

2013/2014 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 10, 2014

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Heiden, Von Till,
Ayala, Van Selst, Sabalius,
Lessow-Hurley

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Hebert, Cara, Rosenblum,
Guerrazzi

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Dukes, Nance, Feinstein,
Bibb
Absent: Qayoumi

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Sibley

Deans:

Present: Green, Stacks,
Vollendorf
Absent: Kifer

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow, Swanson

Students:

Present: Jeffrey, Hart, Miller, Gupta
Gottheil, Hernandez

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Du, Gleixner, Backer

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Brown, Frazier, Desalvo,
Brada-Williams, Grindstaff
Absent: Bacich

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: McClory, Bros-Seemann, Kress, Kaufman

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Kohn, Fujimoto, Morazes
Absent: Kauppila

SOS Representatives:

Present: Trulio, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Wilson

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The Senate minutes of December 9, 2013 were approved unanimously.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Heiden made the following announcements:

The review of governance by the Chancellor in response to the request made by the Senate has begun, and a three-member team has been established. The team includes Dr. Joe Crowley, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Ron Vogel, and Bernadette Cheyne, Professor Emeritus from CSU Humboldt and former Faculty Trustee.

Senators were advised that they would soon be receiving a copy of the team’s agenda in their

email as well as a list of the groups they will be meeting with. Chair Heiden will also update Senators as to the team's upcoming schedule as soon as it is finalized. The committee's first week on campus was spent meeting with various groups such as Associated Students, the Deans, the President's cabinet, faculty on the Executive Committee, etc.

A website has been proposed, but may not be possible.

Chair Heiden emphasized that the process is not meant to be secretive, but is meant to protect those that speak to the committee and ensure their confidentiality.

Chair Heiden welcomed new Senators.

B. From the President of the University –

Senator Bibb announced the death of a student in housing yesterday afternoon (February 9, 2014). The student's family has requested privacy and confidentiality. A student vigil will be held at 9 p.m. this evening in front of Joe West Hall.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

- Executive Committee Minutes of November 4, 2013 – No questions.
- Executive Committee Minutes of December 2, 2013 – No questions.
- Executive Committee Minutes of December 16, 2013 – No questions.
- Executive Committee Minutes of January 13, 2014 – No questions.
- Executive Committee Minutes of January 27, 2014 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar – The consent calendar was approved as is.

AVC Ng announced that there had been a shift in the number of seats in some of the colleges for this year. CASA and ENGR gained a seat, and the General Unit lost a seat. Nominating Petitions are due by COB on Monday, February 24, 2014.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: No action items.

V. Special Order of Business:

Request to Extend the Term of the Senate Chair

The AVC took over the meeting and the Senate voted by secret ballot to extend the term of the Senate Chair for one year by a two-thirds vote.

VI. Unfinished Business - No Unfinished Business.

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

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

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1528, Policy Recommendation, Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading)*.

Q: Why must the number of students per section be limited to 25 in Area A3? The English Department teaches it with 25 students, but the Philosophy Department teaches it with 65 students and were ready to try a jumbo section.

A: The Writing Requirements Committee wanted it that way, but it is a debatable point.

Q: For pre-Nursing, there is a list of about eight courses that if you are in pre-Nursing and you take them, regardless of campus authority, you will be granted GE in the relevant areas. Where does that fit in here?

A: This is category 2, and Undergraduate Studies is the keeper of the category 2 list. The hope with these new guidelines is that if the student leaves Nursing, but took and passed all those courses, that satisfaction of GE moves with them.

Q: Please clarify, it says in category 3 that a request for a waiver goes to the Curriculum and Research Committee, but in the next section under implementation it says degree programs should submit requests for modification to Undergraduate Studies.

A: That language will be cleaned up before the final reading. It will go to C&R, then to the President and Provost, and finally to the Chancellor's Office for final approval.

Q: Other than asking for the prerequisites, have the prerequisite expectations from oral communications been incorporated into the new joint course?

A: The learning objectives for A3 have changed slightly. Some of the writing learning objectives and oral communication writing objectives are new to area A3.

Q: Is oral communication a prerequisite for the course?

A: Yes.

Q: What is it in oral communication that you are supposed to carry forward for critical thinking and is that listed in the critical thinking course? What is the outcome expected?

A: Are you asking if the learning objectives for oral communication are a higher order for this course than they are for the other ones?

Q: Also for R, S, and V, are those supposed to be capstone courses and if so is that captured in the expectations for the course?

A: C&R will look at whether they are doing a higher order learning objective for those.

Q: With regard to the 6,000 word compromise, did the committee consider replacing the lost 2,000 words by adding it to a different part of the GE package.

A: It was not simply a compromise, the UC requirement is 6,000 words.

Q: Did the committee consider adding the 2,000 words to another GE course where writing is commonly used in large measure?

A: No, this wasn't considered. The Chair of C&R will send this out to BOGS and C&R to get input before the next reading.

Q: Are the faculty that currently teach critical thinking satisfied with the 6,000 word

compromise? Also, are the faculty that currently teach English 1B satisfied with the 6,000 word compromise?

A: The English Department is completely satisfied with it. Some of the departments that teach critical thinking are fine with it, but several departments that don't teach critical thinking are not okay with it. The departments that teach critical thinking want a lower word count, they would prefer not to have writing as part of their course. This is some of the critical thinking classes, not all of them.

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): No report.

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

Senator Frazier presented *AS 1536, Policy Recommendation, Student Fairness Dispute Resolution (First Reading)*.

Q: In I.6. it states, “Any member of the SFC may disqualify him or herself from consideration of a specific case...” is this because he/she may have a conflict of interest?

A: He/she might know the person, etc.

Q: Then would the committee consider changing it to read, “Any member of the SFC should disqualify him or herself from consideration...?”

A: The committee would be happy to think about it.

Q: Occasionally there may be something that is a clear violation of policy, has the committee considered another process to look at policy violations?

A: When there are clear violations, such as not providing a greensheet, they go straight to the Ombudsman.

D. University Library Board (ULB) – No report

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1523, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Concerning the Need to Continue to Increase the Proportion of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty at San José State University (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1523 was approved unanimously as written.**

VII. Special Committee Reports –

A. Report from the Student Fairness Committee (SFC):

Chair of the SFC, Mathew Masucci, gave a brief presentation on the SFC.

The Senate Management Resolution that increased the membership of the SFC did not help in getting the backlog resolved. Chair Masucci commented that he believed the appointment process for students is too cumbersome. However, there are a lot of students in the process of being appointed for next semester and that will be a big help.

There are eight cases that have been carried forward from Spring 2012 and two pending cases.

Q: How many cases have been withdrawn because the student got tired of waiting or graduated?

A: The Ombudsman noted that she did not believe this has happened.

Q: Can a student's transcript be changed after it is issued?

A: In certain circumstances.

Q: Since there is such difficulty getting students to serve on the committee, would the SFC committee consider a different procedure?

A: There usually isn't a problem getting students on the committee. The problem is that they are only appointed for a year and the appointment process takes time and students usually don't show up until at least the second or third meeting. The new Student Fairness Dispute resolution asks for a two-year term for students.

Q: Is financial compensation or priority registration better to get students on the committee?

A: I think priority registration could go a long way. Also, because of the time commitment, knowing your schedule a semester in advance for a student could go a long way towards getting students on the committee.

Q: What about the money allocated from Finance and Administration that was to be used to pay for students to serve on the SFC?

A: I think this is just one time funding.

A: The VP of Finance and Administration announced that it is not one time funding, but is part of the base budget.

B. Budget Presentation—

AVP for Finance Josee Larochelle presented a report on the university budget for 2013-2014.

Note: To view the full university budget, please go to:

http://www.sjsu.edu/finance/docs/2013_14%20Budget%20Report_Web.pdf

President Qayoumi held a November 2012 budget forum that clearly identified a deficit \$36.3 million for our campus. That was an accumulation of two years of deficit—\$11.9 million from 2011-2012 added to an additional \$24.4 million deficit for 2012-2013.

Another budget forum was held in April of 2013 and there was some good news. Proposition 30 passed in November 2012 and the net impact of that was \$5.5 million for SJSU. There was a much bigger impact this fiscal year. Reductions were still necessary to close the \$27 million gap. The university applied the \$5.5 million from Proposition 30 to one-time needs.

The university employed a two-year reduction plan to get that \$36.3 million reduction. The starting point was in 2012-2013, and \$3.3 million was taken university-wide off the top. One time funds were able to be used during 2012-2013 to take care of half of that reduction, or \$16.5 million. The intention was to complete the rest of the \$33 million reduction in 2013-2014 fiscal year.

Proposition 30 had a big impact for the 2013-2014 year, and the one time funds the university pledged against the deficit in 2012-2013 were able to be completely restored as base restoration for the 2013-2014 fiscal year.

There were three divisions that took the budget reductions in 2012-2013—Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, and Student Affairs. The total deficit again was \$33 million. In 2012-2013 there was temporary relief of \$16.5 million that was able to be turned into base restoration for 2013-2014.

Student enrollment drives most of the budget allocations for the CSU. There are two categories of students—residents and non-residents. The chancellor’s office sets resident student targets, our resident student target for 2013-2014 was increased by 253 FTES this year or 1.2%. Student demand was once again higher than our target and we project ending the year at 105%.

Non-resident enrollment is also on the rise. Our budget was 1,607 non-resident FTES, and we are currently projected at 1,776 for a total of 169 students over what we anticipated. The non-resident students are mostly international graduate students.

At the time the annual budget report was published, SJSU received a base budget increase of \$21.5 million. The campus was recently notified of an additional \$2.5 million allocation for compensation adjustments.

SJSU received one-time funds of \$81,000 for three courses under the banner of, “Promising Course Redesign,” and \$350,000 to implement a degree audit system based on a competitive proposal process under the allocation for innovation and student success.

Total base funding for the university was \$30.6 million. In addition to the \$21.5 million we received in the new CSU allocation, we had the \$5.5 million from the Proposition 30 proceeds, and our additional students increased our base projections for fee revenue by \$3.6 million for a total of \$30.6 million of available base funds.

After setting aside mandatory costs, funds were primarily used to restore budget reductions made last year. As noted, \$3.5 million of restoration funds came from the new Student Success and Excellence in Technology fee (SSETF). Other uses include \$4.5 million for enrollment growth for the additional 621 FTES. Campus priorities included \$1.4 million for the centralization of IT services which resulted in budget savings across the campus for IT services, and \$300,000 for teacher licensure requirements in the College of Education. A modest reserve of \$3 million was carved out for enrollment fluctuations as we haven’t had any budget reserves for the past two years. A small amount, \$1.8 million, is reserved for contingencies.

One time funds included \$14.2 million from the previous year and additional revenue from FTES. This provided the university with an available \$21.2 million in one-time funds. These funds were allocated for Vision 2017 priorities, FTES support, deferred maintenance,

continuing commitments from the prior year, utilities reserve, Mountain West transition, and again some contingency funds.

In addition to these funds, we also have the new SSETF. This included \$19.2 million in revenue. This is on page 29 of the budget report. The uses for these funds included \$10.5 million to continue former IRA and course fee support, \$7.5 million allocated for new initiatives, with a balance reserve of \$1.1 million.

Questions:

Q: Where are the International and Extended Studies (IES) funds shown?

A: They are in the annual budget report and are included on the Division Expenditure page. VP Bibb noted that IES funds are very formulate driven and go out to those parties when the funds are received.

Q: There is a comparison chart of a number of universities on page 10. Why is the amount of student financial aid that goes to SJSU students so much lower than the other universities listed?

A: This information came from the Chancellor's database and we are all supposed to be using the same financial system, but there are discrepancies between universities in how this information is calculated. AVP Larochelle will check into this and get back to the Senate about it.

Q: The student contribution to Athletics through the SSETF has increased by 60% over the last four years. Why has the Athletics budget increased every year over the last four years, while the college budgets were being cut? Also, what happened to the \$2.5 million deficit carried by the Athletics Division, and why is the deficit Athletics has every year forgiven while colleges are being asked to cut classes to meet their deficit?

A: This university does have a long history of Athletics being funded out of the IRA fee. Several years ago, under then President Don Kassing, there was a substantial increase in the student IRA fee in order to fund and sustain Athletics programs. The IRA fee was subsumed as part of the SSETF. The IRA fee already had a split as to how it was divided up and who it goes to. This has carried over to the new SSETF.

The Athletics Division has submitted a four year plan to President Qayoumi and VP Bibb at the end of which they would be solvent. They are currently projected to have a positive budget yearend balance by the year 2015-2016.

Q: Isn't charging students SSETF fees in summer a violation of Executive Order 1078?

A: The CSU has allowed the campuses to charge a portion of the semester fees during the summer. SJSU charges two-thirds of the regular semester fee during the summer months for those students that are still on campus. This includes the AS Body fee, the Student Union Fee, the Health Services fee, and the SSETF fee.

Q: Are student charged twice during the summer if they take more than one class?

A: No, they are charged only once.

Q: Although Athletics is only getting 2.2% of the General Fund, would it actually be 2.2% if their millions of dollars in debt weren't forgiven each year?

A: The percentage would be greater, but that calculation hasn't been done. Last year is the only year that AVP Larochelle is aware that Athletics had their deficit forgiven.

Q: If you add the \$2.5 million in deficit then the percentage is much higher than the 2.2%, so what is the point of giving them only 2.2% if you continue to forgive them millions in deficit each year? Is the point just to make it look like you aren't giving them more than the 2.2%?

A: Athletics does have a plan to get to where they should by 2015-2016 and it doesn't involve more money from the General Fund. It involves increased donations. Also, for this year Athletics has increased their revenue this year, and their deficit is below the \$2.5 million. This is difficult given that they just recently changed conferences. Their goal is to be solvent by 2015-2016. AVP Larochelle will calculate what the percentage for Athletics would be with the deficits included and email it to Senators. [Per AVP Larochelle, the percentage is 3%.]

Q: The amount given to Athletics from the SSETF fee increased from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. How is that calculated, because there hasn't been any increase in lab fees which also come from these fees.

A: In 2012-2013 there was a built in increase per headcount in the SSETF fee. Athletics is funded based on headcount. Therefore, higher enrollment gives Athletics more money.

Q: Does this apply to lab fees also?

A: Currently, it does not.

Q: In this year's budget, there was a number of things related to 21st Century, Next Gen, etc., and in last year's budget there was \$13.2 million of one time money allocated for the category of Next Gen. This year's budget shows \$1.5 million for 21st Century Learning Spaces, \$2.7 million for 21st Century Spaces, \$3.7 million for Agility through Technology, and then in the SSETF \$1.15 million also for Next Gen. Are there places we can go to find out what is included in these categories, and whether that \$13.2 million allocated last year was actually spent?

A: Many of the categories you listed are not related to the technology issue. The 21st Century Learning Spaces is not necessarily geared to technology or allocated to the Next Gen project. The 21st Century Spaces Vision 2017 is in regards to physical spaces. The \$3.7 million for Agility through Technology was allocated by a Vision 2017 committee and is not earmarked for Next Gen, but could be utilized for some of the original Next Gen projects, or for enhancement of services. This is up to that committee. There is a committee for each of these funds that makes the decisions about the use of these funds.

Q: How can I find out who is on that committee and contact them?

A: The committee is led by AVP Terry Vahey, and the 21st Century Spaces committee is co-chaired by Interim Provost/Senator Feinstein and AVP Chris Brown.

Q: Can you give a brief summary of what you will be telling the UCCD about the SSETF fee and what if any changes have been made and/or are planned for the use of those fees?

A: AVP Larochelle will give a brief overview of the campus fee program, talk a little bit about SSETF last year and this year, and talk a little bit about the resolution that the UCCD had put up. AVP Larochelle would prefer to wait and release that complete conversation

after the UCCD meeting at which time she has no problem with posting the presentation so that everyone can have access.

The SSETF was a new fee and the process was new. There were some bumps last year and some changes have had to be made in how the process will work, how the proposals are reviewed, who the decision-makers are, changes to the advisory committee, and changes to the timeline.

Q: There was a \$1.1 million balance from the SSETF, and isn't there a policy that says that money has to go back to the students?

A: No, it is required to stay in the funding source, so there was \$1.1 million that was not allocated this year and it will roll into the pool for next year.

Q: If we take the total expenditures for the university, it looks like Academic Affairs has 46% of the expenditures, and Intercollegiate Athletics has 4.6% of the total expenditures. What is the reason for making a graph only using the operating funds rather than total funds?

A: Historically, the interest has been in the operating fund. The funding sources other than the operating fund are most often restricted for specific purposes.

Q: Are the funds left over from the various projects, etc. all rolled back into them, and only the \$1.8 million is set aside in contingency funds for a rainy day?

A: Yes, the \$1.8 million is the only undesignated money that the university has available for a rainy day. Other programs such as the SSETF funds have a separate account and the money must roll back into them for the future. The university is not allowed to pool these leftover funds together for a rainy day.

Q: In the sweep of funds that occurred last year, is there somewhere that appears in the budget and will that occur again?

A: The President has said he will not do that again. The CERF funds will stay with wherever your VP puts them.

Comment: We are receiving \$2 million from the lottery and most of it goes to library acquisitions, but lottery funds are not supposed to supplant regular university expenses. In the past these funds were used for professional development for faculty, and it would be nice to see a return to this use for these funds. Departments have no funds for professional development any longer.

VIII. New Business – None

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

A. CSU Statewide Senators—

A report was circulated by email from the CSU Statewide Senators.

Some issues and resolutions under consideration include community colleges and bachelorette degrees, emeritus status for lecturers, and a resolution on ethnic studies on campuses.

B. Provost – No report.

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

D. Vice President for Student Affairs –

Invitation letters for Fall 2014 will go out next week.

The Student Union should open after Spring break. There are many operations that cannot be moved while classes are in session.

E. Associated Students –

Associated Students elections are currently underway.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.