

2011/2012 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 13, 2012

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Von Till, Kaufman,
Sabalius, Lessow-Hurley
Kolodziejek
Absent: Van Selst

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Junn, Nance, Qayoumi
Absent: Bibb, Bussani

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Nellen, Reade

Deans:

Present: Merdinger, Chin,
Bienenfeld
Absent: Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow
Absent: Swanson, P.

Students:

Present: Salazar, Choy, Uweh
Swanson, K., Mink, Sharma,

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Du, Backer

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Frazier, Desalvo, Mok, Haramaki
Absent: Fleck

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, d'Alarcao, Wharton, Bros-Seemann

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Heiden, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Terry

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Absent: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Peck, Bettencourt, Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The Senate approved the minutes of December 5, 2011, as amended by Senators Nance and Johnson, with 1 Abstention.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Provost Ellen Junn and Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne were welcomed by the Senate.

The Vice Chair, Senator Lynda Heiden, was thanked for her efforts on behalf of the Senate Retreat.

Chair Von Till announced that she would be running for reelection for a second term in

accordance with bylaw 2.22a.

B. From the President of the University –

President Qayoumi made the following announcements:

The Strategic Plan is now complete, and was kept under 10 pages to encourage the campus to read it. At the President's Retreat last week, strategies were discussed on ways to implement the Strategic Plan. The campus will hear more about this in the next few weeks. The next step is for the Provost to create the Academic Affairs Master Plan this semester.

As for the budget, the CSU was hit with the \$100 million trigger cut from the Governor's budget, and if the tax bill does not pass the CSU will be hit with an additional \$200 million cut. The President is working with his cabinet, and has consulted with the Executive Committee, in an effort to come up with innovative ways to deal with the cuts.

The President has graciously agreed to host a campus-wide event to celebrate the Senate's 60th Anniversary on April 4, 2012, at 4 p.m. An honorary doctorate will be awarded during the event.

The President welcomed and introduced Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne.

Questions:

The Senate discussed how much SJSU's portion of the possible \$200 million trigger cut would be. SJSU could be hit with an additional \$13 million cut, which could mean cuts of up to \$20 million for the university by November.

The Senate discussed the new stadium being built next to the Athletic Building to commemorate Bill Walsh's memory. The stadium will be completely donor-funded, and construction will not begin until all funds have been secured. The Senate discussed past projects in the Athletic Department that ended up running over budget, and had to be funded by the university. The Senate discussed the fact that general funds cannot be used for buildings.

The Senate discussed the need to come up with ways to publicize the impact the cuts to education are having on students, because the general public is not seeing the impact and believes that everything is fine. The President will learn more about what the CSU system as a whole plans to do at a meeting tomorrow. However, the President is most concerned about two of the Governor's proposals that would have an even more detrimental effect than the \$200 million cut. The Governor is proposing that the CSU fund retirement, similar to the UC. This would be a major financial drain for the CSU. In addition, the Governor is proposing that the CSU pay for all capital outlay that has, up until this point, been paid for using general obligation bonds. This would result in another \$200 million in capital outlay costs to the CSU. The President should know more in the next few days.

The President introduced Faculty Trustee Bernadette Cheyne from Humboldt.

B. From Faculty Trustee Cheyne –

Trustee Cheyne commented on what a wonderful visit it had been for her. She had the opportunity to meet with campus administrators, students, faculty, and the Senate. Trustee Cheyne enjoys attending Senate meetings when visiting the campuses, because it is interesting to see how each campus conducts their meetings. Trustee Cheyne has been attending Senate meetings for 20 out of the last 22 years.

Trustee Cheyne is enjoying being the Faculty Trustee, but noted that it is a “challenging job with a lot of catching-up to do.” After several years without a Faculty Trustee, some members of the Board of Trustees (BOT) are hearing the faculty perspective for the first time. Trustee Cheyne feels it is especially important to have the faculty perspective when the BOT is discussing areas such as Early Start, online education, SB 1440, etc.

Trustee Cheyne sometimes finds that she has the “lone voice” on issues, although there are times when the Student Trustee shares the same perspective. However, the BOT has moved towards more debate on issues than in the past. The most recent issue that was debated was the student tuition increase. The BOT heard many different perspectives on what a student tuition increase means.

Trustee Cheyne has found that the BOT is committed to “making the best choices for the CSU”, although the trustees may “profoundly disagree on the decisions that are made at times.”

Questions:

Trustee Cheyne was asked how the Senate might help her educate the BOT on what the “appropriate division of labor” is when it comes to the curriculum. The CSU Statewide Senate has a direct input to the BOT. Trustee Cheyne is also open to direct communication with faculty. In addition, the CSU Statewide Senate recently passed a resolution that went to the BOT specifically making the point that the faculty need to be involved in curriculum discussions at the beginning and not the end.

The last Trustee to visit SJSU was Trustee Chandler about six or seven years ago. Trustee Cheyne was asked to let the other Trustees know how important it is for them to stay in contact with the campuses, so that they can see how things actually work. Trustee Cheyne is “brainstorming an initiative” to bring back retreats (such as Asilomar, but less costly) that bring people together to have important discussions about these issues.

A Senator asked about the Chancellor’s mandate that all new programs remain within 120 units. Trustee Cheyne responded that she was not aware this was a mandate, but thought that campuses were just being asked to look at majors that were over 120 units to see if it was possible to reduce them. President Qayoumi confirmed that he had been in the meetings with the Chancellor and that it was not a mandate, but something the campuses were being asked to look into.

Trustee Cheyne was asked if the BOT discussed ways to provide an affordable education for students. Trustee Cheyne noted that this is a big part of the conversation by the BOT. During the most recent vote on raising tuition, there was a 9 to 6 vote. Those trustees that voted for increase

felt they were “between a rock and a hard place.” There is no desire to raise tuition again, but Trustee Cheyne does not know what might be coming.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

January 30, 2012 – No questions

February 6, 2012 –

A question was asked about item 5, and whether it meant that a Sense of the Senate would be endorsed by the Executive Committee, or drafted by the Executive Committee and brought before the full Senate for approval. Senator Bros clarified that the planning process was a function of Academic Affairs, but that the Curriculum and Research Committee would bring a Sense of the Senate Resolution to the Executive Committee and Senate.

B. Consent Calendar – **The consent calendar was approved as amended by Associate Vice Chair (AVC) McClory.**

AVC McClory encouraged Senators to complete the online Committee Preference Form as soon as possible. If Senators do not complete a Committee Preference Form, then AVC McClory will be forced to place them on a policy committee that has a vacancy remaining after she places all Senators that filled out a form.

AVC McClory asked for two nominations from Senators to sit on the Housing Appeals Committee. Senator Backer asked if summer work was involved, and AVC McClory responded that appeals should be completed by the end of May. There may be a few appeals in the summer, but they are usually handled by email. Senator Backer volunteered.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Chair Von Till presented *AS 1472, Sense of the Senate Resolution, WASC Review Steering Committee (Final Reading)*. The Senate discussed why the resolution was not a Senate Management Resolution as it is creating a Senate committee. Chair Von Till responded that this was the format used the last time a WASC Review Steering Committee was created, and that it is not a Senate committee. The Senate is only selecting the faculty members. The Senate discussed why the Executive Committee was selecting and appointing the faculty members instead of the full Senate. Chair Von Till and AVC McClory responded that there was a time issue and constituting this committee was considered time-sensitive. Chair Von Till suggested that an amendment could be made during debate if Senators felt strongly about it. The Senate moved to debate. There was no debate. **The Senate voted and AS 1472 was approved with 1 Nay, and 4 Abstentions.**

Special Order of Business –

- V. Re-election of the Senate Chair for another 1-year term in accordance with Senate Bylaw 2.22a. AVC McClory called for a vote by secret. The Senate voted and Chair Von Till was reelected as Chair of the Senate for 2012-2013.

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

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –

Senator Bros-Seemann reported that C&R is working on a credit hour policy that will be incorporated into the Greensheet policy. This policy is the result of a new Department of Education requirement that all universities provide the definition of what a credit hour is. C&R is also working on a certificate policy. SJSU currently has no policy governing certificates, or how they are evaluated.

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –

Senator Kimbarow announced that O&G has been working on a referral to reconstitute the All University Teacher Education Committee (AUTEK). This policy resolution is currently being reviewed by the C&R Committee and will come to the Senate for a first reading on March 12th.

O&G is working on a referral to change the membership of the I&SA Committee.

In addition, O&G just completed the hearings into the department mergers in the college of Humanities and the Arts. Senator Kimbarow met with the President and Provost last week and presented the committee's preliminary report. O&G hopes to finalize the report at their next meeting.

Senator Kimbarow presented *AS 1473, Policy Recommendation, Amends Standing Rule 9A, Addition of the Chair of UCCD to the list of Individuals to be Recognized by the Chair of the Senate (First Reading)*. Senator Kimbarow noted that this policy came about as the result of a referral from the Chair of the UCCD to add a seat for the Chair of UCCD to the Senate. The O&G Committee decided that this was not in the best interest of the Senate for reasons of representation and equality. As a compromise, the O&G Committee is recommending that the Chair of the UCCD be allowed to address the Senate on relevant issues. The Chair of the UCCD has been consulted and agreed to this compromise.

The Senate discussed why O&G felt it would make the Senate out of balance to add the Chair of the UCCD to the Senate. Senator Kimbarow noted that O&G had received another request to add an administrator to the Senate at the same time. The O&G Committee did not want "to go down the path of having constituent representatives for fear that other groups would then want representation on the Senate." A member suggested that having the Chairs represented on the Senate was the same as having the Deans represented on the Senate. It was noted that the Deans do not elect the faculty from their college to the Senate.

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

Senator Gleixner reported that I&SA did not have any policy recommendations for this meeting, but they are working on referrals involving the disclosure of student contact information, the appropriate use of the SJSU Logo, scheduling events with sound on campus,

students posting instructor materials online and/or tape recording classes, and a class scheduling policy.

D. University Library Board (ULB) – No report.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – No report.

Senator Ng presented *AS 1470, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Office Hours (First Reading)*.

Senator Ng described the changes between this policy and the policy the Senate passed on Faculty Office Hours last spring. The changes are in section II.C. Scheduling Hours, Departmental Policies on Office Hours. This section has been changed to read, “Individual departments may develop specific detailed policies on office hours.” The number of hours has remained the same as in the policy last spring.

The Senate discussed why the policy last spring was not signed by the administration. There was concern that there had not been sufficient discussion with department chairs, and there were some technical issues. For example, a person teaching only .20 time would have to be in their office only 30 minutes twice a week to satisfy the requirement. Senator Ng noted that she had received only one comment, and that was after the policy had been passed by the Senate. The comment was that the policy required everyone to have physical office hours, and this is not true. The policy says you should have office hours in the way you are teaching your classes. For instance, if you have online classes you have online hours, but if you are teaching physically in a classroom then you have physical office hours. There was also concern that the amount of time put into email all week and weekend long is not accounted for. However, the PS Committee felt some of that time needed to be accounted for in other ways.

Senator Backer noted that she was Chair of the Professional Standards Committee when the policy was first being drafted, and they had received 20 pages of feedback from the Chairs and Directors. The PS Committee was then shocked when the Chairs said they didn’t get sufficient consultation. The current Office Hours Policy is from 1968, and the PS Committee has been trying to amend it for three years.

The Senate discussed current feedback from the UCCD, and it was determined that when the proposed policy was brought before the UCCD by the PS Committee, there were no questions raised during the meeting. Senator Ng noted that the proposed changes will now allow the departments to establish office hours based on their specific departmental needs. A Senator suggested that a section be added to the policy establishing a review period to determine if the policy is working.

A Senator expressed concern about the drop from a minimum of 5 to a minimum of 2 physical office hours. The PS Committee debated for over a year on whether to make it 2 or 3 physical office hours. The Senate discussed the movement to extensive email communication, and how this results in faculty working almost 24 hours a day, 7 days a week responding to emails.

It was suggested that section II. C. be amended to include language that specifically indicated that it is the faculty in the departments that would vote on the office hours for the department.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

Roger Elrod, Director of the Student Health Center, Vanessa Alcantar, MPH Student at SJSU, and Kim Vagadori of the CA Youth Advocacy Network, gave a presentation on having a “Smoke-Free Campus.” Mr. Elrod, Ms. Alcantar, and Ms. Vagadori represent a coalition of faculty and students that have been working on making SJSU smoke-free for the past several years. The trend over the past several years has been to view tobacco use as negative, unlike drinking coffee and caffeine use which is now being shown to have some benefits. In addition, the first question asked by all health professionals is if you smoke. Smoking is a significant health issue, as is secondhand smoke.

Some studies have shown that smokers in smoke-free environments smoke less, and some even quit smoking. In addition, some studies have shown that young adults in the 18 to 24-year-old range that are inclined to start smoking, do not start smoking if they are in a smoke-free environment.

Mr. Elrod’s coalition did a survey on campus. Approximately 2,300 people on and off campus participated. On average, 50% of those surveyed used tobacco in the past 30 days. About half of these individuals smoke on campus. In addition, 33% of those surveyed indicated that they were allergic to secondhand smoke. Approximately 80% of those surveyed would support SJSU becoming a smoke-free campus, and 90% would support designated smoking areas. Coalitions are being formed, and cleanup of cigarette butts is being done across campus.

Ms. Vagadori reported that the work has been done with community colleges in California and they are now smoke-free. The only remaining campuses that are not smoke-free are the four-year universities. Nationally, there is a trend to go smoke free. The universities of Michigan and Kentucky have went smoke, and/or tobacco free, and the UC system has announced they will go smoke free by 2014.

Santa Clara County has a \$6.9 million grant from the federal government to help with tobacco control issues, but the grant ends June 30, 2012. The funding could be used to help SJSU with signage, education, smoking cessation, etc.

Questions:

The coalition was asked how the respondents were chosen. The response was that the information was put on the Student Health Center website, and they had information tables. Information about the survey was also put in the Spartan Daily, and a campus announcement was put out. There was discussion and agreement that signage would not be enough if SJSU went smoke free, and that education would need to be provided for smokers.

A Senator asked if having designated smoking areas was much more cost prohibitive than having a smoke free campus. The coalition responded that there is a litter problem with designated smoking areas, and there was no decrease in smoking. What the coalition has found is that the “social norm” changes a year or two after going smoke free. However, the cost of signage is about the same. De Anza Community College has designated smoking areas in some of the parking lots, and the signage can be very confusing.

The Coalition noted that most students are not aware of the smoking policy at their university. A technique that has been used at other universities has been handing out postcards that detail the policy and have information on smoking cessation programs on the back. Santa Clara County could pay for postcards such as this if the campus went smoke free by June 30, 2012.

The Coalition believes that if the campus is made smoke free, then people will want to quit smoking. The Student Health Center does have some funding for smoking cessation programs. The coalition is trying to give some funding to student groups on campus so they can buy “quit kits” to give to Human Resources to hand them out to staff to get them to quit smoking. Staff can also get local resources, and/or call the quit line in California which is free.

The Senate discussed the hurdles to getting the campus to go smoke free. The Coalition believes that it varies from campus to campus. At some campuses it is the students, while at other campuses it is the staff due to working condition issues. This is why the coalition recommends giving the campus a year to transition to smoke free.

Concern was expressed that there are 11 bargaining units on campus, and that a smoke free campus policy might not be enforceable brought by the Senate. The coalition agreed and said that usually the students, faculty, and staff all sign resolutions supporting a smoke free campus, and that is then forwarded to the President. The Coalition noted that the people that smoke the most on this campus are the staff, and that less educated and lower income staff members tend to be the biggest tobacco users.

Senators noted that the table of survey results had two questions, one that asked if the respondents would support a smoke free campus, and another that asked if they would support designated smoking areas. However, the percentages do not add up to the average as shown. Mr. Elrod said there would be a Wellness website where Senators could view the raw data. The Senate discussed what was being referred to as student success. Ms. Vagadori responded that “companies are not hiring smokers and it is perfectly legal for them not to hire smokers.” The Coalition believes that many students start smoking in college, and that if they prevent them from smoking, or help them stop smoking, they will be more successful in the workplace.

The Senate discussed the fact that the survey was not a random sample. Senator Peter asked if a random sample survey had been done on campus, and the Coalition responded that they had not conducted one.

The Senate discussed what the hurdles to a smoke free policy would be, and enforcement was the biggest hurdle. However, Ms. Vagadori responded that after a year or so citations could be

issued such as at SFSU. SFSU has designated smoking areas and the police issue citations. The funds from the citations are used to help people quit smoking. The Coalition suggested that if a policy was passed a committee should be established to make sure the policy was enforced and was working.

VIII. New Business – No report.

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

A. CSU Statewide Senators –

B. Provost –

Provost Junn will be developing the Academic Affairs Master Plan in line with the university Strategic Plan. The Academic Affairs leadership team has created the initial draft, and the Provost is now in the process of sharing and modifying it with different campus groups. The Provost will also be holding forums for the entire campus. A website is being created that will be accessible from the Provost's website where anyone can go to submit comments and feedback on the Academic Affairs Master Plan.

The C&R Committee is charged with reviewing the Academic Affairs Master Plan before it comes to the Executive Committee, and then Provost Junn hopes to present the final version to the Senate in May. The Provost's goal is to have it completed by the end of the spring semester.

The Academic Affairs Master Plan is about developing goals. The strategies to reach those goals may change over time, but the goals remain the same. The Provost will assess the progress toward the goals on a yearly basis.

The Senate discussed the need to have town hall meetings scheduled on Tuesdays/Thursdays as well as Mondays/Wednesdays. However, the Provost is unable to accommodate Tuesdays and Thursdays with her travel schedule.

Concern was expressed that the town hall meetings not more sessions where faculty are being told what is going to happen, as opposed to having an actual chance to participate in developing the Academic Affairs Master Plan. A suggestion was made that faculty not be required to fill out a feedback form at the forum, but rather be given time to consider the information and develop ideas. Provost Junn also noted that faculty can access the website at any time to submit their feedback.

Provost Junn will give a 5 to 10 minute update on the progress of the Academic Affairs Master Plan at each Senate meeting. President Qayoumi pointed out that the Academic Affairs Master Plan will follow the same planning process that the Strategic Plan followed, and the Strategic Plan was completed in one semester.

Provost Junn thanked Senators for passing the WASC Review Steering Committee Resolution. The Provost commented that in other countries accreditation is done by the government. This is one reason the Department of Education is now asking for proof that programs accredited by WASC are meeting the qualifications. This is one reason WASC is changing their whole accreditation format. WASC is asking us to provide proof that our students are proficient in at least five areas—quantitative, oral communications, written communications, critical thinking, and information literacy.

Provost Junn asked Senators to assist in coming up with ways that they can showcase how our students are meeting the levels of competency that WASC is asking for. Senators were also encouraged to submit their nomination for the WASC Steering Review Committee.

WASC reaccreditation used to take five years, required three different reports, and had two site visits. The process has now been cut down to 18 months, and only one report is required with a 75-page maximum. This should make the process much more manageable. SJSU is the first of the CSU campuses to begin the new WASC process, and hopefully this will give us a little more flexibility while WASC is still building the process.

Provost Junn had AVPs Merdinger and Sujitparapitaya do a study on the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty at SJSU. SJSU currently has 1,852 faculty. About 53% are tenure/tenure-track, and the majority of the rest are part-time lecturers. The study showed a significant loss in tenure/tenure-track faculty about 2 to 2 ½ years ago resulting in SJSU dropping to 20th in the CSU system in terms of the percentage of tenure/tenure-track faculty. Provost Junn has spoken with President Qayoumi about the need to grow our tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Provost Junn was very surprised to see that SJSU is so behind in technology considering we are in the heart of Silicon Valley. The Provost believes SJSU needs to start with something as basic as the learning management system. Technology can be used by faculty to help reduce workload as well as to engage students in the learning process. The Provost hopes to get widespread input from the faculty on how to reorganize Academic Technology at SJSU. One of the first areas that must be addressed is the Learning Management System (LMS). SJSU is in its third year of a 3-year D2L contract that expires June 30th. Provost Junn met with the Executive Committee and asked for guidance on how to get advisory input and recommendations on where to go from here. The Executive Committee suggested that the Provost create a taskforce. Provost Junn and Chair Von Till asked the Senate to submit names of individuals with expertise that should be included on the taskforce.

Provost Junn would like to create a series of learning opportunities so that faculty can have a chance to see some of the new technology that is out there. For instance, there are technology tools to assist students that can reduce the workload for faculty, such

as grammar check programs that work with students to help develop their report writing skills, or GRE test preparation programs.

Provost Junn will be continuing to support RSCA this next year. The Provost also plans on launching undergraduate research and scholarly activity. AVPs Stacks and Jaehne have been charged with looking into how to promote this. In addition, Senator Backer and Dr. Rona Halualani will be consultants for the university in grant writing.

Provost Junn has consulted with the Center for Teaching and Learning and they have instructional designers that are going to bring e-campus over, and will be working with the new technology taskforce as well.

As the budget unfolds, Provost Junn will be asking faculty to think about new ways they can deliver their curriculum to maximize student learning and save money. For example, at Northridge they reorganized their remedial courses so that students do not have to take three different courses, and this saved \$7 million. If the \$200 million budget trigger to the CSU system occurs, Academic Affairs will be cut \$14 million. Provost Junn asked the faculty to help in coming up with ways to deliver instruction differently to save money.

C. VP for Administration and Finance – No report.

D. VP of Student Affairs – No report.

E. AS President –

AS has been working on aligning their Strategic Plan with the university Strategic Plan. In addition, AS will participate in a March for Higher Education scheduled for March 5, 2012, and there is a California Higher Education Student Summit on April 20-22, 2012. The Student Trustee position on the BOT is also vacant again.

F. VP for University Advancement – No report.

G. CSU Statewide Senators –

SJSU has three CSU Statewide Senators that are being funded at the rate for two Senators this semester. In addition, only two CSU Statewide Senators will be funded next year.

A special meeting of the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Trustee, the Emeritus Faculty Senator, the Senate Chair, and the Chancellor met to discuss the current status of shared governance. Subsequently, during the plenary session, it was noted that the Chancellor was exceptionally gracious regarding future directions and responsive to questions from Senators regarding past and future actions.

A resolution was passed supporting more faculty involvement in CSU initiatives. All CSU Resolution that are passed are on the CAL State website under faculty senate.

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