

2008/2009 Academic Senate

MINUTES
December 15, 2008

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Lessow-Hurley,
Meldal, Whitmore,
Van Selst
Absent: Sabalius, Cavu-Litman

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Najjar, Phillips, Sigler, Lee

Deans:

Present: Parrish, Merdinger, Meyers
Absent: Stacks

Students:

Present: Hypes, Levy, Lichty,
Absent: Cerda, Linder, Palumbo

Alumni Representative:

Absent: No representative assigned
yet.

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

Hon-5(i /rüi TdPreseo)-5(ns (NTd(He)-8-(L)3VTd(tR)-inin)-5)ve:

Indian population on campus after the Mumbai attacks at the end of November.

Chair Meldal announced that AVP Robert Cooper has decided to return to his joy of teaching in the College of Social Sciences in the Fall 2009. This is a decision AVP Cooper has made subsequent to his retirement in a few years. Consequently, the Academic Senate Office will be sending out a call for nominations for the search committee to replace AVP Cooper in the next few days. The deadline to submit nominees will be January 21, 2009.

B. From the President of the University –

The President thanked the Senators for their help, support, and friendship during his first semester at SJSU.

The President also thanked the Senators for their kindness and sympathy to his wife Jennifer with the recent passing of her father. It was greatly appreciated.

The President reported that we may be cut up to \$6 million from our budget this year. Although this has already been announced, the money cannot be taken away until the legislature approves it. The money is being held in reserve until we have to give it back.

SJSU is now officially impacted. We have more students than we are funded for. Impaction allows us to control our admissions, except for those in our local area which is Santa Clara County. Senator (VP) Phillips will be discussing impaction indepth later in today's meeting.

If the economic stimulus package is passed, in early March the President and others from the CSU system will be going to Washington, D.C. to talk to our delegates and push for federal funding.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Minutes of November 17, 2008 – No questions.

Minutes of November 24, 2008 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar – The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved unanimously (with the addition of Wendy Ng to the Board of General Studies for a one semester replacement for the College of Social Sciences).

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Backer presented

Senator Van Selst made a friendly amendment to strike, “As far as possible,” and to replace “shall” with “should” after “Tenured faculty” in 6.9c). **The Senate voted and AS 1402 passed unanimously as amended.**

Senator Backer presented

Senator Van Selst presented a friendly amendment to change the title to read, “16. Specific Designation of Rescinded Policies,” instead of, “16. Specific Designation of Superseded Policies.” Senator Lessow-Hurley presented a friendly amendment to change the Workload Impact, 2nd line, to read, “there will be no need to revisit policies,” instead of “there will be no need to amend policies.” **The Senate voted and AS 1403 passed unanimously as amended.**

Senator Backer presented

Senator Backer commented, “This referral was a request from the Program Planning Committee, and we have talked to both the Program Planning Committee and the AVP of the Office of Institutional Research. The proposal is to add the AVP of the Office of Institutional Research to the Program Planning Committee as an Ex Officio member.” Senator Van Selst asked, “Do you know what the current membership of the committee is?” Senator Backer said, “It has two faculty members from each college and the general unit, in addition to AVP William Nance representing the Provost’s Office, and AVP Robert Cooper representing the Undergraduate Studies Office, the Director of Assessment, 1 Graduate and 1 Undergraduate Student.” Senator Buzanski made a motion to move the resolution to a final reading. The Buzanski motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion carried. **The Senate voted and AS 1406 was approved unanimously.**

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None

VII. Special Committee Reports –

A. CSU Systemwide Impaction for 2009-2010 Admission –

Senator Phillips, Vice President of Student Affairs, gave a presentation on CSU Systemwide Impaction for 2009-2010. (Slides attached).

for the 2009-2010 academic year. The lower division and post baccalaureate students are out of luck unless an individual campus needs them in order to come up to their enrollment target, but if the lower division and post

16 slots. The space available admission for the non-local applicants will be determined by two simultaneous lists. One list is of the GPAs, either for Freshmen or Transfer students. The other list for Freshmen is the CSU eligibility index, which is a combination of GPA and either SAT or ACT tests.

For Spring 2010, we may go to a space available admission process for all applicants, including local area applicants. If needed to manage our enrollment down, it is clear from the Chancellor's Office that we can go on a space available admission basis for all applicants for Spring 2010. We are sufficiently over-enrolled, especially if Saturday's registration figures were to be born out and we hit Spring 2009 as high as we could, that we might need to do that. It is too early to say. I predict we will not close for Spring 2010, that is accept no applications, but simply admit as space becomes available.

There are a number of additional measures planned for 2009/2010. We will adhere to deadlines. We may also restrict registration for students that are well over the number of units required for their major. This is something AVP Robert Cooper and others are working on to see if it is feasible. There may be a few major programs that are declared impacted for Fall 2009. We do have a methodology to expedite the review to get it approved that is under consideration. Disqualified students in the past have been able to reapply almost at the last moment. That is no longer the case. Disqualified students, upon successfully completing a program of study, will need to apply for the next available term whatever that is. If it is past the deadline for Fall 2009, then they will have to wait till Spring 2010. That is another measure we are taking.

We have had almost no time to consult widely about most of what I've talked about so far. We did have a meeting with the Senate Executive Committee a few weeks ago. However, there will be a presidential enrollment advisory group formed. What we are thinking at the present time is that there would be 4 enrollment planners out of Academic Affairs, 4 enrollment planners out of Student Affairs, 4 faculty, 2 students, and we are not sure about community representatives. The kind of community representatives we'd like to consult with include school superintendents and community college chancellors. However, we may have ways of consulting with them that do not require them to sit on our enrollment advisory committee. For example, one of the things we have considered doing is to go to the superintendents that meet about once a month—all 30 of them in this county—and give reports to get feedback from the whole group. Similarly, the community college chancellors meet in a group called the Silicon Valley Higher Education Roundtable through which we could do some consulting with community college chancellors, and so forth. If you have some thoughts about this please let me, or Gerry Selter know. In particular, the advisory committee will be especially helpful in preparing plans beyond next year. The problems are not going to go away next year.

On April 30, 2009, if we wish to declare campus-wide impaction we will need to submit a plan. For example, that could be campus-wide impaction for first-time freshmen and it could be programmatic impaction for upper division transfer students. That would be one possibility. We would be doing this, because the CSU systemwide impaction has been declared for only one year, and that is 2009/2010. The Chancellor might extend the CSU systemwide impaction if the budget continues to be poor, but we have no assurance that is the case. The campus is engaged in the process of determining whether to d

how all that might work. What I did was what San Luis Obispo does, and declared impaction for every single program at the upper division level where we require majors to be declared. We might also declare campus-wide impaction for freshmen and not require majors to be declared, as is our current plan.”

Questions:

Senator Kaufman asked, “One of the biggest tools you have to work with is limiting the addition of non-service area students, but you just told us that any non-service area student that applied before November 20, 2008 is in. What fraction of the non-service area students applied between November 20th and November 30th?” Senator Phillips replied, “I believe the number was approximately half.”

Senator Parrish asked, “I was wondering, has remedial status been anywhere in the equation

that would have an influence for out of local area students.” Senator Lessow-Hurley asked, “Is it only GPA, or it is GPA and the CSU eligibility index?” Senator Phillips replied, “For Fall for Freshmen we plan on running two simultaneous lists from which to draw non-local applicants. One is sorted solely by GPA, the other is sorted by the CSU eligibility index, which is a combination of GPA and test scores. We have test scores for about 80% of the applicants for the Freshman level.”

Senator Mok said, “What are we doing here to encourage students to graduate? Also, with the increase in admissions, how are you training the Admissions Office? We have a disconnect between our school and the admissions office all the time. We lose a number of students due to these problems.” Senator Phillips replied, “One of the things that is being explored is to look at those students that are 30 units above the number of units required for their declared major. We are exploring whether it would be feasible to restrict the registration of such students. They would be prohibited from registering themselves, and would have to go to an advisor who would ensure they were making progress toward graduation. This is one idea. With regard to training, training is always ongoing in the enrollment services unit. Colleen Brown and Deanna Gonzales have held meetings with the entire staff to go over the new enrollment rules. However, change management is not easy and we have a large community. Sometimes a disconnect between what happens in the colleges and what goes on in enrollment services does occur. We take great strides to see that it doesn’t occur. We do have some plans to beef up our communications both written and verbal in these areas. We are aware of that problem and are working on it as feverishly as possible.”

Senator Norton asked, “At one time we had a quota for special admissions, will we still have a quota for special admissions?” Senator Phillips said, “Yes.”

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked, “I’d like to know if the Senate has a role in constituting the enrollment advisory committee, and if so what is that role?” Senator Phillips said, “The Executive Committee of the Senate has, I believe, already weighed in on some names for the faculty members of that committee.” Senator Meldal commented that the Executive Committee had not. Senator Phillips said, “The Executive Committee will be asked to weigh in on the names for the faculty for that committee. I had thought this had already taken place, but I guess not.”

Senator Romo said, “I’d like to thank the members of both the Academic and Student Affairs Divisions for their hard work. I know that this is a real challenge for all of us. I have a couple of questions. Do you know how many students have been admitted, and of those admitted how many are EOP students? Also, what efforts are we making to get students to take the ELM/EPT tests early so that we can determine the remediation process?” Senator Phillips replied, “We are planning on making the Freshman Orientation Fee the Intent to Enroll Fee, and prior to signing up for orientation, one has to sign up for the ELM/EPT test. As for the number of admits, I did not bring that information with me, but we are following the data in order to determine those kinds of questions very, very soon.”

Senator Kao asked, “If a student is currently a student here, but not from the local area, and they get disqualified will they not be allowed to re-enroll?” Senator Phillips said, “They will have to

apply for the next available term upon completing their program of study. Whatever the admission rules are at that time will be what applies. If they are from out of the local area, they will go onto the prioritized lists and will need to be selected off of those prioritized lists.

B. SJSU's 2008/2009 Budget Report –

Senator Rose Lee, Vice President of Finance and Administration, gave a presentation on SJSU's 2008/2009 budget. (Slides attached)

Senator Lee said, "This is a very unusual year in that we are halfway through and we still don't know the amount of money we are working with. We've had major reductions before, but we have never been at a point where we've had so much uncertainty. As you may know, the Trustee's budget for the next fiscal year has been submitted and normally in January the Governor's budget would come out. I would have to say that with the uncertainty of the 2008/2009 budget, I do not know with how much certainty we can take the Governor's budget, even if it is released on January 10th or 12th, because the starting point for the next fiscal year's budget is the prior year's budget."

Senator Lee said, "I have a powerpoint that summarizes what I am going to say today. I invite you to send questions if there is not time today. I would also like to thank my staff, particularly Becka Paulson."

Senator Lee said, "I am going to refer to page iv. At the time this went to print, we had just found out about the \$33 million reduction to the CSU. We did not have time to make any changes to what I am going to show you. At that time, we did not know whether that was a one-time or base reduction. We did know the amount. Our campus's share of the reduction was r,()].1 e did

The next category is uses of funds. For the category called Mandatory Externally Required, \$19.4 million went out. I don't have that on a powerpoint. I'm not going to go through every single line item, but I do want to point out some important items. The very first one is \$4.3 million that had to be transferred into the salary pool as base. That reflects the general salary increase given to CFA for which we have been given no budget. If you look at the resources above, you can see that the biggest piece of our \$11 million base came from state university fees. The next big item is the \$1.4 million in our benefits pool that reflects a health premium increase. Health premiums increase in January of each year. This base adjustment is for last year's premium increase that became permanent in July. We have another one this January. If health premiums go up again, the campus will have to cover that on a one-time basis.

Next, there was a utility shortfall. We will be tracking utilities very carefully at mid-year. It is hard to tell with gas prices rising as high as \$144 a barrel and then dipping to below \$40 per barrel. There are some other adjustments that I won't spend time on unless someone has some questions.

Next, there are the one-time expenditures. The \$700,000 goes to cover the January 2009 health premium increase. Almost \$2.7 million was for enrollment instructional funding. We knew that when we distributed the \$6 million reduction to the divisions, the Academic Division's share was over \$4 million. In the enrollment information that Senator Phillips showed you, we are required to serve 22,460 resident FTES. We received a reduction of \$6 million to our base, but we did not receive a reduction in our budgeted FTE. We had to backfill the Academic Division \$2.7 million just to serve the budgeted FTE. The next line has the \$5.9 million. That only reflects the salary dollars at the low budgeted rate to meet the over-enrollment. This is the over-enrollment that Senator Phillips referred to as possibly being as high as 14.5%. We don't know what it is going to be right now, and it is possible this number is going to go up. This \$5.9 million does not reflect any benefits cost for the part-time faculty. We are hoping the staff benefits pool has enough money to fund that. We will not get \$5.2 million, so I have already moved \$1.5 million, and we haven't funded the matching benefits to serve the over-enrollment. I'm going to pause here for a minute to see if there are any questions on this \$19.4 million allocated for mandatory. [There were no questions.]

On page 10, the next category is Continuing and Previously Approved. We needed to fund a reserve, and we put in \$900,000. Typically, we put \$2 million in a one-time reserve.

Next, we are in our third year of the Comprehensive Campaign. We allocated \$2.2 million for previously approved projects, e.g. funding development officers.

The next category is Allocations to the Divisions. These funds are for special projects. I believe in the Academic Division it included some non-resident advisors. We have a large number of non-resident students, and we really do owe them advising. There are projects behind each of these. If you need more detail, I can send it to you.

The strategic planning requests are from the University Planning Council (UPC). These projects are listed in footnote A. It is not my intent to go over those today. Dr. Rona Halualani is

preparing some pretty detailed reports and will talk about the accomplishments in each of the UPC projects.

Let me bring you to the Total Sources less Uses. This is very important. That is a negative number there, a negative \$3.3 million. The funding for our over-enrollment, which is \$2.7 million plus the \$5.9 million, is causing this deficit. We cannot spend deficit for the state, so what we are going to have to do is take some of our state university fee that we are collecting from the students and use it for this year. If you look back on the revenue line, the \$4.5 million came from last year. Last year we did not spend our excess state university fee, but this year we will have to, at least up to \$3.3 million. This is a pretty serious budget situation. We have been told by the Chancellor's Office that the \$97 million reduction this year will be permanent, and that in January we will be told to start with a base that is redu

\$42.50 a month in parking fees. All other employee parking fees are governed by bargaining unit agreements. The numbers look high, but parking is a capital intensive program. The thought is that we have always been short of parking on campus. The fees are to build up a fund to do something about parking. The problem is that it is a very slow process. We contribute anywhere from \$.5 to \$.75 million into that fund each year, and that fund has been rolling forward for a number of years. We are hoping to have enough money to build a new parking structure, but right now we don't have enough money, and we are not sure we are going to get there. There is a limit on how much we can increase parking per CFA and CSEA bargaining unit agreements.”

Senator Heiden inquired as to whether we would still be getting a new Student Health Center? Senator Lee said, “As a matter of fact, Senator Phillips reported on this at a prior Senate meeting. We are in the process of planning, and will be building a new Student Health Center. Part of what you see is the saving of student fees for these purposes. Pretty much these are restricted balances.

The next items include the auxiliary funds. The difference between an auxiliary fund and a revenue fund is that an auxiliary is a separate incorporated organization. It is related to the university, but under the law it is a separate organization. We have five of them, and they include Associated Students, Research Foundation, Spartan Shops, the Student Union, and the Tower Foundation. The Tower Foundation balance reflects their endowment fund. The Research Foundation balance reflects their grants and other sponsored projects. We thought it was important to show you the annual budget and what was rolling forward. When you see the CSU and university financial reports you see a lot of money, but all of that money can't be used for operating expenses.

Senator Parrish asked, “Does the balance shown for the Research Foundation include actual or potential funding?” Senator Lee replied, “That number has been adjusted dow

these categories together that gives us the \$486 million operating budget. Again, we took out the \$28 million in financial aid, and our minor and major capital projects.

door is being propped open. Last year a homeless person was found living in one of the labs as a result of building doors being left propped open over the holidays. VP Lee asked Senators to ensure all building doors were closed if they were on campus over the holidays. Departments are encouraged to review which personnel really need the card keys, and to limit access to only those that are required. Senators were reminded that most SJSU buildings are opened by the UPD at 7 a.m. VP Lee noted that Senators should not toss out their metal keys until they were told to do so.

F. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Phillips thanked Senators for their hard work, and wished everyone happy holidays.

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