

2013/2014 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
April 14, 2014

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Eight Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

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

**CASA Representatives:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

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

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Campsey, Sibley

**Deans:**

Present: Green, Stacks,  
Vollendorf, Kifer

**EDUC Representatives:**

Absent: Swanson, Kimbarow

**Students:**

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

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Du, Gleixner, Backer

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**H&A Representatives:**

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

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: McClory, Bros-Seemann, Kress, Kaufman

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Kohn, Fujimoto, Morazes,  
Kauppila

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Trulio, Ng, Peter, Rudy, Wilson

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

The Senate minutes of March 10, 2014 were approved unanimously (48-0-0).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

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

Chair Heiden made the following announcements:

The “Spartans Helping Spartans” annual campaign ends April 18, 2014. Please donate to whatever programs you are passionate about.

Chair Heiden sent out an email to faculty on the Campus Governance Review. The Chancellor has indicated his timeline is the end of April or 1<sup>st</sup> of May.

The Provost search process is complete and a decision has been made. An announcement will

be sent out today. [Chair Heiden announced later in the meeting that she had received an email announcing that Interim Provost Andy Feinstein had been selected as the permanent Provost.]

The Dean for International and Extended Studies Search committee just completed telephone interviews, and will be moving to campus visits for finalists.

Chair Heiden attended a Senate Chair's meeting in San Francisco last week. The campuses have shared issues and certainly one of them is student fees. Chair Heiden will send a summary of the meeting to all Senators.

Chair Heiden and the Senate expressed condolences for the ten people killed in the Humboldt bus accident, five were prospective Humboldt State students, one was a staff member from Humboldt State, two were staff members from Los Angeles, and then there were the two drivers of the vehicles.

Wiggys Sivertsen is retiring and there is a retirement celebration for her this Friday, April 18, 2014. The Senate previously presented Senator Sivertsen with a Sense of the Senate Resolution in her honor.

**B. From the President of the University** – No update (President was out of town)

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

Executive Committee Minutes of March 3, 2014 –

Senator Van Selst asked if the 290R fee had been followed up on yet. Chair Heiden responded that no decisions had been made. There is a lot of discovery happening about parameters in the system as well as locally. There are no conclusions at this point.

Senators Gleixner and Frazier met with AVP Pam Stacks and they decided a referral would go to the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee.

**B. Consent Calendar** – The consent calendar was approved unanimously (48-0-0).  
AVC Ng announced the Senate election results for 2014-2015.

AVC Ng announced she had contacted every Senator to place them on a policy committee. The link to the online Committee Preference Form has been sent to all faculty. Senators do not need to fill out the Committee Preference Form as AVC Ng has already placed them on a policy committee.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Senate Calendar for 2014-2015 -- The Senate calendar was approved (47-0-1).

**V. Unfinished Business** - No Unfinished Business.

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

**A. University Library Board (ULB) –**

Dean Kifer reported that the ULB has been reviewing two things over the course of this year. First, the five-year library review required by university policy. The self-study document is being completed and should be sent out to the external reviewers, the ULB, and the library staff this afternoon. The external reviewers will be here next week. They include the Dean of the CSU Los Angeles library, and the Interim Dean of the library at Sonoma State University. This is the second review that has been done. The first was done in 2008-2009.

Dean Kifer reported on the lottery funds used for library materials. Prior to 2011-2012, the library was funded in the same fashion as other colleges and units across the campus. Occasionally, the library would get a small allotment of one-time money from the lottery funds for collections for the library.

Beginning in 2011-2012, the library began to receive \$1.9 million from lottery funds each year. This is close to the total amount of lottery funds the university gets. All of that \$1.9 million must be used for collections in the library. However, the library actually spends over \$2 million on collections. At the same time that the library began to receive the \$1.9 million in lottery funds, \$1.9 million was taken away from the library base funding. A survey of the deans of the libraries at other campuses has revealed that this is not uncommon. Not all CSU libraries get lottery funds, but most do.

**Questions:**

The Senate discussed the fact that the Lottery Act prohibits lottery funds from being used for ongoing and regular university costs. Dean Kifer has confirmed that this is happening by the fact that \$1.9 million was taken away from the library's base budget when they started receiving \$1.9 million in lottery funds each year. The reason the Senate was willing to give up millions from lottery/professional development funds was so that it could be used to supplement our collections, it was not intended to replace the library's normal base budget which is specifically prohibited by law.

**B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1540, Policy Recommendation, Guidelines for GE, AI, and the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (Final Reading)*.

Senator Brada-Williams presented an amendment as follows:

Add a Whereas between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> "Whereas":

Whereas, We are mindful that access to quality education is our key mission at San José State and General Education targets the five core competencies as defined by WASC—written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking--and that years of research by specialists in rhetoric and composition including the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), the Modern Language Association

(MLA), the Council of Writing Program Administrators, and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC)—who all recommend writing-intensive courses be taught at 20 students or less and that developmental or basic writing courses be capped at 15 students—have proven that class size has a direct impact on quality of education and student success in writing intensive courses; and

Change 20% to 10% in the final line under “Workload Impact.”

Amendment to all amended sections of the GE Guidelines after the asterisk: Class size: Enrollment shall normally be limited to 25 students.\* Departments that exceed the section limits by more than 10% must provide a justification in the annual assessment report indicating how practice and revisions in writing will be addressed with larger sections, particularly how students are receiving thorough feedback on the writing which accounts for the minimum word count in this GE category and documentation that the students are meeting the GE SLOs for writing. The Office of Undergraduate Studies will tabulate section enrollments for GE courses every semester on the census date and notify departments that will be required to submit a justification in their annual assessment report. BOGS will review the justifications during the same semester that the assessment report is received, and if BOGS has concerns, these will be forwarded to the Curriculum and Research Committee for recommendations including possible GE decertification of the course to the Provost.

The Senate voted and the Brada-Williams amendment passed (29-13-6).

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to change the Brada-Williams amended section as written above, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, that reads, “Departments that exceed section limits by more than 10% must provide...” to read, “Departments that exceed these limits by more than 10% must provide....”

**The Senate voted and AS 1540 passed as amended (41-5-2).**

-----

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1538, Policy Recommendation, Policy and Assurance for Humane Care and Use of Animals at San José State University (First Reading)*.

Q: The current policy was passed in 2008, what prompted the need to revise this policy now?

A: There were a few things out of compliance with federal law in the 2008 policy. Also, in Section 6.0 there are three sections in a row that address what could happen to students involved in research that had approval at another institution, or are involved in mining data and are not actually involved with any animal (the data was previously collected at another institution, or from another study, etc.). There have been a lot of issues around these areas that are not addressed in the 2008 policy.

-----

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1539, Policy Recommendation, Guidelines for Concentrations (First Reading)*.

Q: Under section I. Curricula Requirements for Concentrations, A. Undergraduate Degree, number 4, it states, “At least 10% of the units for the degree must be a unique set of requirements for that concentration.” Could you explain a little more what is meant by that, does that mean that the courses that are required for the concentration cannot be courses that are required for other concentrations?

A: Yes, that is what is meant by it. Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Departments had a lot of confusion when reviewing concentrations primarily because of two situations. They were seeing concentrations within a degree that were either completely separate from the degree—having no overlap at all, and they were wondering why it was a concentration and not a new degree, or they were seeing such a significant overlap that it appeared not to be different from the degree. This clause is to ensure that if you are making a new concentration, something must be unique and different from the existing degree.

Q: Let me give you a for instance, let’s say you have a department that has a general major and you take virtually any course that department offers and they will all count towards the major, but the department also has a concentration and to earn the concentration you must take several of those courses. However, if you are just getting the general major you could also take those courses, but it is not required that you do so. Does this mean that these are a unique set of requirements for the concentration or not?

A: Yes, the first narrative you listed was essentially an allowed elective list. The students are required to take nine units of electives and the department has an allowed elective list. The concentration is requiring them to take nine units of these classes, which happen to be on the allowed elective list. These are different.

Q: So a course does not have to be only and exclusively offered to the concentration, it simply has to be exclusively required for that concentration?

A: Yes.

Q: My first question has to do with I.A.1 that says, “Concentrations within a degree program must have at least 30% similarity in preparation for the major among all concentrations in the degree program.” Does that include the prerequisite courses for the courses within the concentration, or not?

A: There is a formal category called “Preparation for the Major” and that is what this is referring to.

Q: There are additional courses that you need to take to complete a degree that are the prerequisite courses that may not be listed and are sometimes referred to as a “Table of Prerequisites.” That is not included in this list, correct?

A: Yes, they are not included in this list.

Q: Would the committee consider changing the language to read, “Concentrations within a degree program must have at least 30% similarity in preparation or no more than X unit deviation from it? Some majors have a single prerequisite course, if there are multiple prerequisite courses that would exceed 30% relatively quickly, so this would be better said as 30% or number of units.

A: I'm still not clear.

Q: What happens if the original degree has only one course? What is 30% of one course?

A: I will bring that back to the committee.

Q: The item I'm most concerned about is I.A.5., which reads, "Concentrations must comply with existing TMCs or have a curriculum roadmap that is not inimical to a 60-60 unit transfer program." In many cases, the concentration is a specific focus and one of the things I'm concerned about is say what if in Business we have a concentration in Accounting that is presumably not 1440 compliant. If a degree in Financial Accounting rather than Tax Accounting is proposed, it would not be permissible under these rules. I think that the committee may want to consider whether it is a good idea to have a blanket prohibition that all future concentrations must be 1440 compliant.

A: Senator Gleixner will bring this back to the committee for consideration.

Senator Gleixner asked for the Senate's input on an area the committee is debating with regard to this policy. The approval process right now is practice not policy. The committee debated with what to do with a proposal that one committee approves and another doesn't. For instance, if Undergraduate Studies reviews a curriculum proposal, and they don't approve it, there is nothing clear about what they should do next in our policy, but what they have been doing in practice is giving it back to the department and specifying what must be improved. However, what if Undergraduate Studies does not approve it, but the department still wants to move forward? This is something for the Senate to consider.

Also, with regard to section IV. Existing Concentrations, after contacting the University Council of Chairs and Deans (UCCD), the most common feedback the C&R Committee received was that existing department concentrations do not comply with these requirements. This section is essentially a grandfathering in clause for this reason, but the action moving forward could be that this should be a new degree and not a concentration.

Q: With regard to the approval process, it ends with C&R. Before 1988, there were so many concentrations it was not reasonable for the Senate to be in the approval process, but now there are fewer concentrations. In 1988 about 80 concentrations were abolished. Perhaps, C&R may want to consider whether the Senate should be part of the approval process in the future?

A: Senator Gleixner will bring this back to the committee for consideration.

**C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1537, Policy Recommendation, Naming of Campus Facilities and Properties; and Colleges, Schools, and Other Academic Entities at San José State University (Final Reading)*.

Senator Kaufman presented several amendments that were friendly to eliminate 4.1.2, and to make 4.1.3, 4.1.2 Screening, and to eliminate the current 4.2 Screening section.

**The Senate voted and AS 1537 passed as amended (47-0-1).**

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

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

Senator Frazier announced that part I, section B. needs to be reinserted into the resolution as follows:

“B. Committee Chair

The SFC chair shall be a faculty member and serve as the administrative officer of the committee. The duties of the chair include scheduling of meetings and hearings, giving notice to witnesses and all interested parties involved in the case. The chair will distribute materials appropriate for consideration to all parties involved, maintain committee records and give written notice of committee decisions to the parties and to the university employee’s immediate supervisor (as appropriate). The chair may request the assistance of the Ombudsman in carrying out these administrative duties. The chair shall review all submitted petitions (grade disputes and grievances). If the chair finds the petition is appropriate for consideration by the committee a subcommittee will be assigned to investigate the case. The chair shall reject petitions that go beyond the scope and authority of the SFC, and refer as appropriate.”

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to change, Section V. The Decision Process, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the word “finding” to “recommendation.”

Senator Hebert presented an amendment that was friendly to change Section V, paragraphs 7 and 8 to read as follows, “If the SFC finds in favor of the student in a grade dispute, a written statement specifying which of the eight conditions were violated and the grounds for this determination, shall be mailed to the university employee(s) and their immediate supervisor(s). They shall have ten (10) working days to accept or reject the recommendation of the SFC.

If the SFC finds in favor of the student in a grievance, a written statement specifying which of their statuses, rights, or privileges were adversely affected and the grounds for this determination shall be mailed to the university employee(s) and their immediate supervisor(s). They shall have ten (10) working days to accept or reject the recommendation of the SFC.”

**The Senate voted and AS 1536 passed as amended (48-0-0).**

-----  
Senator Frazier presented *AS 1533, Policy Recommendation, Accommodation to students’ religious holidays (First Reading)*.

Q: Can you explain the reason for the Nay vote?

A: The dissenting voter believed the policy gave preference to students that have religious holidays over students that do not.

Q: Who will be the keeper of the list of acceptable holidays?

A: No one, and that does raise a complicated issue. Obviously, there could be abuse by some students, but for the most part the committee felt students observing religious holidays do so out of true faith within some established religion.

Q: Is the policy saying you do not have to do this, but make every reasonable effort?

A: No, you do have to make every reasonable effort to honor it. A representative from Human Resources came to the committee and explained that inconvenience to the instructor, such as having to create a separate exam, is not an acceptable reason not to honor a religious holiday request.

Q: Why not use the add date instead of using the first two weeks of the class each semester as the time frame for students to inform the instructor?

A: Can you explain what the advantage would be for using the add date?

A: The advantage is in case the policy changes on when the last day to add is, so there won't be some arbitrary two week period locked into the policy.

A: That makes sense. When this was discussed in the I&SA Committee, the committee used two weeks because some religions have moveable holidays, but there should not be a problem with using the add date.

Q: Would the committee consider putting out a list of the most common holidays, not a list of accepted holidays, but common holidays for informational purposes so faculty do not schedule exams on those days, etc.?

A: Okay.

Q: Would the committee consider clarifying what it means when it says SJSU shall provide accommodation, because my guess is that it won't be the university that is providing the accommodation, it will be the faculty member?

A: Okay.

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

**VII. Special Committee Reports –**

**Report on the Number of Exceptional Admissions to the University for the Preceding 12 months:**

AVP Sharon Willey, Administrative and Enrollment Services, and Director Deanna Gonzales, Undergraduate Admissions and Outreach, gave a report on the number of Exceptional Admissions to the University in accordance with university policy S87-10.



AVP Willey informed Senators that while this information is required to be reported to the Senate every Spring under S87-10, her office had not received a request to report this information to the Senate since she was appointed to Administrative and Enrollment Services, and Ms. Gonzales was appointed as Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Outreach. [Note: The Senate Administrator compiled a list of required reports to the Senate by university policy a few years ago and, in an attempt to assist the Chair of the Senate this year, contacted and scheduled them for various Senate meetings.]

AVP Willey announced that exceptional admissions for EOP and Athletics no longer fall under Administrative and Enrollment Services, and they do not have data on those areas.

This report pertains to California Education Code, Title V, Article 6, Section 40900 and 40901, which allows the campus to admit students that are not CSU-eligible as long as the number of exceptions does not exceed 4% of the previous year's incoming class total.

For Fall 2013, based on that 4%, we could have admitted 135 freshmen, and 124 transfer students that did not meet CSU eligibility this year. We actually admitted 46 freshmen and 51 transfer students. As a comparison, in Fall 2007 we admitted 358 freshmen, and 276 transfer students that did not meet CSU eligibility that year.

Director Gonzales explained the meaning of the codes. For instance for freshmen, if a student comes to Undergraduate Admissions and shows them that they are lacking in one of the A through G college preparatory classes they will look at their overall transcripts, their test scores, and their GPA and then they may or may not give them an exception. An example of a denial would include a student that is missing one or more semesters of Math or English. An example of an exception might include a student that has a high GPA and high test scores, but is missing a semester of a foreign language.

In 2007 we did not have impaction. We were in a position to accept all students, even those that missed deadlines. In 2008, the Chancellor's Office instituted impaction CSU-wide. All applicants had to then be CSU-eligible for admission. In 2010, Undergraduate Admissions began only evaluating those students that indicated their intent to enroll and they began withdrawing admissions. This was painful because it occurs in July and August.

In 2012, we had furloughs which meant fewer staff and less time to process applications. Undergraduate Admissions also had a technical issue in 2012. Admissions had converted to a new imaging system and there were problems with it.

The H3/T3 codes are for athletics for Freshmen/Transfer students. This includes students that may have exceptional athletics ability, and have been passed through by the Athletics Department. The CSU does allow those.

There is a code for the EOP Disadvantaged students. However, EOP is not under Undergraduate Admissions, but Undergraduate Admissions works closely with EOP on these exceptions. The Director of EOP approves these exceptions. Then there are codes for those with a special talent such as in music or dance.

The newest code is the Veterans code. Veterans are given exceptions in the four basic skills, or GPA.

There is no spring data for Freshmen, because admission is only done in the Fall. The information in the 21 page report is broken out by exception codes.

**Questions:**

Q: Are former students returning and disqualified students let in under special consideration waivers included in this data?

A: They could fall into this data prior to the former students returning petition. However, we don't have it captured here, but we could add a code for it.

Q: Just to clarify, it looks like there were three categories and now there are four with the new Veterans code. Is it correct that Undergraduate Admissions looks at H2/T2, EOP, and Veterans, but is not responsible for the decision on Athletics?

A: Undergraduate Admissions looks at the application and transcripts for Athletics, and then makes recommendations as to whether the person is admissible based on the needs of the Athletics program and depending on the needs of whatever team it is.

Q: So, you might recommend not admitting, but Athletics could still give an exception?

A: There have been times we have recommended not admitting and Athletics has used their tags.

Q: So, does Athletics has a certain number of tags that allow them to override your decision?

A: Yes, they do, and to clarify--EOP does their own admissions as well.

Q: Just to clarify, who can override Undergraduate Admissions decision not to admit, is it just Athletics, EOP, and Veterans?

A: Undergraduate Admissions doesn't deny Veterans admission, so there is no override really.

Q: It looks like in 2007 we admitted 65 EOP students and in 2013 we only admitted 12, is this correct?

A: There were less EOP students admitted under the exceptions code, but there could still be the same number of EOP students admitted overall. The others could have met CSU-eligibility.

**VIII. New Business – None**

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

**A. Associated Students (AS) –**

AS President Ayala reported that he and Senator Jeffrey just returned from the California State Student Association (CSSA) meeting this week. There were two items linked to the Board of Trustees agenda. One of the items that was on the agenda was the Student Success Excellence Technology Fee (SSETF). AS has been working with Administration and Finance in trying to make the process for this fee more transparent to students at SJSU.

Another information item was the proposed CSSA fee that would be charged to all students in the CSU. Our campus was once opposed to this fee, but AS is more in favor of it now. This will come as an action item for the Board of Trustees next time.

Today is the first day of elections for the AS Board of Directors. Students can vote on MySJSU. The goal is to get 50% of the student population to vote. Last year 10% of the student population voted, and the year before that only 3% voted.

AS is also still pursuing the idea of a student Senate to give more students the opportunity to get involved.

#### **B. CSU Statewide Senators-**

The last plenary for the year will be held in May.

Items of interest include:

A bill for the continuation of the Faculty Trustee.

The Chair of the CSU Statewide Senate spent the entirety of her Board of Trustees time addressing the problem of the Engineering degree—the watering down of the Engineering degree and the quality of the degree.

There is a legislative proposal on the community colleges offering BA degrees.

Another potential item is the changing awareness for Title 5 master's degrees. There is debate between courses organized primarily for Graduate Studies and standalone graduate programs. Organized primarily for Graduate Studies allows you to co-list two courses. For small programs in small universities, the master's degree requirement that 60% of courses be standalone graduate-level courses is problematic.

Other resolutions include: “Modalities of Teaching, Academic Freedom, and Video recording of classes.

There was an ASCSU resolution (AS-3157-13, Recommendation on the Eligibility of Lecturers for Emeritus Status) acknowledging the historic and current contributions of lecturers and encouraging campuses that do not include criteria for the consideration of lecturers in campus emeritus policies to do so.

#### **C. Provost – No report.**

#### **D. Vice President for Administration and Finance –**

AVP Josee Larochelle responded to the question how can the university justify spending lottery funds on library acquisitions. There is legislation that lottery funds are not supposed to supplant regular university operating funds. These lottery funds could be invested in faculty professional development as they have been in the past.

AVP Larochelle responded, “Both faculty development costs and library materials costs are eligible uses of lottery funds. They both support instruction. I believe the question really is directed at “supplant” vs. “supplemental” use that causes concern. While I understand your perspective, using lottery funds for library materials is a regular university operating cost. I would add that faculty development is also a regular university operating cost. Using lottery funds in either case could be considered an enhancement, since the programs would have been funded at a lower level in the absence of lottery funds. The approach used by SJSU which pledged lottery funds primarily to the acquisition of library materials, does not undermine the support for faculty development. To my knowledge, the division was never de-allocated operating funds because lottery funds became available. If you know otherwise, please share the details with me so I may better understand.”

### **Questions:**

Q: Earlier in the Senate meeting, the Dean of the Library, Dean Kifer, was asked when the \$1.9 million in base budget was taken away from the library. Dean Kifer told us that it the library received \$1.9 million in lottery funds at the same time that \$1.9 million was taken away from their operating fund. This was exactly an example of reducing the normal allocation and supplanting it with lottery funds. When the Senate recommended that lottery funds be allocated to the library, faculty decided to do without some professional development funds in order to improve our library budget. Now we learn that the amount of lottery money the Senate approved giving the library, \$1.9 million, was subtracted from the library’s operating fund. The Lottery Act specifically says that these funds shall not supplant existing funding. How is that not supplanting existing funding?

A: AVP Larochelle responded, “I speak from the university perspective, maybe that question should be directed to the Academic Affairs Division. I believe Provost Selter requested that the lottery funds be given to the library, and then he redirected funds from the library operating fund to other areas in Academic Affairs.”

Q: There used to be a Budget Advisory Committee composed of the members of the Executive Committee that made the decisions on the use of lottery funds. The majority of the money went to the faculty mentor program. That was about 60% of the funds, and the rest was allocated to a variety of other entities. Faculty Development got a good chunk of the money. When you say faculty development is part of the ongoing costs of the university that funding has mostly disappeared. You have spoken about bookkeeping and swapping funds, but this sounds like a way to make things sound right when the intent for those funds was clearly not how they are being used. Senator Peter has quoted the law many times. Provost Selter absorbed those funds, and the university began to use those funds however they wanted. This might be legal, but this is clearly not the legislative intent for the use of the lottery funds. It is also not the way the funds were handled in the past when the Senate leadership was involved in determining the use and distribution of these funds.

A: AVP Larochelle responded, “I concur that the funding decisions since my arrival have mostly been done at the cabinet level. I have been involved with only one Budget

Committee and that had to do with budget reduction, not in regards to budget allocation. This is the budget history that I know of SJSU. I don't know whether it is appropriate, or whether there is an ability to be more inclusive, or to bring back the Budget Advisory Committee in this current environment. I don't know how you can get those conversations going, but I would not be opposed to that."

Q: Our enrollment is about equal between SFSU and SJSU, but there is great disparity between the total amount of money allocated for student aid between campuses. The answer given at the last Senate meeting for this disparity was in such general terms that it did not answer the question. The answer given was that student needs are different at different campuses and the various aid programs are also different at different campuses.

A: AVP Larochelle responded, "I think that what you are saying is that you'd like to get a better understanding of our student population and their financial needs. If that is the case, then I can redirect the question to student financial aid."

Q: When funds were swept from self-support programs the consequences were unbelievably catastrophic. People that were excited about providing programs that could have helped us in our financial woes have stopped doing it. Is there any movement towards guaranteeing that this won't happen again?

A: AVP Larochelle replied, "The President has said a number of times that he would not do another sweep. I don't remember the exact words, but I think it was in the Fall address. I will take that back and find the written word that says this. I am not aware of any budget situation that would support a need for any fund balances to be taken. We are in a positive situation for 2014-2015."

A: Provost Feinstein replied, "Interestingly, because of the auditor's findings, we are actually having a problem spending the CERF funds that we have right now. Second, the President has said to me many times that there will be no sweep of CERF funds now or in the future, and I believe him."

Q: Can you elaborate on why we are having a problem spending CERF funds?

A: Provost Feinstein replied, "The state auditor's findings say really specifically that the way those funds are spent has to be tied back to the program for which they were created. I am working very closely with Administration and Finance, and one of the issues we are working on is how do we reimburse the operating fund for resources, such as payroll, when conducting self-support activity. There are some issues with how we are going to allocate these funds in the future. Also, our CERF funds are down about 10%. We went from first to third place in terms of CERF funds."

AVP Larochelle said, "The state auditor selects a variety of state entities to perform audits on. They picked the CSU, and three campuses, to perform a continuing education audit on. There is education code that states self-supporting operations need to support themselves, and the funds raised from the fees charged for continuing education programs must be used for those programs."

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

This past Saturday was "Admitted Spartan Day." There were about 10,000 visitors to the campus. There were about 4,000 students, and 6,000 family members.

The intent to enroll admissions deadline is May 1, 2014 at midnight. This is also the deadline to pay for orientation and signing up for housing.

**Questions:**

Q: When is the Spartan Bookstore going to open in its new facility, and what is the status of the new Student Health Center?

A: This will happen over the summer. Final inspections are being done now. The new Student Health and Counseling Center is slated to open next Winter. They are very close to being on schedule with this construction.

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

VP Dukes reported that in 2015 it is anticipated that the CSU will graduate its 3 millionth student from the system. There is planning underway in preparation for this event.

University Advancement is still in the planning phase of the next fundraising campaign. There is also a fundraising academy planned for this summer. University Advancement is trying to find a date when as many employees as possible can attend, so stay tuned.

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.