## 2014-2015 Academic Senate

## MINUTES
## April 6, 2015

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

**Ex Officio:**
Present: Van Selst, Sabalius, Heiden, Lessow-Hurley, Miller

**Administrative Representatives:**
Present: Feinstein, Terry
Absent: Bibb, Mendoza, Qayoumi

**Deans:**
Present: Kifer, Green, Steele, Stacks

**Students:**
Present: Blaylock, Hernandez, Romero, McPherson, Amante, Jeffrey

**Alumni Representative:**
Present:: Walters

**Emeritus Representative:**
Present: Buzanski

**General Unit Representatives:**
Present: Matoush
Absent: Fujimoto, Huang

**CASA Representatives:**
Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Lee
Absent: Grosvenor

**COB Representatives:**
Present: Sibley, 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 March 2, 2015 were approved as written (44-0-0).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

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

CSU Senate Chairs will be meeting April 16, 2015. Chair Heiden will have additional information after that meeting.

Questions:

Q: When will the Senate get to see the University Governance Report?
A: Chair Heiden is still waiting for input from everyone that needs to vote on it prior to it coming

to the Senate. Chair Heiden will try and get that vote at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Q: The President's review was completed on March 9, 2015. What can we expect from here on?
A: The deadline for feedback was March 9, 2015, but that isn't the full review. The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees must also complete a review. The review should go to the Board of Trustees in June 2015.

Q: Has there been any conversation in the cabinet or the Executive Committee about what is happening in Indiana? The President of San Francisco State University has said no state money will be spent on travel to Indiana. Are there any plans for us to take similar action?
A: They received a lot of backlash from their own constituents, and modifications were made to the legislation. However, the affected community was not happy with those modifications. Chair Heiden will follow-up.

**B. From the President of the University –** Not present.

## IV. Executive Committee Report –

### A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Executive Committee Minutes of February 16, 2015 – No Questions.
Executive Committee Minutes of February 23, 2015 – No Questions.
Executive Committee Minutes of March 9, 2015 – No Questions

### B. Consent Calendar –

The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved (44-0-0).
AVC Backer reported the results of the Senate General Elections for 2015-2016.

### C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Sabalius presented ***AS 1563, Policy Recommendation, Scheduling of Thanksgiving Holiday (First Reading).***

The Thanksgiving Vacation does not serve the faculty or students well. Other CSUs have the whole week off, and we only have Thanksgiving day and the day after off.

The Spartan Daily published an article a while back that talked about the difficulty students faced in trying to get last minute travel arrangements the evening before Thanksgiving, because classes are held on that day.

Senator Sabalius originally proposed developing a system that would give faculty and students the whole week off the week of Thanksgiving. There were some concerns in regards to where to take the time from. As a compromise, Senator Sabalius is bringing this resolution today that calls for just the day prior to Thanksgiving to be a non-instruction day.

There is low attendance by students in those classes that meet the Wednesday prior to Thanksgiving right now. However, a concern was raised by the Executive Committee that if the Wednesday before Thanksgiving is changed to a non-instruction day, the low attendance will

just shift to the Tuesday prior to Thanksgiving. However, if we had the whole week off one could argue the low attendance could shift to the Friday prior to Thanksgiving.

The Executive Committee discussed where the non-instructional day could be taken from and most likely it would come from the beginning of the semester. There was concern that the end of summer sessions would be too close to the beginning of the Fall semester. However, in all the scenarios Senator Sabalius has considered, there would be a minimum of one week between the end of the summer classes and the first instructional day of the Fall semester.

There will be a slight increase in workload. Right now the Wednesday classes after 5 p.m. are canceled, and they are not moved to another day. This change would add another day of instruction.

**Questions:**

Q: For those campuses that have the whole week off do they start earlier in the Fall?
A: Some are quarter campuses, and others go much closer to Christmas. We did not think this was a good idea since students also want to go home for Christmas and this scenario would result in the same problem at Christmas for students.

Q: Why is it easier to find time to take a week off in the Spring and not in the Fall? It is helpful to have this week for students to catch up in the Spring. How hard would it be to get a week off in Fall?
A: I don't think it is harder, it is the same amount of difficulty to have a week off in Fall or Spring.

## V. State of the University Announcements –

### A. Associated Students President –

AS President Miller announced that elections are underway. There are more candidates this year than in the past, and only one position will have to be appointed. AS extended the voting period to allow more students to vote from April 15th to April 23rd.

AS 55 Ceremony is on April 23, 2015. This is an awards ceremony honoring students that give back to the community through leadership.

AS passed a resolution regarding the Student Success Fee part of the SSETF fee asking for a decrease from $118 to $95. This resolution took into account student surveys, and student feedback.

CFAC will be the student body that makes future recommendations for the SSETF fees.

AS has been conducting its Executive Director Search and this Thursday they will decide who to invite to the campus for interviews.

The AS Budget will be approved this week.

AS has had an increase in rent from the move to the new Student Union.

AS will host its first annual Spartan Showcase on April 15, 2015, 5 p.m.

The CSSA will meet this weekend.

Last month AS President Miller and Senator Amante were lobbying for more funding for the CSU.

**Question:**
Q: Doesn't the Student Union belong to AS? If so, who are you paying rent to?
A: This is one of the things we are looking at.

**B. Vice President for University Advancement –** Not Present.

**C. CSU Statewide Academic Senators –**
There are four resolutions that were passed at the last CSU Statewide meeting:

A resolution on the CSU Budget asking legislators to support a higher CSU budget.

A resolution on legislative advocacy.

A resolution on accommodation for the CSU Legislative Conference.

A resolution asking faculty to avoid purchasing John Wiley products for the time being.

Other resolutions include a resolution on tenure density, a resolution on the CSU Statewide Senate Calendar for 2015-2016, a resolution on faculty development around assessment, and expectations for upper division GE.

Other discussions include the new Executive Order on GE, on Statway, and on the movement from a faculty-based to a management-based position supported by faculty.

**Questions:**
Q: What is the tenure-density the CSU is aiming for?
A: 75%
Q: Where is the CSU at right now?
A: 56% WTUs, but tenure/tenure-track personnel are outnumbered by lecturers.

**D. Provost –**
Provost Feinstein announced:

At the last Senate meeting we discussed the Chancellor's Office pending approval of supplemental criteria. This was approved.

Impaction criteria will be implemented Fall 2016.

You will be receiving an email in the next hour regarding equity. The university is allocating $800,000 for faculty, and $500,000 for staff equities. Two key components are being addressed; salary compression and salary inversion. The university is initially concentrating on tenure/tenure-track faculty. The university is not focusing on lecturers or coaches. The program provides a minimum salary for assistant professors of $65,000, $70,000 for associate professors, and $75,000 for full professors. This will impact about 36 faculty members. The university will also completely eliminate salary inversion in tenure/tenure-track faculty members. This means there will be no assistant professors making more than associate professors, and no associate professors making more than full professors. This will affect 45 faculty members on this campus. The university will also be addressing those faculty members that are making less than 10% of the mean salary in their department by rank. The last change will be that full Professors that have been in their position for 5 years will receive a 1% increase, 10 years will receive a 2% increase, and 15 years will getting a 3% increase. These improvements will be effective July 1, 2015, except for the increases for full professors with 10 and 15 years. The 2% or 3% increases for full professors will be effective July 1, 2016. This will impact over 250 faculty members.

**Questions:**
Q: By delaying some of the increases to July 1, 2016, does this mean they might possibly not happen if something comes up?
A: We are committed to these increases and this is a first step for us.

Q: The whole purpose of this being retroactive to July 2014 was to free up funds available in 2014. By pushing the effective date for the full professor increases to July 1, 2016, you are impacting the bargaining unit agreement.
A: It was the university's hope to have implemented everything on July 1, 2015, but the university does not have the funds to implement everything on July 1, 2015.

**E. Vice President for Administration and Finance – Not Present.**

**F. Vice President for Student Affairs –**
This Saturday is the Annual Admitted Spartan Day. Approximately 3,000 prospective students and 7,000 guests are expected on campus. The event is scheduled from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. and includes an opening session at the event center with visits to departments and programs throughout the morning.

About 3,724 undergraduates and 1,655 graduates have applied for graduation. This is an increase over last year. Also, the "Intent to Enroll" deadline for Fall 2015 is May 1, 2015. Prospective students can submit their "Intent to Enroll" form at the Admitted Spartan Day.

AS has worked with Student Affairs to get applicants for the CSU Student Trustee position. Eight students submitted applications. Student Affairs is pleased to announce that SJSU has six students that are eligible and in the running for the seat. SJSU has more students than any of the other campuses.

A spring Open Forum on Diversity will be held where the community can meet with the President's Commission on Diversity on April 28, 2015 from noon to 2 p.m. in the Student Union Theatre.

Please complete the Campus Climate Survey. The deadline is April 17, 2015 for students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

Faculty were encouraged to attend the Angela Davis lecture on Thursday, April 16, 2015.

**VI. Unfinished Business -**

Senator Sabalius presented ***AS 1563, 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).***

**The Senate voted and AS 1563 passed as written (39-0-5)**.

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

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

Senator Brada-Williams presented ***AS 1556, Policy Recommendation, Prerequisite for Writing Skills Test (WST), Amends S14-5 (Final Reading).***

Chair Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to change the 1st Resolved clause to read, "Resolved that the following replace the 4th bullet of the "Implementation of the General Education Guidelines" section (page 5) of *Guidelines For General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)* approved through S14-5 and put into effect Fall 2014: "Registration for the Writing Skills Test (WST) requires completion of an Area A2 course (e.g. , ENGL 1A with a C or better (C- not accepted)"; be it further.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to change the last line of the Rationale and Background to read, "This policy is meant to clarify WST prerequisites in the GE Guidelines."

**The Senate voted and AS 1556 was approved as amended (42-0-2)**.

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

Senator Bacich presented ***AS 1564, Senate Management Resolution, Change to the Membership and Charge of the Strategic Planning Board (SPB) and Strategic Planning Assessment Agency (SPAA) (First Reading).***

**Questions:**

Q: Was the Senate Chair or a representative on both the SPB and SPAA in the past?
A: Yes
Q: Maybe the committee could consider putting the Senate Chair back on the SPB and SPAA or explain why the chair is not on the committee?

A: This will be brought back to the committee for consideration.

Q: In Part I, number 2, you call for an Executive Committee Member, was this member supposed to be a faculty member?
A: Yes, the committee will revisit this item.

Q: Item number 6 states that in the absence of the Chair of the SPB, the Senate Chair will convene the SPB. However, the Senate Chair is not a member of the SPB, did the committee consider this?
A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Did the committee consider whether both boards are still necessary, or whether they could be merged into one committee?
A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Have you considered an ex officio seat on the SPB for the Senate Chair?
A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Why is the committee made up of an even number of people making decisions harder?
A: One person is non-voting, but the committee will consider this.

Q: Could you explain why you have reduced the number of faculty currently serving on the SPB from 5 to 2, also why was the Director of Institutional Planning removed from the membership?
A: The committee was actually trying to find a sufficient number of faculty members to serve on the SPB, but the committee will reconsider.

Q: What are the requirements for the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) from the CSU? I'm not sure we have enough faculty.
A: There is a communication from the Chancellor's Office, but I don't know the specifics. We will revisit this.

Q: Under item 5.b., it says the President will assign responsibility for the implementation of each goal, and one individual will be designated as the lead for each goal. Are these individuals people that are on the committee or at-large?
A: The intent was that the President has responsibility for the strategic planning process, so I imagine it would be a cabinet member.

Q: It says there will be reduction in workload, but if there is a reduction in the number of people on the committee and the work is the same, then how will there be a reduction in the workload?
A: This is a valid point. The committee will revisit this.

Q: CSU Executive Order 805 has no mention of the BAC in it. Please find the new Executive Order. Also, under the mission of the SPB, it says the board "plays an important role in balancing the style and priorities of the President with the values and voices of the SJSU

community." Would the committee consider different language here?
A: The committee will revisit these items.

Q: Whenever you decide if you are going to add the Senate Chair, can you then specify if you mean for one of the policy committee chairs from the Executive Committee to be the Executive Committee member on the board?
A: The committee will revisit this.

Q: Would the committee consider whether this should be a Senate Management Resolution, or a Policy Recommendation, since it modifies a policy?
A: The committee will consider this.

**C. Instruction Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**
Senator Frazier presented ***AS 1558, Amendment to S10-6, Academic Standards: Probation and Disqualification (Final Reading).***
**The Senate voted and AS 1558 passed as written unanimously (44-0-0)**.

**D. University Library Board (ULB) --** No report.

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

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1561, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Regular Faculty Employees, Rescinds S98-8 (First Reading).***

Senator Peter urged Senators to send him any questions, concerns, proposed changes, etc. for him to bring back to the PS Committee.

Senator Peter commented, "Devising a policy for SJSU is more complex and difficult than for other universities. We are an urban comprehensive university. Most faculty aren't aware of everything other faculty are doing. There are certain disciplines which earn grants and focus primarily on scholarship. There are other departments that teach almost exclusively lower division GE students. Then there are other departments that teach primarily graduate students and are deeply involved in mentoring students. We are neither a poly technical university nor a liberal arts college, but we have elements of both. The problem with a university that lacks a narrow focus is how to develop a policy that can nurture faculty that come from many areas. Secondly, almost all faculty have a heartfelt devotion to the pathway for professional development that they themselves have chosen. It is a life decision. It is sometimes difficult to see that what is right for one discipline may not be right for others. Finally, the policy we create is heavily regulated by the collective bargaining agreement. This makes it impossible for us to do whatever we please. Whatever policy we come up with must conform to the basic structure of what has been negotiated between the CSU and California Faculty Association (CFA).

The final challenge is that we have a history of failure. The last successful RTP reform was in 1998. In 2000 we began reforming it and after six years we produced a policy that passed the Senate unanimously, but was not signed into effect by the President. That failure to bring about a reform in 2006 shocked the Senate, and we did not start the process again until 2012. So now

we are in the 3rd year of round 2 trying to reform a 1998 policy.

I have read all the RTP policies going back to 1966 and in the early years research was not even mentioned, and under service there were items such as giving to the United Way. The nature of the job has changed over the decades. We have added a substantial research component, but something that has not changed has been the teaching load. By and large, unless you get a grant and buy yourself out of teaching you are still teaching as many if not more students. The teaching load is as high as it has ever been and the research expectations have skyrocketed since the 1960's. We have added and not subtracted from what we expect from faculty. Prior to 1998, the RTP policy was revised regularly, which used to be every three to four years. We have now gone 17 years without a substantial change. There were a number of reasons the RTP policy changed so frequently in the past including changes in the bargaining agreement, expectations changed, etc. This is the only 17 year stretch without a major reform we have ever had.

In 2012-2013, the PS Committee began this process again. The committee interviewed members of the university community, the Provost, a variety of faculty members, and conducted a campus-wide survey of the faculty. The committee examined the feedback, and then crafted a Flexible Achievement Plan that was brought to the Senate in December 2013. The Senate endorsed the plan and the PS Committee then began the task of rewriting the policy. If this policy passes in the Spring or the Fall, it would be implemented a year after the policy is passed. One year would be dedicated to informing the campus of the new policy and procedures. Then in 2016, all the procedural elements would begin as well as the criteria and standards by which faculty are evaluated would begin to be phased in. Currently, we are required to send a copy of the RTP policy to all faculty that are hired. The PS Committee feels most faculty will want to be evaluated under the new policy, but it would be unethical to force faculty to be evaluated under the new criteria and standards without a phase-in period.

The new policy establishes three categories and under the old policy there were only two. The first category in the old policy is academic assignment, and the second category is scholarship, creative activity and professional achievement. In the old policy, service gets subsumed under the other categories. The new policy adds service as its own area.

A more significant change is that candidates are required to be evaluated in each of the three categories. Each evaluator, which can include a committee, the dean, etc. needs to determine a level of achievement in each of the categories. Whether you are tenured or promoted will depend on achieving a baseline level of achievement in all three categories, and you must also achieve an overall level of achievement across all three categories. The policy establishes general levels of achievement within each category. However, departments and colleges may choose to develop more specific guidelines. The guidelines need to be approved by the faculty of each department. This was ambiguous under the old policy.

In December 2013, the PS Committee talked about five levels of achievement. The committee renamed one of them on the basis of advice given by the Senate. What the PS gained from discussions with the Provost (both previous and current) and the Senate, is that having a merely numerical number attached to each level is insufficient, so the committee went through each level of achievement and drafted textual descriptions. For example, let's take service. The

committee would look at a dossier and determine if the candidate had undertaken a fair share of workload to keep the department functioning well: such as activities like work on department committees; the creation, revision or assessment of department curricula; or participation in department planning, outreach, and advisement. These are the type of things we would expect all faculty to be involved in. If you are going to have a good rating in service—you must do this and more. In addition in the baseline described, the candidate has also participated in significant service activities beyond the department. This will usually include college-level service, university-level service, service to the community, and significant activities for professional organizations. Getting a rating of "Excellent" in service is harder yet, as the candidate would have to do more than even that listed above and this is included in the guidelines. Over time the committees will read the descriptors and begin to match profiles to what is good or excellent.

In general the PS Committee has attempted to create more clarity, and more organization in the policy than it had before. The PS committee also attempted to remove duplicate language that had crept up over time in amendments. In addition, the PS committee attempted to remove conflicts with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Collective Bargaining Agreement is now 17 years newer than the last time the policy was revised.

We currently have a 2, 4, 6 faculty performance review cycle where faculty receive more extensive reviews in years 2, 4 and 6. The PS Committee is proposing to change this to a 3rd year review. The PS Committee unanimously agreed that the 2nd year review is not very useful as it is currently put together. The 2nd year review begins at the beginning of the 2nd year, and the faculty member is judged on only one year of performance. The fourth year review, which is currently the most important review of all because it is the chance for faculty who need to change something in order to get tenure to do so, comes too late for some faculty. Especially for those faculty that may need to get more involved in research and raise grants to do so. The PS Committee feels the third year is the "sweet spot" for giving faculty data, but still allowing them enough time to make changes. Another advantage of a third year review is to help determine if a fourth or fifth year review is needed. This allows the outcome of the third year review to determine when the next review should occur. Under the contract, everyone gets reviewed every year with a shorter "annual summary of achievements." The policy also establishes the capability of using the outcome of the short one-year review to determine if a full performance review is necessary in the following fall.

The PS Committee will be returning Professor to the university level of review. In 1998, the promotion to Professor was removed from the university-level committee. The PS Committee feels this was a mistake. Professors usually are expected to undertake university governance and service activities and only a university-level committee is equipped to judge if this is the case. In 2006, this was a reform the Senate approved.

In the PS Committee review of faculty surveys, many faculty complained about the misuse of abstentions in votes. Some faculty have used their vote to abstain strategically. They abstain from voting and then insist on writing an opinion that justifies their vote giving a very negative opinion. The PS Committee feels an abstention vote should only occur if the faculty member has a conflict of interest or is not informed on the voting issue. Under the new policy, faculty that abstain must absent themselves from the discussion and will not be allowed to participate in

the writing of a decision.

Finally, dossiers shall be put in an electronic format. Electronic dossiers will be phased in by the time the phase-in portions of this policy are completed.

When you get to a college-level committee dossiers must be reviewed in a locked room. This is very difficult for faculty. The PS Committee believes electronic dossiers will allow faculty on committees to do a more thorough review than is currently possible. Also, the dossiers should be prefaced with a narrative statement and give guidance on what the candidate should say. As we move to an electronic format, faculty may use hyperlinks. One reason for the narrative statement is that it gives faculty an opportunity to show the synergy between their teaching and their research.

The PS Committee has not determined the timeline for next steps. They are waiting for input. The committee has received some input from the Provost. The scope of the revision and how many revisions need to be made will determine whether it comes back in the spring or the fall to the Senate, but the committee does want a year to prepare the campus.

**Questions:**

Q: Line 1025 states probationary credit may not be awarded for achievements received before award of the candidate's permanent degree, why is this in there?
A: My understanding is that it is part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, but the PS Committee will research this to be sure.
A: If it has to do with what was announced as a requirement for the position, for example if a Ph.D. was announced as a requirement of the position, then work done before the granting of the Ph.D. could not be used.

Q: Please consider modifying the language (lines 200-202). Don't limit this to just when it enhances student success. There are other legitimate reasons to integrate teaching-research-service.
A: The PS Committee will consider it.

Q: The reason I was against this policy back when Senator Bros brought it years ago is because of what you have put in on line 1450. You are not going to evaluate everyone for tenure as it reads in 7.4.4. It says the committee may choose to review based on its workload and judgment. I was on a university committee in the early 1990's and the workload was heavy then, but even so you still need to make sure the candidate has the same ethics as all the departments and college have. There was a situation we ran into where one department and college said this person is great, but it turned out he was a great researcher but was abusive to his students. If all we had done was look at the evaluation by the one department, we would have never known this person should never receive promotion and tenure. There needs to be a way to evaluate everyone for tenure. I hope we can think our way through to evaluate everyone for retention and tenure and make sure no one slips through that does not have the same ethics we have.
A: The PS Committee has received the same feedback from some committee members as well as the Provost, so the committee will be thinking very seriously about what we can do.

Q: Would you consider retaining the teacher-scholar model for the university revising the

proposal to define baseline achievement in such a way that a candidate achieving baseline in all three areas earns tenure? In the interest of fairness and clarity for all candidates, would you consider modifying the proposal to prohibit or at least discourage departmental guidelines in those cases except for librarians and others that have special assignments?

A: With regard to guidelines, the guidelines have been very controversial since 1998. We will never get a unanimous decision with regard to all for or all against guidelines. The concern that some faculty have is that if individual departments devise their own guidelines, one department may edit their guidelines to be substantially easier in some category, or substantially harder in some category and this may create a disparity between people doing similar kinds of research. This is a concern. The PS Committee will discuss this further at the next meeting. The PS Committee may consider having the college curriculum committee approve the guidelines in the policy.

With regard to the teacher-scholar model, it assumes if you do the baseline in both the teacher and scholar area you should get tenure. However, just achieving baseline in all areas may not be someone we want to tenure. We are looking for someone that has more to offer than just basic competence. With regard to the three criteria, please read the verbal descriptors. One problem constituents in the College of Science expressed to the PS Committee is that these guidelines would permit someone that excelled in service, but was poor in teaching and/or scholarship, to earn tenure. If you read the verbal descriptors you will see this is not true.

Q: On line 309, section 2.3.1.4, it says that "external reviewers should not have personal or professional relationships with the candidate that could compromise their objectivity." Can you define where this concern came from?
A: This came from Faculty Affairs and one example is that they had people asking their dissertation advisers to write special letters, but there were also cases of spouses and others that clearly had personal relationships that clearly had a conflict of interest. The PS Committee will revisit this and be more specific about it.

Q: In section 2.3.3, it appears the requirement in the artistic area also seems to require traditional research. The end of that statement concludes that, "… and the mastery of a skill in addition to research."
A: That was certainly not intended. The PS Committee will revisit this.

Q: Can you summarize the objection by your own committee member to this resolution?
A: The concern was that certain areas do not go far enough where other areas go too far.

Q: Would the committee consider having everyone go through the 3rd and 6th year reviews? Also on the optional reviews, who can flag after the annual reviews?
A: The contract says you must have a full performance review before someone can be terminated or promoted, but does not say how many reviews or in what order the reviews happen. That is set by policy. However, the contract does require these annual reviews every year.

Q: In section 6.2.6.4. it says appointment letters "shall may" can you clarify which way this is going?

A: This is a typographical error, the committee settled on "may," but the minutes will be checked to verify this.

Q: Would the committee consider having all candidates have an independent review either in the third year review when all dossiers are reviewed by an independent committee, or by a separate committee?
A: Your suggestion is then to have two university committees.

Q: Can you explain why librarians and counselor who aren't professors are considered tenured?
A: Part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in 1992 I believe, included librarians and counselors as part of unit 3 faculty. For the first six years after librarians became considered faculty, they had their own RTP policy, but later they were included in the overall RTP policy.

Q: Would the committee consider limiting e-dossiers? The moment after you allow e-dossiers, the candidate can put link-after-link in their dossier and this could make the workload impossible for any committee to review.
A: Yes

**VIII. Special Committee Reports –**

**A. Petitions to the Senate Regarding LOFT by Bruce Reynolds:**

"Over the past several months, many faculty have been concerned about the future of our library and specifically the rescinding of library policy. Our ad hoc faculty/student group, Save Our University Library (SOUL) has been circulating a petition urging the Senate in its consideration of a revised policy, not to open the door to a radical and expensive Library of the Future (LOFT) plan which is described in the vision statement on the library website.

SOUL is not opposed to routine weeding of the collection, and LOFT is certainly not asserting the library should only be about print books. However, SOUL is opposed to print books becoming an afterthought, which seems to be the case if the vision statement's plan to remove the stacks from the 1st three floors of the library and create a kind of book ghetto in the basement were implemented. For such a radical remake of the library to occur, the print journals that are currently in the basement would have to go and compact shelving notwithstanding, it would be impossible to cram 3 floors worth of books into the basement unless tens of thousands of books were thrown out. This plan was devised, as far as I can determine, without input from faculty or students, and the LOFT plan would be unknown if it were not for the vision statement on the library website. I fear unless the Senate takes a stand against this radical thing, the library may become unrecognizable as a university library. The faculty petition opposing LOFT has been signed by 167 faculty plus 17 staff members. A student petition initiated by History students has gained 572 signatures. An online petition at change.org has obtained 188 signatures and many of the signers there have posted comments as to why they are opposed. Copies of the petitions and the originals have been turned over to the Senate Chair and the AS President has the original of the student petition.

In the presentation to the Senate last month, the Chair of the University Library Board (ULB) made a great deal of the declining circulation of print books. There is little doubt

that this in part reflects the fact that we are buying very few new print books, it also reflects, no doubt, the reluctance of the current generation of students to read much of anything, but I don't think we should cater to this proclivity of current students. Also, the evidence suggests if students are going to read something they prefer to read print books and moreover there are more and more studies that show learning is more effective from print books than e-books. It is true, of course, that many books in our library are seldom checked out, but it doesn't mean just because they are seldom checked out that they are not potentially valuable for particular research needs. Browsing the stacks is still one of the very best ways to discover sources that might otherwise elude a researcher and also it is a good way to quickly assess what is available on a particular subject.

We have no shortage of space in the MLK Library, which was promised to provide adequate space for 30 years of collection expansion, and now not only is the print collection not expanding as it should be, it is proposed to decimate it and make it less accessible. I would particularly appeal to those of you that represent disciplines that do not rely heavily on books, not to ignore the needs of those of us from Humanities and Social Sciences and our students who do. We do not wish to take away laboratories from the scientists and engineers, or the online journals that many disciplines rely heavily on, so please don't facilitate this attack on our laboratory. The print book collection which has been gathered over many decades preserves our history and culture for current and future generations. We in SOUL ask you to oppose any revision of library policy that would open the door to the radical LOFT plan, which we believe would do irreparable damage to our library print collection. Moreover, we urge you to take a positive stand in opposition to it. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today.

**Questions:**

Dean Kifer responded, "If you look at the vision strategy statement that Dr. Reynolds makes reference to, and read it carefully, you will see that there is not a plan for removing all of the books from the 6th, 7th, and 8th floors and withdrawing some of them and putting the remaining books in the lower level. There are a lot of different issues that Dr. Reynolds mentioned, and I don't want to get into a debate of any kind, but that is in particular a very important point. That is not a part of the plan the library has had. Another point I'd like to make is that the document Dr. Reynolds makes reference to is not a static document, it is a living document that the university owns and that can be looked at during any point in time in the future. I just urge that we not confuse the LOFT initiative, which is a CSU-wide issue with revision to the library policy that deals specifically with the SJSU library."

Q: Is this simply an opposing position to the LOFT plan, or is there an alternative compromise?
A: Dr. Reynolds responded, "Of course there can always be compromise and I'm pleased to hear Dean Kifer's comments, but I wish that everyone would read the statement for themselves. I believe you will find that the ultimate goal is to do what I have suggested."

**B. Report on Recruitment, Retention and Hiring of Faculty in various Demographic Groups by the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Senator Elna Green.**

This is the annual report to the Senate on the recruitment and retention of faculty and our attempts to diversity the faculty.

The number one reason we get turned down for recruitment at SJSU is due to the cost of housing. Our salaries are competitive until you look at the cost of living. This is the biggest hurdle we face. The second reason we hear from faculty candidates that turn down offers has to do with the facilities. An additional challenge is that Faculty Affairs must abide by the rules of Proposition 209 in recruiting faculty.

The Provost Office has provided Faculty Affairs with funding that has allowed them to do central advertising so departments can concentrates on the disciplines. This year Faculty Affairs spent about $25,000 on advertising.

The following data includes librarians and counselors. When it says AA searches that is Academic Affairs.

This year we are recruiting 66 faculty positions. We have hired 32 Tenure-Track faculty, and 0 tenure faculty thus far this year.

In 2013/2014, we had 39 searches with 26 Tenure-Track, and 5 Tenure faculty hires for a total of 31 tenure/tenure-track hires.

However, our losses for 2014/2015 include 2 Assistant, 5 Associate, and 4 full Professors for a total of 11 faculty losses.

In 2013/2014 we lost 3 Assistant, 4 Associate, and 3 Full Professors for a total of 10 losses. This data does not include retirements, and/or terminations.

Our total gain of tenure/tenure track faculty for 2014/2015 is still to be determined, but our losses equal 11 tenure/tenure-track faculty. In 2013/2014 we had a total gain of 31 tenure/tenure-track faculty, but we lost 10 faculty members. In 2012/2013 we had a total gain of 30 tenure/tenure-track faculty members with 10 tenure/tenure-track faculty losses. In 2011/2012 we had 40 tenure/tenure-track faculty hires, and 6 tenure/tenure-track faculty losses.

**Questions:**
Q: Do you have exit interviews to determine why faculty leave?
A: Everyone has the opportunity to have an exit interview, but most faculty do not. However, we know many times that faculty are going to other jobs.

Q: Is this an issue throughout the CSU, or is this just an SJSU issue?
A: It is a CSU statewide issue.

Up until recently, Faculty Affairs was using data from the IEA website, but they have recently learned that the data on the IEA website is specific to what the CSU asks for and includes the number of people teaching in a given semester, but it leaves out librarians/counselors, leaves of absence, and 1.0 chairs. This makes it incomplete for our purposes. For instance, this data left out 85 people for Fall 2014. Faculty Affairs is now running their own reports.

For Fall 2014, we hired 628 Tenure line faculty. Of the 628, about 362 were White, 54 Other, 37 Hispanic, 18 Black, 152 Asian, and 5 American Indian.

**Questions:**
Q: With the losses, it appears we need to hire more than 40 faculty a year with retirements.
A: Yes, we need to hire about 45 tenure/tenure-track faculty per year.

Q: Can you tell me how the 66 hires were budgeted?
A: I'd be happy to have the Provost answer that. Provost Feinstein responded, "If you remember last year, we received additional resources of about $9 million that was untethered to FTES. These funds were allocated to the colleges. We won't see that kind of increase this year. Our FTES only increased by .7% this year. What you will find with the colleges is that while we are aggressively trying to hire 66 faculty members, the chance is slim we will hire that many faculty. The money is sitting in the colleges and being used to hire part time faculty to teach the classes that need to be taught. Other strategies we are considering include base funding with non-resident students. As we grow non-resident students those resources are considered base funding. We can utilize those funds to hire additional faculty members, but as many of you know we grew by 30% last year and that is not a sustainable model for growing resources at the university. We are also getting pushback that somehow we are removing opportunities for CA resident students by having more non-resident students. This is not true, but is perceived this way by many."

Compared to our sister campuses, we have more Asians, less Hispanics, and slightly less Whites.

Looking at all tenure and tenure-track faculty for 2013/2014, we had 50.8% male, 49.2% female, 44.3% White female, 57.6% White male, 41.1% minority female, 33.8% minority male, 8.6% unknown male, and 14.6% unknown female.

A lot of work is done to recruit a diverse faculty, but then we lose the faculty over time.

**Questions:**

Q: Seven years ago when I was hired, there was a program to help new faculty get loans to buy homes, can we do something like this again?
A: The redevelopment funds are now gone. This was what funded the program.

Q: How do we compare to the other CSU campuses as far as retention?
A: The CSU does not report that data.
A: This was talked about in the Senate Chairs' meeting, but there are campuses that struggle as much as we do and they tend to be the urban campuses.
A: At the Business Deans' meeting this came up and we all have the same problem.

Q: I wonder if there aren't other factors that are affecting hiring and retention like lesser workloads and better facilities for working and parking, and professional development opportunities. If we don't know why someone is leaving then we can't fix the problem.
A: The most common reason given to Faculty Affairs is higher salaries.

**IX. New Business –**

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.