

2014-2015 Academic Senate

MINUTES
March 2, 2015

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Van Selst, Sabalius, Heiden, Lessow-Hurley
Absent: Miller

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Feinstein, Terry, Qayoumi
Absent: Bibb, Mendoza

Deans:

Present: Kifer, Green, Steele, Stacks

Students:

Present: Blaylock, Hernandez, Romero, McPherson
Absent: Amante, Jeffrey

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Walters

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Fujimoto, Huang

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett,
Grosvenor, Lee

COB Representatives:

Present: Sibley
Absent: Campsey

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Kimbarow, Mathur

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Fatoohi, Sullivan-Green

H&A Representatives:

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

SCI Representatives:

Present: White, Muller, Kress

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Rudy, Coopman, Ng, Feist

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of February 9, 2015 were approved as amended (39-0-4).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Announcements from the Chair:

The Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility, the CFA, and Faculty Affairs are co-sponsoring an Academic Freedom Forum on April 9, 2015, from 11:30 a.m. – 1 p.m. in Engr. 285/287.

There is a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document on questions about the Library, and also on the assigned time for exceptional service and the process being developed. Senators should watch for them to be posted.

B. From the President of the University –

President Qayoumi made the following announcements:

The CSU is working on how the Pell Grants could be preserved and will be bringing this to our legislators.

Under the Higher Education Act, SJSU would be limited to one designation such as being a minority-serving campus. This could really hurt us.

The Provost is working on the Equity issue and hopefully will have something to share in the next few weeks.

Questions:

Q: The Spartan Daily reported that SJSU was being sued for \$560 million for the death of a student from 2008. If that party should win that is two years worth of our budget. What would happen?

A: Every campus pays into the insurance for litigation purposes.

Q: At the last Senate meeting, it was requested that Earthquake signs be posted telling us what to do in the event of an earthquake, but no signs have been posted. Do you know anything else about that?

A: The President will be happy to check into it and report back.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Executive Committee Minutes of January 26, 2015 –

Q: Were the two vacant seats on the Deputy Provost Search Committee filled?

A: Yes, they were.

Executive Committee Minutes of February 2, 2015 – No Questions.

B. Consent Calendar – None

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

V. State of the University Announcements –

A. Vice President for University Advancement – N/A

B. CSU Statewide Academic Senators –

One of CSU Statewide Senators from Northridge needed a bone marrow transplant, but no match has been found. He is currently out of the hospital. At the CSU Statewide Senate, they wanted to donate leave to him, but were told you cannot donate beyond your own campus by

Faculty Affairs. They are working on changing this so in the future you can donate beyond your campus to another campus.

The Ethnic Studies Task Force will meet again in March 2015. They are gathering broad input.

The Faculty Affairs Committee is working on a resolution that calls for the increase of tenure density in the CSU.

Senator Sabalius was re-elected as a CSU Statewide Senator for a term ending 2018, and Senator Ng will take Senator Lessow-Hurley's seat (Senator Lessow-Hurley is retiring) with a term ending 2017.

C. Provost – No report.

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

E. Vice President for Student Affairs – No report.

F. Associated Students President –

Senator Blaylock reported for AS President Miller who was not present at the meeting. Senators Miller and Jeffrey are in Sacramento lobbying legislators for more funding on behalf of the CSU.

The Student Success Fee Survey has closed. Approximately, 1,400 students responded to the survey.

Voting in AS elections will begin on April 2, 2015 and continue for one week.

VI. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Frazier presented *AS 1552, Policy Recommendation, Leaves of Absence for Students (Final Reading)*.

Senator Brada-Williams presented an amendment to change the last sentence of Section V, that currently reads, "Under no circumstances shall retroactive leaves of absence be granted after two years" to read, "Only under very rare circumstances shall retroactive leaves of absence be granted after two years." Senator Frazier presented an amendment to the Brada-Williams amendment to strike the last sentence. The Frazier amendment was not friendly and was withdrawn. Senator Peter made a motion to move the question. The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed (36-4-3). The Senate voted and the Brada-Williams amendment passed (33-7-3). Senator Buzanski called the question. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed (29-7-7). **The Senate voted and AS 1552 passed as amended (43-0-0).**

Senator Frazier presented *AS 1558, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to S10-6, Academic Standards, Probation, and Disqualification (First Reading)*.

This policy proposal is an amendment to S10-6 because by the time S10-6 passed, there was an amendment from the floor that did not follow the current practice of how students are assessed for probation and disqualification status. The policy (Section B.1.) should read, "Students on academic probation are subject to academic disqualification if their corresponding Fall or Spring SJSU term GPA falls below 2.0. Freshmen on Academic Probation are allowed a second consecutive semester of probation if their SJSU Cum GPA is in the range 1.50 to 1.99." A complete revision of S10-6 is still being worked on, in the meantime the I&SA Committee would like to pass this amendment.

B. University Library Board (ULB) --

Chair Eggers presented presented *AS 1557, Policy Recommendation, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy (First Reading)*.

University Policy S03-5 has not had a comprehensive review since its implementation in 2003. In Spring 2014, the ULB began working on revisions to the Library Policy which has resulted in AS 1557.

Questions:

Q: Given that the top concern expressed by the focus groups was a continued need for print books, and given the context of prior reports such as the Spring 2013 Vision Statement which proposed deselection as a means to clear away print books and clear space for other uses, could this policy be reworked to include protection for print books?

A: The ULB will consider this. However, circulation of the print collection has dropped drastically. The number of books circulated this last year is 15% of what it was 10 years ago.

Q: Sections 7.2.2.1, 7.2.2.2, and 7.2.2.3 move away from allowing many departments to vet books for withdrawal to a single department unlike the previous policy. Why is that?

A: This is a little bit of a misinterpretation. Section 7.2.2.1 says the department will help determine the criteria, but 7.2.2.2 allows all departments to weigh in, and then it comes back to a single department in 7.2.2.3 with the information from the other departments. The ULB will clarify these paragraphs.

Q: In the confidentiality section, a suggestion was made to quote the act rather than trying to cover everything.

A The ULB will consider this.

Q: Many of us still use the print books, and there has been a lot of research lately that the information obtained using electronic books is inferior, why isn't this being considered?

A: The library will honor requests from the departments about which books to remove, and if the department doesn't want any books removed they won't be. Hopefully, if a book has mold and is affecting books around it the department would allow removal. Every department will

have the opportunity to set the criteria if the policy is approved.

Q: Once a book is selected for removal, does that mean that it isn't available in any form in the future?

A: This is in the new FAQ sheet on the ULB website. When a book is deselected, it is first offered to the faculty and then to students.

Q: What is the purpose of the Circulation section and what separates the new Circulation section from the old Circulation section? Section 4.3 and 4.4 have all been struck out.

A: The original policy incorporated some of what is in the library's everyday circulation policy. In redrafting this policy we wanted to streamline it, and we did not want to duplicate what was already in the circulation policy we use every day.

Q: SJSU is a university, and each university has a library, and the dictionary says libraries hold books, books that were once needed. What right does the ULB think it has to remove books from the library?

A: Deselection is a practice in all libraries across the country. The idea is to keep the collection more healthy, and makes browsing more effective.

Q: If we are looking at circulation figures to drive this policy, shouldn't we be looking at the fact that we have a significant number of patrons from the public using our library, and how are we tracking the use of books in the library without checkout? Statistics of book use by SJSU users derive from a single tracking method, the SJSU King Library Card. This omits three significant uses of hard copy books. Circulation figures have dropped in inverse correspondence to the steady increase of library study rooms and student success stations, and in house use of books, i.e. pre-circulation, is not tracked. It also omits the increased use by non-SJSU card holders; the public library does not require residency and it is believed that public and community college students use SJSU resources as budget cuts erode their resources. Finally, shared circulation services such as LINK+ and interlibrary loan agreements see greater net exports of SJSU hardcopy books than are requested by SJSU users. Books used for these purposes are not part of the ULB statistics nor are they available for check out by SJSU users. What is being done to address this non-circulating use of hardcopy books?

A: Before the MLK Library opened our circulation was 200,000 to 250,000 print books a year. After the new library opened, the circulation started dropping and last year it was only 31,000. On the public side, the total number of print books checked out is also declining. The combined circulation in 2013-2014 is 1/3rd of what it was before the new library opened. The library is also considering setting it up where books used in the library without checkout could be swiped so the library can see what is being used in-house.

Q: Would the committee consider adding Emeritus Faculty to section 4.4?

A: Absolutely, the ULB must have overlooked that.

Q: Doesn't removing circulation from this policy mean removing the Senate from any decisions regarding circulation in the future?

A: Under the current policy in 2.7.2. it states the Dean of the Library should not be prohibited from constructing internal library policies consistent with university policy.

Q: Yes, but if circulation policy is removed from this policy, we won't have a university policy

regarding circulation.

A: I understand your point and the ULB will consider this.

Q: There is the issue of not having every circulation procedure written into the policy, but the circulation philosophy should be there. Perhaps what the committee could incorporate is the intent of the circulation policy.

A: The ULB will revisit section 4.

Q: My understanding is that students are using books in the library, and this may be impacting the number of print books showing as being checked out, also how does this will affect deselection? Is there a limit to the number of books that can be deselected per year?

A: There is no limit to the number of books that can be deselected. However, we plan on showing the criteria that was used to make the list in the first place, and also the green flap file which shows how many versions of this book exist elsewhere, etc., etc. ULB will discuss this further.

Q: Section 4.5 restricts professors from being able to assign how long a student can check a book out on reserve. Why was this taken away from professors?

A: The instructor determines how long you can have reserve access.

Q: Section 4.5 says the length of time a booked can be checked out and what the fine will be is to be determined by the dean of the library.

A: The ULB will revisit this, the instructor should determine the checkout period.

Q: Has the library considered storing books offsite?

A: The ULB considered this and compact shelving. There are a number of things that we can do. We have compact shelving in the lower levels of the MLK Library, so we can put some books there. The other option we have is sharing books with other CSU campuses in a centralized storage facility where books could be checked out from.

Q: Could the decline in circulation of print books be related to decisions by the library not to buy print books, also what does this do to our agreement to share books with the public of San José. I believe only print books are shared with the public, not our e-books. Does this endanger our joint agreement?

A: No, this does not endanger our joint agreement. The decline may partially reflect that we have not being buying as many new books.

Q: Can you chart that?

A: I do not have those numbers. Purchase of print materials has declined slightly, but the use of electronic materials has grown substantially.

Q: Would the committee consider leaving in the language in the original policy regarding the budget priority for security?

A: Yes.

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

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

Senator Brada-Williams presented *AS 1556, Policy Recommendation, Prerequisite for Writing Skills Test (WST)*.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to replace the Resolved clause as follows: “Resolved, Registration for the Writing Skills Test (WST) requires completion of the Critical Thinking Course Area A3 with a C or better (C- not accepted). Students with A3 waivers and transfer students arriving with approved lower division GE packages are exempt from this requirement so will continue to be strongly encouraged to take an A3 course.”

Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was friendly to the Frazier amendment to make it two Resolved clauses rather than one.

Senator Peter presented a motion to refer the Frazier amendment and AS 1556 back to the C&R Committee. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed (42-1-0).**

Senator Brada-Williams presented *AS 1559, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing Concern Regarding the Implementation of California Senate Bill 850 (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented a friendly amendment to change the last Resolved clause, first sentence to read, “That careful review be given to the accreditation and assessment...”.

Senator Frazier presented a friendly amendment to change the last sentence in the “Background” to read, “ending by 2022 unless extended.”

Senator Kimbarow presented an amendment to the last sentence of the 5th Whereas clause, 4th sentence to read, “have appropriate regional accreditation and oversight; and...”. The Senate voted and the Kimbarow amendment failed.

Senator Peter presented an amendment to add a Resolved clause to read, “Resolved, that copies of this resolution be distributed comprehensively.

Senator Lessow-Hurley presented a friendly amendment to change the word “expresses” to “express” in the first line of the first Resolved clause.

Senator Brada-Williams presented an amendment to strike the fifth Whereas clause. The Senate voted and the Brada-Williams amendment passed (43-0-0).

Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change the last line of the 2nd Whereas clause to read, “campus alone; and that the CSU has found substantive overlap for 14 of the 15 proposed programs.”

The Senate voted on AS 1559 as amended and it passed (43-0-0).

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

VIII. Special Committee Reports –

A. Project Succeed SJSU Title III Strengthening Institutions Grant Presentation by AVC and Senator Pat Backer and AVP of Student Academic Success Services, Maureen Scharberg, Time Certain: 3:00 p.m.

Senator Backer announced that Project Succeed is a newly funded Department of Education Grant for \$2.2 million. This is based on our retention and graduation plans at SJSU. Project Succeed is built on these plans to try and implement one well established research fund based on best practices in first-year retention that will lead to second, third, and fourth year retention and graduation.

AVP Scharberg is the principal investigator and Senator Backer is the project coordinator and day-to-day manager. Other team members include; Dr. Alaniz, Dr. Maureen Smith, Stephanie Hubbard, and Cynthia Kato. There are four initiatives to this program. They include Block Scheduling, First-Year Experience (FYE), Student Learning Communities, and Faculty Mentor Program.

Dr. Alaniz announced that what they are planning for block scheduling primarily includes the colleges of Business and Engineering. The focus is on the Fall 2015 semester. Approximately 975 frosh, which is 1/3rd of the incoming class, will be block scheduled. What this means is that they will attend their classes together. There may or may not be additional students in these classes.

Dr. Smith announced that her goal is to adapt the Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) in area E to align with a FYE focus. The intention is to develop a broad set of guidelines that can then be modified to specific needs in area E courses. An FYE Advisory Board will also be established. Workshops will be held every year for area E teachers. Dr. Smith will also be to connect the area E courses with faculty mentors so they are talking to each other about at risk students, and at the same time connect with student life services so peer mentors are working with faculty mentors.

Stephanie Hubbard announced she will be partnering with Deanna Peck. The target population is FYE students. There will be one peer mentor to 25 students. The peer mentor will have interactions with students through the course and through several different workshops, e.g. social, financial, academic advising, and one-on-one interaction. The other thing that Ms. Hubbard would like to do is to have off campus students have more of a connection to being on campus. There will be 10 peer mentors this first year—2015-2016. Six will be connected with the living-learning communities for Business and Engineering, and four will be a mix of on and off campus students. The program is hoping to have 30 to 40 peer mentors for the future years of the grant.

Dr. Alaniz announced that they are trying to bring back the successful faculty mentor program SJSU used to have. The major predictor of success, in terms of mentoring, is quality and that is defined as the student feeling the faculty member really cares about the student in terms of

wanting to know about their life, their family, etc. Faculty mentors will be assigned three to five students and are asked to meet with them often during the semester. The first year there will be 30 faculty mentors. Faculty mentors will get a small stipend. By the fifth year, the plan is to have 50 mentors, and a faculty mentor for each incoming student.

There is an Advisory Board for the entire project as well and they are recruiting faculty for it. Please email Senator Backer if you are interested.

B. Report on the Recruitment, Retention, and Hiring of Faculty in Various Demographic Groups by the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Elna Green, Time Certain: 3:15 p.m.

AVP Green delayed her presentation until the next meeting.

IX. New Business –

Senator Sabalius presented a resolution from the floor, *Sense of the Senate Resolution, In Support of AS-3197-14, The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom (Final Reading)*.

Senator Kimbarow presented an amendment that was friendly to change the first line of the 4thWhereas clause to read, “Whereas, the 21st century has brought potential challenges to Academic Freedom due to new modes of content...”.

Senator Van Selst made a motion to return the resolution to the committee as amended to allow time for the Senate to review the AAUP Statement. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion passed (17-16-11).**

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.