

2009/2010 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
November 16, 2009**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:09 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Kaufman, Lessow-Hurley,
Baker, Van Selst, Meldal
Absent: Whitmore, Sabalius

CASA Representatives:

Present: Fee, Hendrick, Schultz-Krohn, Kao
Absent: Correia

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Phillips, Selter
Absent: Lee, Najjar

COB Representatives:

Present: Campsey, Roldan
Absent: Jiang

Deans:

Present: Parrish, Merdinger
Absent: Bullock, Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Smith
Absent: Kimbarow

Students:

Present: Levy, Armendariz, Montross,
Pulu, Gonzales, Orr

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Gleixner, Backer, Du

Alumni Representative:

Absent: Ferguson

H&A Representatives:

Present: Van Hooff, Butler, Brown, Brada-Williams, Fleck
Absent: Desalvo

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: d'Alarcao, Williams, Silber, McGee
Absent: McClory

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):

Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Fujimoto, Sivertsen, Lin

SOS Representatives:

Present: Ng, Heiden, Lee
Absent: Von Till

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 12, 2009. The Senate voted and the minutes were approved as written with 1 abstention.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kaufman made the following announcements:

Sadly, Ann Lucas, past chair of the Justice Studies Department, passed away after a brief battle with cancer.

A Senate Blog has been created, and is currently in the testing mode. Chair Kaufman is the only person that can post to it at the moment. However, you can submit comments, and you can send items for posting either to the blog, or to Chair Kaufman's email address.

B. From the President of the University –

President Whitmore was not present and no report was given.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Minutes of October 12, 2009 – no questions.

Minutes of October 26, 2009 – no questions.

B. Consent Calendar – A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar. The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as written.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: A motion was made to approve the Election Calendar for 2010. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Election Calendar was approved as written.

V. Unfinished Business - None

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

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

Senator Heiden presented *AS 1426, Senate Management Resolution, Revision to Admissions and Standards Committee Title (First Reading)*. The O&G Committee was given a referral to change the title of the Admissions and Standards Committee to better reflect the function of the committee.

Questions:

it d8(ittee.)TJEMC /P </MCID 31 >>BDC 0 Tc 0 Tw -13.6.resente-1(s entet wr0.000ET/P </MCID 29 >>SDC q2

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

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1424, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Opposition to the Reduction in State Support to the CSU System (First Reading)*. The PS Committee is bringing this resolution back to the Senate for another first reading due to the number of changes recommended at the last Senate meeting.

Questions:

Senator Parrish commented that the fourth whereas clause states that the Board of Trustees was voting on another student fee increase of 10%, and that they were actually asking the state to fund the equivalent of a 10% fee increase.

Senator Backer commented that the resolved clause wasn't in the standard format for resolved clauses. There should be many resolved clauses, and not one long resolved clause. Senator Gleixner commented it was a good point.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if the committee would consider that some of the resolved clauses could be part of the rationale, e.g. the second resolved clause. Senator Gleixner made a note, and said the committee would consider it. This was also brought up in the Executive Committee meeting.

Senator Van Selst wanted to know what the cost would be to send a letter on the implications of the current budget crisis on the CSU to all SJSU alumni, employees, and their families. Senator Gleixner responded that this was a Sense of the Senate Resolution and it didn't require a financial impact statement, but that she had no idea what the actual cost would be. Senator Heiden commented that she remembered a discussion about this, and that it could only be sent via email due to the costs. Chair Kaufman agreed, and noted that Senator Najjar had said there were about 100,000 emails in the database that could be used for this purpose.

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1428, Policy Recommendation, Policy on Late and Retroactive Enrollment (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner commented that this policy recommendation is broken down into two parts. The first part concerns student initiated petitions for adding a class between the add date and the census date. The second part concerns retroactive enrollment which is a departmental meeting a

Senator Butler commented that the second line points out that exceptions will be considered by the Associate Deans of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies, and that this should be enough.

Senator James Lee commented that we don't want students waiting until their fourth or fifth year and then wanting to add classes to five semesters. It needs to be clear that it is one semester, and one time only.

Senator Heiden asked for clarification as to whether it was only one class for one semester, or could it be multiple classes for one semester. Senator Gleixner responded that it could be the entire semester's courses.

Senator Campsey wanted to know if this policy would supersede a department's policy that prohibited adding after the census date. Senator Gleixner commented that a department would still be allowed to prohibit adding after the census date.

Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that a university policy would override department policy and that this should be addressed before the policy is brought back to the Senate for a final reading.

Senator Meldal commented that the department chair has to initiate the anatorle0 Td(yt07ll)9(ent poetiion

disenrolled from” and then “on a space available basis,” so the spot isn’t actually held open and given to another student, and we don’t exceed the enrollment cap as a result of this policy. Senator Gleixner responded that this is all taking place after the add date, so there shouldn’t be any holding of spots for students at this point, but their approval would be based on a space availability.

Senator Gleixner commented that the registrar tracks the reasons given on the add petitions, and there are some valid reasons. However, the vast majority of them are self-reported student errors such as the student forgot, or didn’t pay their credit card. The students that have valid reasons for adding late are a very small percentage of total late adds.

Senator Backer expressed concern that this policy would allow English 1B to be passed with a D-, instead of a C. Typically, students that have problems with English 1B barely pass the WST, and they have repeated problems in their other courses no matter which courses they are. Senator Backer also expressed concern that this policy removes the requirement that students take English 1B prior to taking the 100W, and noted that many problems that are currently found and dealt with in English 1B, will be passed on to the upper division course instructors. Senator Gleixner explained that although the policy is removing the requirement, they are not assuming that most students will try and take 100W before English 1B. Senator Backer noted that in her experience if you remove the requirement, students will wait until their senior year to take it.

Senator Gleixner noted that going from A, B, C, C/NC to A, B, C, D, F grading was strongly recommended by the English Department. The English Department faculty feel that students that are failing midway through English 1B, simply take NC and then retake the class the next semester. I&SA will consider making a requirement, such as passing English 1A with a C or better, a prerequisite for taking English 1B.

Senator Buzanski expressed concern that students will be admitted to upper division courses that require writing skills without having these skills, and suggested that if the 100W classes are too crowded we should deal with that issue rather than using this policy as an alternative.

Senator Kao asked if a student that had not taken English 1B could take R, S, and V classes. Senator Gleixner will add the passage that the WST is still a requirement for both English 1B and R, S, and V classes.

Senator Van Selst expressed concern that we will be pushing students into advanced writing courses that they are not prepared for and suggested that maybe there is a middle ground, e.g. if you fail the WST, you must take 3 units of English, or take English 1B over again, etc.

Senator Brada-Williams highly suggested that I&SA keep English 1B at a "C" or better. Senator Brada-Williams noted that even in her upper division English courses she ends up teaching some of the basic skills again, but it is not at the English 1B level, and she is usually building on what students already have.

Associate ntst ete0 Td28 Tw 9.9L m0.0001 Tcenat

revision could be used to change the Solate and SOTES policy. Senator Backer responded that it could not, and that the current policy does not leave it totally up to the departments. The departments must follow the current CFA contract. Individual departments may choose to vote to assess every class every semester, but that is not the policy under discussion.

Senator Van Hooff wanted to know if this meant temporary faculty could only be evaluated once during the 3-year period. Senator Backer commented that temporary faculty must be evaluated once during the 3-year period, but that they could be evaluated more often if the department, or the employee wanted it.

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) - No report.

VII. Special Committee Reports – No reports

VIII. New Business –

Professor David Mesher and Mr. Dave Rudel gave a short presentation on International Programs.

Professor Mesher is the Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP) representative to the CSU. Professor Mesher informed the Senate that if an international program lasts a year or longer, it is from the CSU, and falls under the Office of International Programs. If the program is less than a year, it falls under Study Abroad.

Professor Mesher passed out a flyer on the Wang Family Award, and the Resident Directorship in China, France, Italy, Japan, and Spain for 2011-2012. The Wang Family Award has not been won by a faculty member at SJSU during the 7 years that the award has been offered, and it is only funded for 10 years. This is primarily because no one has applied. Professor Mesher would like Senators to get the word out to their colleagues. The deadline for applications for both the Resident Director and Wang Award is December 1, 2009.

Resident Directors usually do not teach, except for Japan where they teach 1 class. There is also very little time for research. The Resident Director's time is mainly used to advise students. The faculty members selected as Resident Directors get their regular salary plus 10%. The faculty member's department doesn't just get vacancy rate in return, they get a fee equivalent to the average pay for an Associate Professor, so the department has money to hire someone to replace the recipient. The Resident Director Handbook is an excellent resource for information on the program, and Professor Mesher will forward a copy to anyone that is interested.

Professor Mesher asked the Senate to keep in mind when making policy that some students finish their studies in their major, and then work on their minors abroad. Senator Gleixner noted that the Senate had passed a Priority and Advanced Registration Policy at the October Senate meeting that was directed specifically at the problems of international students. Professor Mesher responded that the problem with priority registration is that international students often do not arrive here until right before the semester begins, and what they really need is the same status for enrollment as graduating seniors.

Mr. Rudel clarified that there are degree-seeking international students and then there are exchange students. The exchange students are under reciprocal exchange agreements that we have signed with institutions abroad. These students do not represent an increase in our enrollment. Our student pays the fees here and they go abroad, and the exchange student pays the fees abroad and comes here. The exchange programs allow our students to go to very expensive institutions abroad while paying state rates. The one program that has been suspended for at least a year or two is exchanges with Australia and New Zealand. Although we have many students that want to go there, there aren't many students from Australia and New Zealand that want to come here.

Senator Van Selst wanted to know where a student coming here from abroad would get his/her transcripts evaluated. Mr. Rudel commented that the evaluators in Enrollment and Academic Services evaluate the transcripts. Senator Van Hooff commented that they often receive requests from the evaluators in Admissions and Records to assist in translating transcripts.

Senator Butler asked for clarification about the restriction on exchange students coming and going to/from Australia and New Zealand. Professor Mesher noted that students from Australia and New Zealand can still come here, but our students cannot go there until we get in balance. This will probably take 2 years.

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

A. Vice President for University Advancement – No report.

B. CSU Statewide Senators –

CSU Statewide Senators Lessow-Hurley and Van Selst gave the following report. Senator Van Selst will send out the written report on the CSU Statewide Senate meeting last week as soon as he gets it. Several resolutions/issues were discussed at that meeting as follows:

The CSU Provosts met last week and the issue of the Faculty Trustee was on their agenda. The Trustees and the Chancellor's Office have repeatedly contacted the Governor's Office to find out when we will have an appointment, but they have not been able to get a reply.

Within a few weeks of Provost Selter taking over the Office of the Provost this summer, it was determined that there would be a 20% fee increase for students, there would be employee furloughs in all the bargaining units except for one, and the university would receive a base budget reduction of \$42 million, plus another \$2 million in mandated health care costs. We received a \$7 million base budget reduction. This translated into a \$4.06 million base budget reduction for the Academic Affairs Division.

Approximately half of the \$35 million shortfall that remained was mitigated by the increase in student fees. Another \$17 million was taken from the salary savings from the furlough program. In the Academic Affairs Division, we have enough money to operate this year.

Another part of the situation is our enrollment target. For the first time the Provost can remember, we had a cap put on our enrollment. Our California resident target was 22,460 FTES. The Provost was told in no uncertain terms, that we were not to go over that target. We were also given a target of 1,239 FTES for non-resident students by the Chancellor's Office.

temporary faculty. They were then asked to try to determine what sections would be offered in this scenario, and how many FTES would be generated. The Provost promised to report on this at the last Senate meeting. However, not all the data was reported in the same way. The best the Provost can do is estimate that about 50% of our enrollment could be taught. This is, of course, unacceptable.

For this year, since we know the amount of money that it costs per FTE to pay our regular faculty and temporary faculty per college, we can estimate how much it is going to cost us for spring to come in on target. We are going to have that amount of money in the Academic Affairs Division. The deans have been allocated the same base funding levels that they were last year, minus the reduction we took of \$4 million. The Provost is

a

more oftening

ty awincer abudtarehay f1,239getTt the ProvoTES

Next year there will be no stimulus money, and assuming there are no furloughs, we won't have enough money to hire the number of temporary faculty we need. That is what we are working on now.

discussions yet about how we are going to increase our graduation rates. However, most of the Provosts would agree that the first place to focus on is improving advising. None of the Provosts were against the initiative to increase graduation rates. However, there is widespread concern about how we are going to fund this. The Provost commented that this is yet another unfunded mandate, which is very troublesome. It doesn't make sense to have to consider reducing the work force, while at the same time being given a mandate to increase graduation rates. However, there was a hint at the last Provost meeting that the CSU may be considering some type of funding for this initiative. Chair Kaufman commented that given the 2015 deadline, and the fact that the class of 2015 will be starting this fall, we had better get money fast. Provost Selter agreed this was a