublesome personal principles phrase” to “other reasons.” Senator Gleixner responded that the more help that the committee could give to the appeals committee by specifying categories, the easier it would be for them in the future, but the list wasn’t meant to be a conclusive.

Senator Mansour suggested that students may think that they are not eligible to apply if they don’t see their category listed in the exemptions.

Senator Peter asked how these exemptions differed from those in the current housing policy, and when the Senate would have to approve this resolution to influence the next cycle of admissions. Senator Gleixner responded that that wording in the impaction policy was vague and did not list exemptions. The housing policy itself was approved by the Chancellor’s Office, but not specific exemptions. The difference between this policy and the housing policy is the personal principles, and living with parents exemptions. Everything else is the same. Also, the Exemptions Committee already exists on campus. This resolution just adds a few people.

Senator Gleixner clarified that students that are over 21, or those that graduated from a high school that is within 30 miles of SJSU’s main campus, are exempt from the requirement for all first-time frosh to live in housing.

Senator Kimbarow asked if, under section II.C.2., a majority of students wouldn’t be coming right out of high school and still be living with their parents when they completed the application. If so, how would this policy achieve the objective. Senator Gleixner clarified that there may have been a mistake in language, and that it wasn’t meant to say living with their parents at the time of application, but should say living with their parents in the Fall when they attend college. Senator Kimbarow asked that the committee reconsider this, because he felt the Senate could be setting a policy that would exempt 80% of the students.

Senator Peter asked what would happen if the Senate didn’t pass this resolution by mid Fall 2011. Senator Gleixner responded that if this policy isn’t passed, the existing regulation will continue in effect and even students living with their parents will be forced to live on campus. Senator Gleixner noted that on the positive side, the existing housing policy got very little questions and very few exemptions.

Senator McClory commented that she had two students that didn’t meet the existing exemptions categories, and asked that the committee consider adding additional categories. One student was attending high school in Arizona while living with one parent, but will be attending college here and living with another parent in San Francisco. Senator McClory noted that her concern was that a student living with a parent in San Francisco, or 50/60 miles from campus, would be exempt. Senator Gleixner responded that this was how the current policy was written. Senator McClory suggested that the committee might want to consider adding language that specified the geographical area for the living with a parent exemption.

Senator Heiden asked the committee to consider requiring a student applying for financial hardship to fill out something that can be reviewed. Senator Gleixner responded that this was in the resolution. Senator Heiden added that some parents decide that their child is not eligible and refuse to fill the forms out. Senator Gleixner noted that the clause, “is eligible to apply,” was a result of trying to give undocumented students an avenue to apply for financial hardship.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if we are going to be tracking students that do not live on campus, because it would be nice to know if the requirement to live in housing is truly beneficial to students as stated in the second whereas clause. Senator Gleixner commented that campus housing is doing a lot to improve the quality of living in student housing “in terms of campus engagement.” In addition one program, the Center for Engineering Living and Learning (CELL), already has a number of programs such as tutoring in student housing, and they report a 98% retention rate.

Senator James Lee asked if the committee would consider creating a personal issues category that would allow a student to be exempt if living in housing would be detrimental, or would interfere with other students’ success (such as a student that is on probation or parole).

Senator Beilke asked the committee to consider not requiring students to have to fill out a form for financial hardship, because some students might have parents that refuse to fill out the form, such as students with divorced parents, and it could penalize the student. Senator Laker responded that if a student is facing these challenges, there are people on the campus that can and will assist.

## **VII. Special Committee Reports –**

Professor Jonathan Roth gave a presentation on the Vets to College Program.

Professor Roth is Chair of the Veterans Advisory Committee. The Veterans Advisory Committee came about as a result of a recommendation by the Veterans’ Taskforce, and was made a permanent committee under the Student Affairs Division by President Kassing. The Veterans’ Advisory Committee works with both veterans and military students.

The Veterans’ Advisory Committee has been instrumental in a number of projects and programs on campus including a establishing a Veteran Student Organization (VSO) (that is 100 members strong now), creating a Salute to Spartans Newsletter (now in its 3<sup>rd</sup> edition), creating a peer mentoring program, and establishing an introductory course designed for veteran’s returning to campus (to be taught by Elena Klaw in Psychology). The committee’s current priority is to create a veteran’s website.

SJSU has 290 veterans, and 278 dependents receiving veterans’ benefits for a total of 568 students. This is about 1.9% of our student population. Some of these students are eligible for veteran’s benefits, but most are not. Professor Roth noted that the new GI Bill is so attractive that new veterans can’t afford not to go to college, and he expects the number of veterans attending SJSU to increase to over 1,000.

A study done by the Veterans' Taskforce (President Kassing made The Veterans' Taskforce permanent by establishing the Veterans Advisory Committee) indicated that only half of our student veterans had been screened for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), and of those screened about 30% suffer from PTSD.

Dr. Rona Halualani was the first Chair of the Veteran's Taskforce, and Dr. Halualani came up with the idea to include military students as a diverse group. This made a lot of sense as the military has its own culture, and many of the problems and issues facing military students trying to return to civilian life are similar to those faced by other minority groups.

The Chancellor's Office has also established a program for veterans called, "The CSU Troops to College Program." This program was created to make campuses more military-friendly, and to assist veterans with their return to college. However, like many of our mandates, the CSU Troops to College Program does not have any funding attached to it.

On the positive side, Professor Roth noted that federal funding is available for some veteran's programs. For example, SJSU veteran students are eligible for work study funding that is paid for by the Department of Defense.

The Veterans' Advisory Committee would like to have a liaison with the Senate. Professor Roth noted that this could be by his regular reports to the Senate, or by having a liaison from the Veterans' Advisory Committee with a particular Senate committee. Professor Roth stressed that he felt it was very important that the Senate be involved in the issue of veterans on campus.

**Questions:**

While doing research for a lecture, Senator Peter found out that the CSU had twice as many veteran students as the UC, and asked why we don't talk about the fact that our veteran students comprise a much higher percentage of our student body than other public universities. Professor Roth commented that he has had discussions with colleagues about whether this is a military-friendly or unfriendly campus, but he does not feel it is particularly military-friendly. Professor Roth further noted that the invisibility of our veteran students is an issue. SJSU has a lot of events that honor various groups on campus, but we do not honor our veterans.

SJSU's military students include ROTC students. SJSU has about 40 Army ROTC Cadets, and 70 Air Force ROTC Cadets on campus. SJSU has about 10 times as many ROTC students as Stanford does.

Professor Roth informed Senators that veteran students could be referred to IS 239 where the Veterans' Advisory Committee has established a whole table of full of pamphlets, phone numbers, etc. for veterans. Students can anonymously pickup information there.

Senator Mok recently had a veteran student approach her that wanted to study the piano. It turned out that this student had a wonderful singing voice. Senator Mok encouraged him to join the voice department, and he will be starting in the Fall as a Baritone. The School of Music and Dance plans to honor him at the first class meeting.

Professor Roth suggested posting signs outside of all faculty classrooms that welcome returning veterans. Professor Roth also noted what a powerful tool art was in helping returning veterans adjust.

Senator Merdinger suggested establishing a Senate Veterans Committee. Professor Roth responded that he thought the best thing to do would be to give that charge to an existing Senate committee.

**VIII. New Business – None**

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

**A. Statewide Academic Senators –**

Senator Van Selst commented that our American Institutions resolution has received a lot of attention at the CSU Statewide Senate, and that four other campuses have since created their own American Institutions resolution. The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee is meeting tomorrow, and the CSU Statewide Senate meets the remainder of this week.

**B. Vice President for University Advancement –**

Senator Bussani noted that University Advancement is working on a campus campaign communication vehicle that will allow University Advancement to do a better job of informing the campus where we are in the fundraising campaign. University Advancement is also working on a way for faculty to feed in their success stories, and things they are working on and this should be up and running by Fall 2011.

**C. Provost – None**

**D. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No Report.**

Senator Stacks asked if the open forums for the Vice President of Administration and Finance would be streamed. Senator Bussani responded that they would. Chair Kaufman noted that an open forum was being held right now, and forums would be held for the next three days from 3:15 p.m. to 4:15 p.m. in Engineering 189. Chair Kaufman encouraged Senators to attend where possible.

**E. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

Senator Laker commended Associated Students for the wonderful job they did on the AS 55, and Sparta Awards events.

Senator Laker noted that over the weekend the Next Steps program had gotten clogged and froze just as the deadline for completing Next Steps was approaching on Sunday evening. However, Senator Laker noted that the Enrollment Services Team not only caught it right away, but also put in place a plan to deal with it where they manually handled over 1,500 calls. The deadline for Next Steps was opened up for three additional days to accommodate those that couldn't get in.

Senator Laker told Senators that SJSU is doing very well as far as enrollment for Fall 2011.

**F. Associated Students President –**

Senator Khan reported that AS President Tomasz Kolodziejak could not be at the Senate meeting today and she was giving the AS report.

Senator Khan said that AS had just held the AS 55 Awards event, and it had went very well.

AS also recently presented Senator Rose Lee with a commendation for her service.

The Senate commended Senator Khan for being a finalist for Student Trustee.

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.