

**Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting
March 8, 2010**

Present: Kaufman, Phillips, Heiden, Gleixner, Baker, McClory, Lessow-Hurley, Lee, Meldal, Najjar, Selter

Absent: Backer, Roldan, Whitmore

Late: Von Till

Guests: Nance

1. Consent Calendar: Unanimously approved

2. Laptop: Spartan Daily story last Wednesday said that the University may require laptops as early as next Fall. Chair Kaufman checked that with the author and the article was initiated by the Daily, not the CIO. President Whitmore did not know about this until after it was published in the Daily. The Provost says that it is news to him and has not been discussed at any management level meetings. Past Chair Meldal commented that their department has a policy related to curricula issues and it was voted on by faculty. Point raised that this is a topic that goes back 10 years with a long discussion history that settled on NOT having a university-wide laptop policy. VP Najjar pointed out that the CIO was also on television (KGO?) at the same time as this issue.

A point was raised to reinvestigate having the CIO on the Senate Executive Committee. Issue with that was that it will take a full campus vote to get the CIO added to the Senate and we cannot add him to the Executive Committee if he is not added to the Senate.

Motion to move forward as expediently as possible with having the vote to add the CIO to the Senate passed unanimously. Motion that in the meantime we invite him to Exec as a non-voting member passed unanimously.

3. Strategic Planning: An update on the Strategic Planning Board was requested. The Provost said that he and the Chair had been meeting to get the board convened. The board hasn't convened yet, because they were missing two constituencies. Two groups don't have names submitted correctly. The UCCD submitted 3 names, but they need to submit only 2 names. Chief of Staff Nance has followed-up with them. Chair Kaufman will follow-up further with the UCCD on Wednesday. In addition, Associated Students needs to submit the names of two students, one undergraduate and graduate student. A point was raised that the board should start meeting without these two groups. A point was raised that convening them at this point may be pointless as they will only meet once or twice before stopping for the Fall. A counterargument was that the downside to not convening is greater than downside of only meeting once this year.

The Provost said they will get a meeting convened as soon as possible.

4. Nominees for the Athletic Director Review Committee: President Whitmore asked the Senate to review the Athletic Director in same manner as the VPs, because there was no other policy. Using the review process used for the VPs was suggested by the Athletics Board.

VP Najjar has been getting calls from alumni that are worried about the Senate's involvement and that the review of the Athletics Director will be more of a review of Athletics than of the director.

There is a difference with the other VPs in that the Athletics Director has a termed contract. Another factor in the concern is that the review is taking place in the last year of his contract. Also, the community doesn't understand the Senate's role is to send out a call for nominees and to forward the names of those selected to the President. Also, a point was raised that previous directors were rumored to have refused to be reviewed.

The Athletics Board charter does have the role of reviewing the director. However, it is awkward for them as the Director sits on the Board. The Provost emphasized that the review should be of the director and his managerial skill, not on the performance of coaches or teams. The Athletics Board has been constituted and refocused to ensure student athlete success. It has been at the request of the Athletics Board that the director be reviewed in this way.

We should address the community's perception that the Senate is opposed to Athletics. We need to reinforce what our role is in forming the review committee, and emphasize that the adversarial relationship is in the past.

We do not know the size of committee. The policy only states that it must be a third faculty. A question was raised about who appoints the chair. The policy doesn't explicitly state this, but the chair is traditionally appointed by the President from among the committee members.

A motion was made to forward all the community members to the President and let him work with VP Najjar in choosing who is selected to be on the committee. The motion was unanimously approved.

A point was raised again that the next time we have a call for nominees, we should make sure that if it is not a self-nomination that we make sure the person is interested and that we get statements of interest.

A motion was made that all the students' names be forwarded to Chief of Staff Nance and that he interview them. The motion was unanimously approved.

A motion was made to forward the names of 2 faculty members on the Athletics Board (Fritz Yambrach & Sonja Lilienthal) on to President. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Executive Committee voted for and five other faculty members were selected to be sent to the President for consideration. They are Shirley Reekie, Beth Von Till, Kell Fujimoto, Joyce Osland, and Greg Payne.

The Executive Committee voted for 3 administrators' names to be sent to the President. They are Cathy Busalacchi, Emily Allen, and Dennis Jaehne.

The Executive Committee voted for sending 3 staff names forward Mireya Salinas, Mari Hernandez, and Carey Netzloff.

5. Enrollment Management: The Enrollment Advisory Committee developed 11 guiding principles. We need a statement of guiding principles of enrollment management as either a policy, a Sense of the Senate Resolution, or a Presidential Directive. Some members felt it should be a policy through the Senate, because it reinforces the shared governance referenced in the principles. Others felt a presidential directive endorsed by Senate would be more expedient with careful, tweaking of the wording by the Enrollment Advisory Committee. A counterargument was that because it is principled and well thought out it should go through the Senate. Other comments seem to allude that we don't trust the Senate. VP Phillips verified that until another policy is formed, the Enrollment Management Team is using these principles to develop the 11/12 plan so it is urgent in that sense, but he also feels that it is important that it undergo the proper procedure. A motion was made that the Executive Committee bring an amended version of this to the Senate floor for a first reading. The Executive Committee voted and the motion passed (4-0-8).

The Executive Committee discussed replacing the wording of #8 and #9 with "regionally" focused wording. It was suggested replacing "regionally focused" in #8 with "programmatic service area focus". The Executive Committee discussed that "region" leaves it open to different interpretations (like Pacific Rim, Si Valley) beyond service area. It was suggested that, "while regionally focused" be eliminated, because the mission is not to provide employees for the Si Valley job market. The counterargument was that this is really a statement of fact. A friendly amendment was made to add "other stakeholders" at the end (which would include employees). A motion to remove the first sentence of the rationale in #8 failed.

A friendly amendment was made to remove "regional" from #9 and change it to "SJSU is committed to engage in partnerships, consortia, and other agreements...."

A motion to strike "guiding" from the title, subtitles, and other points it comes up in text unanimously passed.

A question was brought up about what is "alternative revenue sources" in #3. VP Phillips explained this was things like special session.

A friendly amendment was made to change #9 to "global education continuum."

A friendly amendment was made to strike "(such as science labs and computers)" from #10.

6. Sustainability Board: O&G is suggesting modifying Campus Planning Board to include the charge of sustainability. The goal is to add a centralized place to guarantee that the campus is making a coordinated effort towards sustainability. The Campus Planning Board is concerned that the planning role of committee will get lost under the

broad mission of sustainability. Some Campus Planning Board members were opposed to function #2, “promoting existing sustainability related courses...”, because they felt that this fell under C&R. O&G replied to them that curricula changes would eventually go through C&R anyway. A question was raised as to whether this should be a policy committee, or a special agency reporting to the Senate.

A point was raised that the coordination of sustainability efforts on campus is a position (Katherine’s). It seems to be a management issue not a committee issue.

It was suggested that the draft is too specific about the role of the committee, and that we should eliminate the details and just add one more sentence on coordination of sustainability as part of campus planning.

It was pointed out that we need a strategic planning discussion to lay out what we want to accomplish under the sustainability focus. A point was raised that this was done through the task force. The process needs to be re-thought around what are the goals of sustainability from a strategic planning viewpoint. If sustainability is all-encompassing throughout the university, we can’t get a broad enough representation on the committee. The role of the committee needs to be re-thought.

7. Alcohol Policy: This policy is meant to be a student oriented policy (leave employees out due to union issues and such). A referral has been sent to ISA committee to work on.

8. Status Updates:

Thanks to the Provost for after hours data that he provided so quickly after the last meeting. It was decided that we should discuss this in more detail as to how we should structure ourselves to be more available to all of our student body.

Associated Students needs a faculty member for Personnel Committee (which works with the Corporation side). AS President Baker will bring names to Chair Kaufman who will bring it to the Executive Committee.

The search for VP of Student Affairs is actively ongoing. The search committee meets frequently.

(Minutes prepared by Stacy Gleixner, Chair of Instruction and Student Affairs Committee, 3/8/10.)