

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

Engineering 285-287

Academic Senate
November 30, 1998, 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

- I. The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m. All were present except Barba, Brent, Burak, Canziani, Constantin, Doordan, Edgar, Green, Katz, Novak, Van Hooff, and Wall
- II. The minutes of November 2, 1998 were approved with corrections.
- III. **Communications and Questions**

A. From the Chair of the Senate

The Chair reminded senators that comments, complaints, etc., should be directed to the Academic Senate Office and not to individuals who hand deliver mail. She described the time constraints involved in constructing senate agenda packets and assured senators that every effort is being made to provide materials as soon as possible for senators to review prior to senate meetings.

A sub-committee of the Executive Committee is currently developing a draft of the response to Academic Vice Chancellor David Spence on the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. Presentation to the senate is scheduled for December 7th, however, because of the time factor, it may not be included in the packet, but every effort is being made to make it available prior to the meeting.

The Curriculum and Research Committee is currently compiling feedback and producing a campus report on globalization -- also scheduled to be presented on December 7th.

The Chair concluded her statement with several comments on the importance of collaboration in getting so many projects completed in such a short amount of time.

B. From the President of the University

President Caret brought to the attention of senators, the gift of \$1 million by Stanley Wang, CSU Trustee, to the CSU system. This donation was made to recognize and reward outstanding faculty and administrators. The money will not go to an endowment, rather the Stanley Wang Recognition Award will grant each year, for 10 years, four faculty and one administrator \$20,000. President Caret has been asked to nominate four faculty and one administrator by January 20th. The Executive Committee discussed this award. Guidelines on selecting nominees will be developed.

While at a conference in San Francisco, President Caret received a draft of a project Chancellor Reed is currently working on entitled "Facing Change: Building a Faculty of the Future." This document will be formally presented. For now, President Caret stated he would make a draft of that project available to the senate office for those senators who are interested. According to President Caret, it is an interesting document.

IV. Executive Committee Report

A. Minutes of Executive Committee

The minutes of Executive Committee were presented to the senate. Senator Norton suggested modifying the wording of the description of the working committee to the sub committee of the

Executive Committee on the Cornerstones Implementation plan.

B. Executive Committee Action Items

AS 1052 Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Collective Bargaining Impasse

No other questions were presented so AS 1050 was moved to debate. Senator Peter stated that the years of research the two committees have put into this proposal was extensive and believed that this policy should be tried. Senator McNeil offered a friendly amendment to the first sentence in the second paragraph of number two to read "If a department chooses to offer three-unit classes on a MW-TR schedule ~~it~~ its college must offer at least one three-unit Friday class for every 10 three-unit classes offered on MW-TR." Senator Cook echoed Senator Peter's comments and added that this policy would be a benefit to students and faculty. Senator Hamill, concerned with going to a four day work week, offered a friendly amendment to drop the second whereas clause because he did not believe there was sufficient evidence to support the notion that the two day a week classes was pedagogically more sound than three. Senator Pearce regarded it as unfriendly and the motion was withdrawn. Senator Young exclaimed his support of the policy. Senator Stork stated that she was aware of the concerns of going to a four days a week schedule, but believed that allowing the option of offering three hour classes on Fridays, especially for graduate students who do not prefer night classes were advantageous in that it provided more flexibility. Senator Roth echoed Hamill's concern and stated he remembered going to classes on Saturday. Senator Roth believed that this type of scheduling could alleviate parking problems. Debate was closed and a voice vote was taken. The proposal passed unanimously.

VIII. Special Committee Reports (Time Certain 3 p.m. moved to 3:30 p.m.)

A.S. 1053 Library Policy (Senate Special Committee on the Joint Library Project)

The chair informed the senate that according to Standing Rule 9B, "Any person may address the Senate on a particular agenda item by invitation of the Executive Committee or by permission of the Chair prior to the call to order." She introduced three guest speakers, Professors Bruce Reynolds, James Walsh, and John Engell.

Professor Bruce Reynolds opposed the proposed Joint Library between SJSU and the City of San Jose. He presented to the senate a listing of the faculty and staff signers of the following petition, broken down by College, Department, and rank. He also presented to the Chair a list of 290 faculty and 160 staff signatures on petitions that stated:

Save Our University Library: We urge the Academic Senate to vote NO on the Joint Library Proposal.

This fall the University's Academic Senate will vote on a project which, if implemented, would dramatically impact the lives of every San Jose State University student, staff and faculty member. The Academic Senate established guidelines for the joint library (SS-S8-1, AS 1048) (sic) but these have been virtually ignored and the principles designed to protect the Library have not been considered. Students, faculty and staff have raised many questions on the possible dangers to SJSU's academic environment. These include competition for library materials with potential 800,000 new patrons, including local high school and college students, and increased noise, vandalism and security problems. These possibilities have not been adequately addressed in a headlong dash by the San Jose Redevelopment Agency to push the project through. The project, as presently planned, represents a T0 1 Tfeep001 Tw 12 0 0 12 87.18 340au1.8 1 03 Tc -0.0021 Tw12 0 0 12 oudu

and faculty and institutional collegiality would suffer.

Senator Peter, as representative for the Senate Special Committee on the Joint Library Project, presented AS 1053 to the senate. He gave a brief history of the project. He explained that the complexity and detail of the proposed policy was essential for a project with unknowns, in order to reduce the risk to all parties concerned, and to make the joint library project workable. Senator Peter explained that the policy was limited to the scope of the academic role the senate plays in policy recommendation. He urged senators to email or bring in suggestions to the senate office for consideration during this process of developing a policy recommendation. Senator Peter then went through AS 1053 (Revised 11/30/98), section by section, and gave the history and rationale for inclusions and strikeouts from the original draft proposed. From discussions and feedback from librarians, senators, and members of the Executive Committee, it was believed that Section 2.6 and 2.7 would likely go as a referral to Organization and Government Committee.

Senator Peter stated that developing a library policy with specified procedures now would reduce the number of problems that might arise later. During the five years it would take to construct the new building, it would give the University the opportunity to track collection usage. The collection should be subjected to an audit prior the moving of the collection into the new facility as a tool to better judge security issues and current losses in our collection. Senators need to be sure that we have a policy in place that supports the academic mission.

The floor was then open for questions. Senator Mullen referred the senate to a handout in their packet from a number of librarians with their concerns on AS 1053. Their concerns included the short timeline for librarian response to the proposed policy, governance issues, possible technical difficulties in the implementation of the policy, the legality of certain sections of the policy. She then presented the senate with a three-page handout of questions. She reminded the committee that the policy should have a cover sheet with names of participants, the recorded vote, and the estimated financial impact of the proposal. A series of questions focused on why Organization and Government were excluded from the review of the Library Committee.

Senator Peter explained that the Chair of Organization and Government had been informed about the policy and that those sections of the draft policy could be referred to them with the charge to deal with increasing the number of library faculty on the committee. The suggestion to make the Library Committee a special agency would allow it to bypass Curriculum and Research Committee (which normally has Library Committee members present their proposed policies to the senate since all policy on the library has arisen from the Library committee, not C&R).

Senator Mullen, referring to the newly constituted Library committee, asked for the rationale in assigning a 14-member committee to manage the Academic Library. Senator Peter replied that the committee was not meant to "manage" the library but rather to serve to "advise" the University Library Director. The first draft has been modified (see Section 2.7) to reflect this emphasis. The recommendation of the size of the Library committee was to have it be as low as possible, identify appointed students by title (with the intent to improve student participation), and that the selection of teaching faculty members could be modeled on the BOGS (Board of General Studies) organization. (Applicants willing to serve on BOGS are reviewed by the Executive Committee, recommended to the senate and approval by the senate.) It was pointed out that if the proposed Library Committee decisions were found to be faulty, the University Library Director or Provost could reject their advice and that a revision clause could be introduced in Section 9. Senator Mullen took issue with whether the Senate Special Committee on the Joint Library has deviated "from the Senate's original objective." It was the committee's

opinion that the committee has not deviated from the original charge of the Senate and she was referred to the two previous resolutions on the

The issues the team of negotiators is currently grappling with are ways to identify problems and gradually phase in restricted circulation. One strategy is extending borrowing privileges for faculty and staff.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at five o'clock.

No Consent Calendar Presented

Send comments or questions regarding this Senate Web site to

[Lydia Rose](#)

Administrative Operations Analyst

Academic Senate Office

San José State University

One Washington Square

San José, CA 95192-0024

voice: (408) 924-2440

fax: (408) 924-2410