

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 8, 2016

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius, Amante,
Van Selst, Lee, Heiden

CASA Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett, Sen, Grosvenor

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Martin, Blaylock, Feinstein,
Larochelle, Lanning

COB Representatives:

Present: Virick, Campsey, Sibley

Deans:

Present: Green, Jacobs, Stacks
Absent: Hsu

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Mathur, Laker

Students:

Present: El-Miaari, Sarras, Medrano,
Gay
Absent: Romero, Cuellar

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green, Hamed-Hagh

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Bacich, Grindstaff, Khan, Riley

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

SCI Representatives:

Present: Clements, White, Beyersdorf
Absent: Kaufman

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Curry, Wilson
Absent: Coopman

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Medina
Absent: Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of November 30, 2015 were approved as written (46-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Our new President, Dr. Mary Papazian, will start on July 1, 2016. President Papazian will be on campus for a visit on February 22nd and February 23rd. There will be a campus-wide reception as part of her visit on February 22, 2016 from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. in the Student Union Ballroom.

The Senate Retreat is this Friday, February 12, 2016 from 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Please complete the evite if you have not already done so.

The Tower Foundation will hold their first ever SJSU Gala on March 19, 2016.

There is a bit of a crisis with staffing the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR). We now have vacancies on the committee in CASA, BUS, H&A, and COS. Members must be elected by their college and must be tenured full professors. The term is four years. Although the workload is minimal, this is an extremely important committee. Please contact your Dean's Office if you are interested in serving on the BAFPR.

Academic Senate Elections are now underway and nominating petitions are due in the Senate Office no later than February 22, 2016. Past Chair Heiden asked if the materials could be sent again as she did not receive them. [Note: All election materials were emailed a second time to all Chairs, Deans, and the General Unit members by Eva Joice, Senate Administrator, on February 10, 2016.]

Chair Kimbarow and the Senate thanked Senator Campsey for his years of service as the FAR.

Chair Kimbarow welcomed our newest Senator, Senator Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh from the College of Engineering.

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Martin welcomed Senators back from the Winter Break.

Interim President Martin announced that while she appreciated everyone's support and encouragement in asking her to apply for the permanent presidency, she could not commit to five or more years and did not feel that would be fair to the campus.

In the first six months of this year, University Advancement has raised over \$32 million.

SJSU Football won the Citrus Bowl game.

The NFL did use our playing fields and they thought our fields were inferior so they put in brand new fields for free that cost them nearly \$300,000.

SJSU is hiring a new football defensive coordinator, Coach Ron English. Interim President Martin hired him at Eastern Michigan as Head Coach, but he was not successful. Interim President Martin noted, "At the end of his last season, when it was clear he would not be renewed, he lost his way in the locker room with a few students and had a bit of a tirade which included the use of a gay slur." He has had two years to reflect on that. I believe people deserve a second chance, and we have decided to hire him."

Questions:

Q: How much did our participation in the bowl game earn for us and how much did the NFL pay for the use of our facilities besides putting on their own turf which is probably torn up now since they practiced there all week?

A: The NFL doesn't actually pay anyone the host committee does. The host committee gave us \$50,000. Interim President Martin stated, "I'll be the first to say we didn't follow university policy and we need to have one policy for all our facilities. As for the bowl game, I can bring that accounting. We were fortunate enough to go to the Citrus Bowl and the payout for that is slightly over \$1 million. As of the last accounting I saw, we had about \$60,000 left. It looks like we will end up breaking even."

Q: Relating to this new defensive coordinator, aside from two years to reflect on things, has he had any sort of training or other intervention?

A: Yes, but I will leave it to him to explain what he's done.

Q: You mentioned bonuses associated with the bowl game, can you elaborate on that?

A: In coaches' contracts, they normally have language that gives them a bonus if they make it to bowl games. It is according to their employment contracts, we don't just decide to give them out.

Q: Can that information be included in the presentation on expenditures you bring back to the Senate?

A: Yes.

Q: Santa Clara University had a recent outbreak of meningitis, so I was wondering if we had any plans if it starts here?

A: Senator Blaylock, the VPSA, commented that in the last week we've had five students and one staff member come down with Chicken Pox. The students were all roommates. We are in very close contact with the county health department as well as Santa Clara University about the outbreak of Meningitis. Eighteen months ago the vaccine wasn't available in the U.S., but now we are in a much better place and the vaccines are available.

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

A. Associated Students President –

AS elections are coming up soon. Packets can be picked up this Friday at the AS House.

SJSU will host the California State Student Association (CSSA) in April. This is the first time the CSSA has held a meeting at SJSU in many years.

Last semester AS passed several resolutions that included a request to the university to develop resource centers for AB 540 students as well as African-American and Latino students, and asking the university to address student hunger issues.

AS will be heading to Sacramento this month for their annual Chess Conference where they will be lobbying legislators for more funding for the CSU.

AS passed a resolution dedicating the AS Printshop to their longest serving staff member that recently passed away, Mr. Paul Lee. Mr. Lee was the AS Printshop manager for many years. Mr. Lee also requested that his funeral be held on campus at the chapel.

AS will be hosting several local politicians this Friday during their lecture series about getting women to serve in politics.

Questions:

Q: I have three questions. Do you have the exact dates the CSSA will be on campus in April? Is the meeting open to the public? Are you hosting delegations from each campus?

A: CSSA will be here during the weekend of April 15-17, 2016. Each AS President (from each campus) as well as a delegate will be here along with the Board of Trustees, and representatives from the CSU Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office, etc. There is an open public forum, so feel free to come.

Q: Can you update us on the efforts to develop a Student Senate?

A: We are in year three of our restructure efforts and we hope to test a pilot student Senate model out next year. This issue was put on the back burner this year due to other more pressing matters.

B. Vice President for University Advancement –

Vice President Lanning announced that our fundraising efforts this year are looking much more robust than in previous years. We have more people giving this year and more foundations supporting us. In total last year we raised about \$14.1 million dollars. As of January 15, 2016, we were at \$33.1 million raised and that is just over midway through the year. Our goal was \$25.5 million and we have surpassed that. However, endowment returns are not strong for this year. We will be reviewing earnings as a Board of the Tower Foundation to determine endowment distributions for the next fiscal year. The endowment in total has lost some of its principal. We will be reviewing spending very closely this year.

On January 27, 2016, University Advancement held the second of two Sports Tech Symposiums.

The next Tower Foundation Board of Directors meeting will be held on March 15, 2016 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. in the Wellness Center Conference room. These meetings are open to the public.

Questions:

Q: You mentioned the return on the endowments wasn't rosy. In an average year we get about 4% and that drives the amount of scholarships we give out in our

department, so are we going to be below 4% this year?

A: There is a 50/50 chance we could go below that. The value of the endowment in the Fall was \$117 million and as of mid January it was down to \$110 million.

C. CSU Statewide Senators –

Senator Lee reported on resolutions passed by the CSU Statewide Senate at the last meeting. AS 3239 advocates for the inclusion of lecturers in annual and semi-annual faculty orientation days. This is something we already do at SJSU. AS 3240 was applauding CSU efforts at increasing the tenure/tenure-track density in the CSU. However, the Senate has asked that the CFA and others be invited to serve on a taskforce to make this a reality because as retirements go, the current rate we are hiring tenure and tenure-track faculty is not creating much growth. AS 3242 (developed by the Executive Committee of the CSU Academic Senate) approved the statement on competencies in the natural sciences expected of entering Freshmen. These competency statements serve to advise high school students and their families about what kind of intellectual preparation is necessary for success in California higher education. AS 3247 urges the Chancellor's Office to restore Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) funds as a permanent line item in the CSU Operating Budget.

A couple of items that we may need to take note of in the Senate include AS 3237 which encourages campus Senates, campus advancement, Philanthropy Offices, and the Chancellor's Office to find ways to acknowledge the role of taxpayers in funding the CSU. AS 3238 addresses recent changes in automatic course transferability created by AB 386, CSU fully online courses and the advent of upper division general education courses in California Community Colleges. It affirms that campus curricula and the satisfactory completion of degree requirements are the purview of local campus faculty. It also encourages campus Academic Senates to develop policies, or review existing policies regarding transfer of courses. This includes establishing criteria for evaluation and reevaluation and articulation of courses. It also asks for involvement of department chairs and faculty in procedures surrounding decision making about transfer courses.

First reading items included a call for a taskforce to analyze student data to evaluate students' ability to graduate in 4 to 6 years. Another policy calls for more math. CSU currently requires three years of high school math for admission to the CSU, and this policy calls for a fourth year of high school math or quantitative reasoning. One of these courses must be taken in the senior year of high school.

Another issue is selection of faculty representatives for Honorary degrees. In November 2015, the CSU Board of Trustees approved an Honorary Degree policy that authorizes the campus Presidents to select faculty in consultation with faculty for campus honorary degree committees.

Questions:

Q: Can you give more details about the community colleges and transfer courses?

A: I can say I am very disappointed with our community colleges. The four year degrees they are offering were officially supposed to require consultation with the CSU. We know what happened there—no conversation. The current degree plans for the four-year degrees in the community colleges states they will have a minimum of 24 units of upper division credit. They are telling us they will have 6 units of upper division GE. Those GE courses will be restricted to only those students that are in that particular degree program offered at that particular college. The commitment for the CCC degree programs is that they will include either CSU GE or IGETC GE. Given that they have a business degree it is likely there may be students that transfer upper division coursework from the CCC to the CSU and the question is whether that will count for degree credit. This is where faculty purview comes in. The other issue that pertains to this is CSU to CSU transfer. We require certain items in our upper division GE package that other places don't require. The CSU Statewide Senate contention is that upper division GE belongs to the campuses and is not a flexible commodity. The practice at the Chancellor's Office has been to treat it as a flexible commodity.

Q: I thought there was a residency requirement for upper division GE?

A: If you take it online at another CSU, it counts as if you took it here anyway. The reality is that if you take a course that is close at another CSU we are going to take it.

D. Provost –

There have been some questions surrounding Student Success fees, and in particular the old miscellaneous course fees now called course support. What Senator Laroche has prepared for you is a presentation that shows the unbundled SSETF fees. You can see that there are three components; course support, instruction related activities, and student success. Of these three, you can see that \$31 is allocated for course support. The only way this amount goes up in the colleges is if there are more students or a higher education pricing index increase. The Provost has worked with the Deans and has identified \$75,000 that will be allocated to the colleges this year. Dean Vollendorf was asked to develop a plan to ensure an equitable way to distribute that money.

Questions:

Q: Any request for additional support for a course should go through Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC). If CFAC approves it then it goes into the hopper. The other issue is that the \$31 is paid by every student even if they take a course that has no course materials fees. For some departments and colleges, this adds up to a lot of money that they never see. Are there any plans to address this?

A: The Provost is open to further discussions about this and further unbundling of the fees. In the interim, the Provost is trying to find resources to help the

colleges pay for items they need and the \$75,000 has nothing to do with Student Success fees.

Q: The Provost has asked for suggestions on unbundling the Student Success fees, and I am going to give my feedback. The Athletics Division receives 85% of the instruction related activity fees. Please unbundle this fee so that the students can clearly see exactly how much of their instruction related activity fee is going to Athletics.

A: Thank you.

The Provost has identified four pillars of Student Success strategy and they are: addressing bottleneck courses, advising, student engagement, and college readiness. The Provost will be meeting with the University Council of Chairs and Deans (UCCD) soon and will continue working on these strategies that he hopes to implement by the end of the semester.

Provost Feinstein is also working on the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) plan. AVP Stacks is working on this and will soon have a presentation. The Provost is also working on an international student growth plan.

There will be a Celebration of Research event on February 10, 2016 from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Student Union Ballroom.

On February 17, 2016 from 1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. there is an IT event featuring CISCO personnel in Engr. 285/287.

E. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) –

Interim Vice President Josee Larochelle announced that the Governor's budget does provide an increase for the CSU of \$140 million, but it is \$103 million short of the CSU support budget. There is a lot of work at the state capital to get additional funding. There are some one time funds for deferred maintenance, but it is no where near the amount set aside for the rest of the state buildings up and down California. The Governor's budget has a 1% increase in enrollment. We would like to see that number be 3%. We are planning for the budget for next year and there will be more information as we get further along in the process.

There is a lot of construction going on across campus. The Student Union (SU) building is still in the works. It has been frustrating for everyone. We are still hopeful that we will be able to move into the SU in February. The issues are related to safety. However, the bookstore, bowling center, and AS Printshop are scheduled to move in later this year.

We are planning aggressively for the Science Building. Also, we will be installing air conditioning in DMH. DMH will be closed summer through fall 2016.

We are also finalizing Campus Village Phase II. That project is on target and slated to be open in Fall 2016. Also, we are in the final planning stage for the Student Recreation and Aquatics Center.

F. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –

Vice President Blaylock announced that Senators received a flyer that lists an opportunity for training with our Counselors on Suicide and Mental Health Crisis Intervention. There will also be classes this fall on time management, stress management, effective communication, and healthy relationships.

On February 23-24, 2016, we have about 150 employers coming to the campus for an internship fair in the Event Center for undergraduate and graduate students.

Student Affairs will also be launching *Portfolium* in the Spring. Right now 7,400 students and 6,500 alumni are using this social media platform in which students and alumni can showcase their projects. Portfolium is free for faculty, staff, and students.

The John Steinbeck Award recipient, Ruby Bridges, will be on campus in the Student Union on February 24, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Student Affairs is in the process of evaluating 46,000 undergraduate applications for admission for Fall 2016.

The last day to drop a class without a “W” is Tuesday, February 9, 2016. The last day to add a class is February 16, 2016. The last day for faculty to drop students and for students to elect the credit/no credit option is also on February 16, 2016.

VP Blaylock announced that our AS President, Looloo Amante, has been accepted to the first graduate school she applied to. The Senate gave applause.

Questions:

Q: Is there a grand central station URL for student resources and if not could we work toward that?

A: Yes, Student Affairs is having those discussions.

Q: If we have faculty that have senior seminars or capstone classes that might want their students to work with Porfolium, how do they go about getting access?

A: They just go to the site and log in. Career Services works with students and faculty on logging in every day.

Q: Are 46,000 applications more than usual, and how many spots are we aiming

for?

A: We had 25% more students apply for graduation this spring than usual, so we have a significant number of students on the campus with 90 units or more. We are looking at how we can get those students out the door. It is a balancing act.

Q: The “Ask Me” tent was very helpful and students loved it. What is the enrollment cap for graduate students.

A: This spring we had slightly over 500 new students most of which were graduate students.

Q: Of those that apply for graduation is there a typical percentage that actually graduate?

A: I do not know the answer to that. We will look into that and get back to the Senate.

V. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Executive Committee Minutes of November 16, 2015 – No questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of December 7, 2015 –

Q: There is a comment that you reminded the Chancellor that a key element to student success was faculty and I was wondering if this was a trip you made down there or did he come to the campus?

A: This was part of my regular Senate Chairs’ meeting in Long Beach, CA.

Q: I was also intrigued that SFSU is trying to improve their workload for faculty. Does this apply to all faculty, and if so how did they do this?

A: Good question. It only applied to new faculty hires that were offered additional release time for three years or more, and the issue was that the deans were offering these releases without informing the department chairs. Faculty were being hired to fill needs for the departments and the chairs were unaware and only told after the fact that they were hiring people that were not going to be teaching a full load for an extended period of time. We are still trying to understand how they were able to achieve this campus-wide.

A: Senator Van Selst responded that he could answer that question. What SFSU did was remove most assigned time. There is little assigned time left for any projects, etc.

Executive Committee Minutes of January 25, 2016 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar as amended to remove Buddy Butler from the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR). **The consent calendar of November 30, 2015 was approved (46-0-0).**

AVC Report on Senate Seat Changes for 2016-2017 – The seats will remain exactly as they are this year.

Senate Calendar for 2016-2017 -- A motion was made and seconded to approve the Senate Calendar for 2016-2017. The Senate voted and the Senate Calendar was approved (46-0-0).

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Special Order of Business –

Election of the Senate Chair for a second year – The Senate voted by secret ballot and Chair Kimbarow was re-elected for a second year.

VII. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1600, Policy Recommendation, Expansion of Bylaw 15 – Updating Senate Documents (First Reading)*. [There were no questions.]

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1593, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Assessment of Core Competencies (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1593 was approved (44-0-2).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1588, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Athletics Representative (Final Reading)*.

Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 199 to read, **“The Senate Executive Committee and the Athletics Board will each forward its recommendation to the President who will arrange for the”**.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to strike the words **“non-voting”** from line 148.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to drop “extraordinary circumstances” from line 185. **The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment passed (22-15-9).**

Senator Campsey presented an amendment to line 204, section 3.2.1 to replace the words “Reappointment should not be automatic” with “After consultation with the Athletics Board and the Senate Executive Committee, the President makes the final decision on reappointment.” Senator Campsey withdrew his amendment.

The Senate voted and AS 1588 was approved as amended (38-6-2).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1594, Policy Recommendation, Update of Policy on Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Why is the dean listed as a non-voting member?

A: The committee felt that while a dean from another college might be needed to provide insights, information, and also be a resource for the candidate for frank discussions, he/she need not be part of the voting in selecting a new dean.

Q: Why not?

A: You have the college selecting its dean rather than having a dean from outside the college involved in selecting the dean. However, the committee will reconsider this.

Q: Given your rationale for having a dean from outside the college as a non-voting member, why have a faculty member from outside the college and a community member that isn't even part of the university as voting members?

A: The committee will revisit this.

Q: There is no room on the committee for a regular faculty member that isn't a chair or part of the library to be on the Dean of the University Library Search Committee, will the committee revisiting this?

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: The way the non-voting dean is specified allows for the sitting dean of a college to be appointed to the search committee to select their successor, will the committee consider fixing this?

A: Yes. The committee's intention was always for that to be a dean from outside the college.

Q: What is the reason for a person from the community in the decanal search?

A: The deans are involved in the fundraising for the colleges in the community and so getting input from the community seems to make good sense.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1598, Policy Recommendation, WASC Accreditation Review Committee and Leadership Steering Committee (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Do other universities have permanent committees to deal with university accreditation?

A: Informally, some discussions around accreditation have noted the potential need for campuses putting a permanent committee in place since the review cycle and mid-term reporting come up to almost time for the next review before everything is completed. If the campus is going to remain engaged, we need a more permanent group in place.

Q: In section 1.2.3 isn't that just standard procedure?

A: O&G has pretty much put this same standard language in all of its recommendations regarding the committees. The reasoning goes like this, the information is in the bylaws but not everyone reads the bylaws. When a new chair of the committee comes along they read the policy that established the committee.

Q: Would the committee consider removing the language in section 1.2.3 because bylaws change? Also, the majority of the members on the committee are established by title so there will be little turnover in members, so would the committee consider rewriting this to allow administrators to be replaced for missing meetings as well? Our policy doesn't allow for their removal if they are appointed by title.

A: The committee will review this.

Q: Can you tell me how many members you have on this committee, it appears to me that there are over 20 people and it would be difficult to get a quorum?

A: The current lead for the WASC group that just went through the review put forward this membership. O&G assumed this is the membership they need to get the work done. However, the steering committee, as a smaller group, will be the committee to keep work on track.

Q: There are 33 members that I count and keeping track of the membership will be a nightmare. Doesn't it make more sense to just establish a leadership committee and instruct them to add who is needed?

A: Interesting thought and I will bring back to the committee.

Q: What is the difference between a faculty chair and a department chair?

A: We will clarify this. It should say the faculty chair of the review committee.

Q: Could it say that this committee will be chaired by one of the nine at-large faculty?

A: The committee will clarify this.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1599, Policy Recommendation, Committee Obligations and Senate Membership (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Can you perform assigned committee duties without attending the committee meetings?

A: Yes.

Q: I think this needs clarification.

A: The committee will review and clarify this.

Q: On line 51, section 6.12a) it states a member an Academic Senate committee can be kicked off the committee for missing three meetings, so what happens if the President misses three meetings of the Executive Committee? I think you should specify we are talking about policy and operating committees.

A: Administrators are appointed by title and can't be removed this way.

Q: Would the committee consider making the number of meetings that can be missed consistent across committees and the Senate. Right now there is nothing in the bylaws that specifies how many Senate meetings can be missed. Also, to be consistent either the Executive Committee or the Committee on Committees/AVC should be designated to remove personnel. It should not be both the Executive Committee for policy committees and the AVC/Committee on Committees for operating committees. Would the committee consider giving authority to either the AVC/Committee on Committees, or the Executive Committee in sections 6.12a and 6.13a?

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Did this come about as the result of a lot of truancy at committee meetings? What was the motivation for this?

A: Yes. There are members of the Senate that have asked to be removed from policy committees, and when we looked at the bylaws we found although it is implied that all Senators should serve on a policy committee it is not required. That is what led to this policy recommendation.

Q: How does bylaw change occur and will there be major changes between readings?

A: O&G will bring this back for a second reading and at the second reading we need a 2/3rds majority vote to pass the resolution. It then goes to the President for approval. However, when O&G goes over the recommended changes, we can decide that we need to bring it back to the Senate for another first reading. That is an option available to the committee.

Q: What happens if a student Senator can't make one semester due to classes, but can make the next semester?

A: That is already part of the bylaws that a Senator can be replaced for one semester.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1590, Policy Recommendation, Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings (First Reading)*.

This modifies or adds language to existing bylaws in order to provide guidance with respect to remote attendance at Senate and committee meetings. The referral emerged after discussion in the Executive Committee after a request to participate remotely in policy committee meetings. As the second whereas states, Senate bylaws clearly establish expectations and standards for attendance at Senate and committee meetings, but is silent on whether participating via teleconferencing or web-based conferencing

fulfills the attendance requirements.

Questions:

Q: There was a dissenting vote in O&G, can you explain why?

A: The dissenting vote was that of Chair Shifflett. Chair Shifflett feels very strongly that people should not attend the Senate or Executive Committee meetings remotely. However, it may be appropriate for other committees and Chair Shifflett felt it should differentiate between them and allow the Chair of the committee to make that decision.

Q: Would the committee consider setting a limit on the number of meetings that could be attended remotely? I am concerned the entire room could be filled with microphones and tape recorders and no one be physically present.

A: This was discussed in O&G and tracking attendance could be pretty daunting for the committee chair, but we will discuss this again.

Q: The CSU Statewide Senate has changed the committee meetings to long distance meetings, not because it is more effective but due to budget. Has O&G considered talking to those Senators that have attended those meetings remotely and get their input about how effective and ineffective it is?

A: Thank you. We will.

Q: How can I help you as a committee chair convince the rest of the committee that, at least in the case of policy committees, remote attendance will place a huge amount of pressure on committee chairs to allow remote attendance when he/she may really not want to allow it? Would the committee please consider striking that language and accepting the language that attendance at committee meetings is crucial?

A: Some of the members of O&G are Senators and have heard you and we will consider it.

Q: Has the committee examined whether there are any examples of parliamentary bodies working successfully with the phone in model? Also, since the language says remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable equipment is available and the work of the committee will not be compromised, has O&G seen committees where this is working?

A: The closest we have seen is the University Library Board (ULB).

Q: Would the committee please consider some serious concerns I have about this policy? The meetings of the Executive Committee are confidential and if an individual is calling in remotely, you cannot guarantee that confidentiality as you cannot be sure who is in the room with the person calling in. Furthermore, as for the Senate meetings, this room (Engr. 285/287) does not have the technology to allow for remote calling in, nor do we have information technology person assigned to assist with the technology for these meetings. I am not sure how we could handle secret ballot voting. In addition, I feel very strongly that this policy will place the committee chairs under a lot of pressure to accommodate members that want to attend remotely and they will need locations that

have the technology. While this might not be an issue for one committee, we have over 30 committees under the Senate. Also, members of the committees and the Senate are elected or appointed to represent their colleges and should want to attend these meetings. There are provisions that already allow for missing up to two meetings should an emergency arise.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: I have recent experience calling into a meeting in a room with the technology for conference calling and I can tell you that I could not hear well at all. This is the best technology that is available on the campus right now and it doesn't work well, so will the committee consider these issues?

A: Yes.

Q: Would O&G please consider returning this for a final reading just as soon as they can present a working model of how this could be successful?

A: The committee will consider all comments and suggestions.

Q: All of the questions have concerned tele-conferencing, but no one has addressed web-based conferencing and can you explain what that would involve?

A: We have two resources on campus called Web Ex to call in and also Blackboard. These two resources are available so that a student or faculty member could join remotely without ever using the telephone.

B. University Library Board (ULB) – No Report.

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

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1597, Policy Recommendation, Minimum Criteria for Undergraduate Minors (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: It says that the 12 units must be completely distinct from coursework in one's major. Does that mean that someone that has a major in Biology can also get a minor in Biology if they have 12 separate units?

A: Technically that is the way the policy reads.

Q: Can you briefly explain item 7?

A: Item 7 says the minimum aggregate GPA for all coursework required for the minor must be at least 2.0.

Q: Would the committee consider lowering the maximum units?

A: We had quite a bit of discussion about the maximum units. There are some minors out there that require a high level of proficiency for the curricular coherence of the minor. A good example would be foreign languages. You would need more coursework in those types of minors. That is how we came to the compromise of 24 units, and it is also one course per semester.

Q: Did the committee consider overlapping minors and language that would make the units distinct from other minors?

A: We actually did not, but I'll take that back to the committee for consideration.

Q: Can you explain number 5, line 33?

A: Currently courses in preparation for the major are included in the unit count for the minor in the course catalog. There was quite a bit of discussion about whether they should count or not count. This policy would enable double-dipping. You can also do it for GE.

Q: Are there any majors that have so much prep work that the student would automatically complete the units for a minor by doing the prep work?

A: Yes, Sports Management has enough prep work in the College of Business that they could complete a minor in Business with the prep work.

Q: Would the committee consider taking a stance on whether a department could offer more than one minor or multiple tracks for a minor?

A: Lots of departments do have multiple minors.

Q: With regard to item 6 where 25% of the units must be taken in residence, what was the committee's thinking on that?

A: If you note our 120 unit major program, we do have a requirement of 25% of units in residence. We were aligning with that. The thinking is that if it says that it is an SJSU minor, then at least one course should be taken at SJSU.

Q: Did the committee consider what the workload to the departments would be?

A: We have talked to two of the chairs in the departments that have minors over 24 units. This is the reason that we put in meeting the criteria by Fall 2018 which gives lots of lead time for Graduate and Undergraduate Programs to work with departments if changes need to be made.

Q: Am I correct that it is out of the scope for this policy when you are allowed to declare a minor for students?

A: The committee is going to discuss this. This is a procedural issue.

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

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1596, Policy Recommendation, Clarifying the Administrator Equivalent to a College Dean for Counseling Faculty in the RTP Process, Amends S15-7 (RTP Procedures) (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1596 was approved unanimously (46-0-0).

IX. Special Committee Reports –

X. New Business – None

XI. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.