

ter

Dea

ger, Chin, Parrish,

Stu

: Peddada, Salazar, Solorzano,

**Administrator. Forty-five Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kolodziejak, Sabalius,  
Van Selst  
Absent: Kassing

**Administrative Repres**

Present: Laker, Najjar, Lee, Sel

**ns:**

Present: Merdin  
Stacks

**dents:**

Present: Beilke  
Absent: Starks, Armendariz

**nni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**eritus Representa**

Present: Buzanski

**onorary Senators (No**

Absent: Norton

**G neral Unit Repre**

Present: Kauppila, Lin  
Absent: Peck

**C**

Present: Fee, Schultz  
Absent: Kao, Gonzales

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Nellen, Jian  
Absent: Campsey

**E C Representatives**

Present: Kimbarow, Sm

**E GR Representatives:**

Present: Gleixner, Ba

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Van Hooff, D  
Absent: Mok

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Silber, d'A

**S S Representatives:**

Present: Von Till, H

Alu

Em

Ho

e

tive:

n-Voting):

sentatives:

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**

The Senate voted and the minutes of September 20, 2010 were approved (45-0-4) with the following corrections:

Senators Correia and James Lee were incorrectly marked as absent at the last meeting, and the minutes will be corrected.

Senator Mok requested that her remarks on page 7 be changed to read:

"Senator Mok commented that Dean Toepfer had come to a faculty meeting with the School of Music and Dance (SMD) to explore with them his plan to merge the SMD with the Radio, Television, Video, and Film Department (RTVF). Faculty members expressed their concern at



attendance at this meeting.

- **Executive Committee Report –**

- **Executive Committee Minutes –**

- **September 27, 2010 –**

- this would be a good time to elaborate on items 5 and 6 in the

y

campus. There are many assets in terms of the diversity of the SJSU community, and the kinds of resources available in terms of knowledge, experience, and the types of classes offered." This is why VP Laker was startled to see that we only have a 41% retention rate. VP Laker believes "it is not so much a matter of missing assets as it is one of how we are organizing them. The way that we are organizing ourselves is not getting the outcomes we need." VP Laker believes more engagement will lead to better outcomes.

### **Questions:**

Senator Buzanski asked if VP Laker could assure the Senate that any student ineligible for financial aid, and ineligible for scholarships, would be exempted from the requirement to live in housing. VP Laker responded that he was "not prepared to give a yes to that today."

Senator Buzanski asked VP Laker if he had any idea what percentage of SJSU students have jobs requiring a minimum of 20 hours a week. Senator Buzanski was told that a significant percent of the student body works 40 hours a week. Senator Buzanski commented that, "This explains why our students do not get their degrees in four years." VP Laker responded that the purpose of the appeals committee is to allow every student the opportunity to present their particular situation. VP Laker further commented that, "It is terrible what is happening nowadays that our students have to work so hard, but we also have to do everything we can to help them through. If this policy ultimately helps us to do that then great, and if it doesn't then we should dump it. That will be subject to assessment and evaluation, and should be a living conversation in this body."

Senator Gleixner asked if financial hardship could be added to the list of exemptions, because she felt that some students would be turned off from even applying without it. VP Laker commented, "It is a good point. I just need to make sure that is reflected in the minutes and I'll see to it that that is articulated and that there is some description of what that means."

Senator Sabalius commented that when students get financial aid they are getting a loan, and that by saying that "they can just get financial aid," we are forgetting that they are assuming greater debt. Senator Sabalius suggested that a better way to get more students into student housing is to reduce the cost of housing so there is more demand and it is more competitive with local housing.

Senator Sabalius further commented that one of the major reasons for this requirement is to allow housing to meet their debt obligation, and "this is not such a laudable thing to push this onto the shoulders of the students."

Associated Students recently sent Senator Sabalius a copy of a resolution they passed speaking very strongly against the new housing mandate for two reasons. First, it is a question of access, and secondly it will "disallow SJSU students to self determination." Senator Sabalius stated that he would like for that resolution to be added to the minutes, and he asked AS President Kolodziejak to forward it to the Senate Secretary [correction - should state forward to the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice].

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if it was "legal to exempt people based on marital status

that

Senator Lee inquired if there was an exemption for people based on religion. VP Laker

als

Senator Peter thanked VP Laker for coming and speaking to the Senate about the issue.

ich

as

e

Senator Peter further commented that we could do nothing about this year, but "the normal

in

or in

."

Senator Peter then suggested that "until such time as this becomes a university policy, or a

s

advertising the process so that students know there is an appeals process, and there was further discussion about who would be involved in the appeals process.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chair Kaufman asked Provost Selter to comment on the discussion surrounding the proposed reorganization within the College of Humanities and the Arts that was discussed at the Executive Committee meeting of September 27, 2010.

Provost Selter assured Senators that his office was committed to "allowing the proposed changes to unfold in accordance with university policy, S06-7."

Provost Selter commented, "My general perception of the document [S06-7] that I helped craft, is that it addresses department mergers, department splits, department eliminations, and partial transfers to other departments in a one or two-dimensional fashion, which is fine, because that was all we were thinking about at the time we debated and put together this document. But, in looking at what appears to be happening in the College of Humanities and the Arts, clearly the moves that are being proposed there are three-dimensional, or beyond. There is not one department or school in that college that is not being discussed by the dean in terms of some type of transformation. Nothing is being discussed in terms of elimination.

What happened was that in the summer there was a change in leadership in the School of Art and Design which prompted the dean to have to take certain actions to keep that area in the college running. That seems to have snowballed into a lot of lateral moves in different areas in the college, so Art and Design; Radio, Television, and Film; and Music and Dance all are involved in some moves in terms of splitting and reincorporation and the like. I know there is discussion about English and LLD and World Languages as potential [areas] where changes could take place. I know there are other discussions, and these discussions live largely in the dean's imagination I'm sure. Discussions about, at one time, moving Art and Design into Humanities, and a couple of units back with Philosophy.

Where I'm going to in this is that there is a lot of potential to make some very interesting changes in the College of Humanities and the Arts, and as I look at that, without giving excuses for whether or not we are following the policy, it seems to me if you read the policy it is more than a simple matter to have someone come up with the idea that Art History, for example, should move to Humanities and then the faculty respectively sits down and takes a vote and decides whether that is going to happen or not.

To put that in context with when I was Dean in the College of Science, we split the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science into two departments. It took about a year for the faculty to agree that they wanted to do this, and then it took another year to actually implement it. So, it was never a matter of whether or not we sat down and took a formal vote, although I have to admit that S06-7 wasn't in place at the time that this action was taken, but I think that it is realistic to think that there should be opportunity for the faculties involved in these respective schools and departments to debate seriously the pros and cons and the structural reorganizations—within the context of the structural



Senator Buzanski commented that at the last Senate meeting, that the Provost missed, Senator Parrish offered an explanation that made sense. Senator Parrish noted "that we are under tremendous pressure to effect savings, and that with some kinds of reorganization there might be savings." Senator Buzanski said that the Provost never said anything about that at all, and Senator Buzanski wanted to know "what the real reason behind this is. None of the other deans have even attempted to introduce similar types of reorganization."

Provost Selter responded that there is probably no better college than the college of Humanities and the Arts in which this type of change should be explored. According to Provost Selter, "The structure of the departments in the other colleges is working relatively well." Provost Selter further explained that he has not looked at what the dean wants to do in the college of Humanities and the Arts as a "money saver." In fact, the Provost believes this will probably cost more money. Provost Selter commented, "There are no appreciable savings."

Provost Selter explained, "Our main emphasis right now within Academic Affairs, and I think the President embraces this though I can't talk for him, our number one initiative is student success. In my mind student success, in order to be a viable endeavor of this university, has to be coupled with programmatic quality and this in turn speaks to faculty development. When I talked to Karl [Dean Toepfer] about the actions he was offering for consideration in Humanities and the Arts, I think that, in my estimation, the vast majority of what he wants to do speaks toward ultimately faculty involvement in student success, and the part that doesn't, speaks to operational efficiency but not efficiency in terms of saving money. Not that I'm opposed to saving money, but that is not our first and foremost thought here."

Senator Peter thanked Provost Selter for his openness and commitment to the procedures in the university policy. Senator Peter stated, "While this process is continuing, it is very important that the faculty who could be involved have the perception that the mergers are an open question, and that their input over the course of the year, or however long it is going to be, be genuinely considered by the dean, yourself, and the President. Any action that takes place over that course of time that would create the appearance that the decision has already been made, even if they aren't intended that create that appearance, might tend to demoralize and discourage the faculty. So, there are a couple of things that can happen that perhaps were unintentional that I think may have contributed to some misperceptions. One of which is the appointment of a single chair to chair two separate departments that are in discussion about a possible merger. The second item that happened is the creation of promotional literature which doesn't advertise any department, but which puts a whole variety of programs together and associates them for the purposes of promotion through post cards, and posters, and on a website that was recently removed. Could you, as Provost, do what you can to see that these kinds of things that are happening that would tend to make faculty believe that decisions have already been made, be stopped until such time as the process can continue to its fruition?"

Provost Selter responded, "Certainly, I'll keep an eye out and do what I can. The item that

you mentioned about the chair serving in two departments may not have been articulated in the best manner, but nevertheless was done because there was an emergency and there needed to be somebody in charge of Radio, Television, and Film. Someone had to do that and it turned out that, in my estimation and largely in the dean's estimation, the Director of Music and Dance was a person who could take that under his wing. I saw the promotional materials that you are referring to. They could have gone through an explanation of which units were say firm, and which ones were under discussion. I think that would have defeated the purpose of the materials that were put out there, but your point is very well taken and my understanding is that Music and Dance was trying to do a good turn for the other program. It wasn't meant that way, but I think if perhaps I were in the faculty position now, I would be suspicious, and so we will try to minimize that.

There have been some things that were done that, frankly, shouldn't have been. In particular, I think that Art History was told that they had been reassigned to Humanities, and that certainly was premature, regrettably. When the department did vote that they did not want to do that, the assigning was overturned. We will keep up with it. I will work with the dean to try to keep as much of the unfolding of these possi

enator Parrish clarified Senator Buzanski's summary of his comments from the last Senate

ere

enator Smith commented that all of the speakers had made a point about process.

volved

Even

place

enator Smith commented that he felt all Senators were "kind of saying the same thing,"

enator van Hooff commented that in January she had spoken with the Provost and that he

departments that are supposed to merge with one another. We've had no discussions whatsoever."

Senator Sabalius asked if the committee would consider making VI a little clearer. Senator Sabalius suggested that the clause might be strengthened by saying, "In order to serve one or more subsequent terms the department chair must proceed through the review process and regular nominating and election processes." Senator Sabalius further suggested that there should be clearer language in IV.3. If a department wants to hire a chair, then the nominating and election process would not take place.

Senator Sabalius asked if the committee had considered whether or not to require the committee had

Senator Silber commented that he believed the issue in the spring was that the policy restricted

Senator Gleixner commented that section V.1 was a little vague and asked what was meant by

as

Senator Ng responded that the committee had "an extensive discussion on what the criteria

Senator Ng further commented that the first sentence in Section V.1 where it says, "interim or  
, there

Senator Peter asked in section V if the committee could "clarify the relationship between points  
*st may*

Senator Peter also commented that in the current policy interim appointments are for 6 months

Senator Ng responded that there was not a decision to extend interim appointments to one year. This was a mistake that the committee missed, and the committee will address this.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked why this policy was coming back to the Senate as a first reading instead of a final reading. Senator Ng responded that it was withdrawn in the Spring.

Senator James Lee asked if Senator Ng could explain the rationale for having the RTP committee count the votes. Senator Lee commented that this might prolong the process. Senator Ng responded that, "The committee was looking for a place where the ballots could be counted, somewhat like an election committee only this is for nominations, that was impartial to the current chair or anyone that was running for chair, so the committee settled on having an outside group serve as the counting committee for the nominations, and by using the RTP committee they had a body that was already elected."

Senator Nellen asked if the committee considered having "electronic balloting to make this less labor intensive." Several members of the PS committee commented that this had not been discussed. Senator Jiang responded that they had done this in his department, however, "the rate of participation was very low, less than 1%."

Senator Van Selst asked the committee, "to consider using the dean and one chair from one department in the college to count the votes, or some other committee, because having the RTP Committee count the nominations seems like a misuse of the college RTP Committee. Senator Ng responded that she would take that back to the committee. Senator Backer responded, that "there was a strong feeling last year that faculty should be counting these ballots so that's why, and realize this is only 3 members of the college RTP Committee, and they don't elect chairs

Senator Kimbarow asked if "the intent of that part of the policy recommendation about the RTP

- . **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R)** - No Report.
- . **Organization and Government Committee (O&G)** - No Report.
- . **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA)** –  
*, The Use and Abuse of Alcohol*

Senator James Lee asked what data the statement that "alcohol abuse is a growing problem"

on,

(UPD) had recently given presentations to, and UPD definitely feels that alcohol abuse on campus is a growing concern. Senator Laker also noted that while reviewing the conduct data for the last few years, he saw an increase in the number of cases involving alcohol abuse.

**Debate:**

Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to add a new first whereas clause to read, "Whereas: Society entrusts people of student age to drive a car, to own a credit card, to accumulate student loan debt, and to serve in the military, and thereby considers them citizens who are able to carry immense responsibility; and." The amendment was seconded.

Senator Gleixner explained that there are many students that are old enough to do a number of the things in the Sabalius amendment however, they are not of legal drinking age. Senator Gleixner noted that this amendment would require the committee to rewrite portions of the policy recommendation.

Senator Laker said that he had forwarded the current version of this policy recommendation to the departments under him that deal with alcohol and drug use for review, and all of them were very comfortable with the policy recommendation as it is written. Se

enator Sabalius withdrew his amendment.

**he Senate voted and AS 1441 was approved (45-2-0).**





recommendation had anything different from the Presidential Directive. However, Senator Gleixner commented that the Senate did not have to do what was in the Presidential Directive, they could do what the Senate thinks is right. Senator Gleixner further noted that all of the units were chosen kind of "arbitrarily." However, Senator Gleixner did like the 70 units because it is less arbitrary, and stated that she agreed with that.

Senator Silber asked if he was correct in assuming that the reason we were trying to make it so

Senator Sabalius commented that he understood the logic between the impacted and non-  
ry,  
ts

Senator Peter asked, "Senator Gleixner would the committee consider in 4.4 making an  
jor in  
d

ng  
nits  
a  
units,

. **University Library Board (ULB)** – None

**VII. Special Committee Reports –**

Professor David Mesher, our Academic Council on International

Professor Mesher announced the Wang Family stipend for faculty for short-term research or study in China and Taiwan. This stipend has been given out for eight years now, and San José State University has never won the award. San Francisco State University has won most of them, and Professor Mesher believes it is time we got our share. The award is for short-term research either in China or Taiwan, and the deadline for applications is December 1, 2010. Professor Mesher announced that Senators could go to the CSU website for more information under International Programs.

Professor Mesher announced that Resident Directorships for International Programs have the same deadline of December 1, 2010. Resident Directorships are available in France, Spain, Italy, China, and Japan. Professor Mesher said, "Facility in the language is required, but possibly not native-equivalent." The Resident Director serves for one year. There is a Resident Director Handbook in pdf form and Professor Mesher can send it to Senators that are interested. Contact Professor Mesher for the application forms, etc.

Professor Mesher announced that even with the economic downturn, there has continued to be strong demand for the international programs. For the first two years of the economic downturn, the American dollar actually did better than the Euro, and some of the budget cuts last year were covered for international programs by the favorable exchange rate. Professor Mesher does not believe that will occur this year. However, many of the programs are exchanges where we take a certain number of their students, and they take a r

of the committees and these committees meet several times during the year, where they either interview faculty for the Resident Directorship



Chair Kaufman has invited the subcommittee chairs to the November Senate meeting to give a brief presentation on what they are working on. The Provost is working on getting a website up where draft documents can be reviewed. Senators will be told how to access the website, and where to submit comments. The Provost noted that comments will be very welcomed.

Provost Selter will give an overview of the changes within the Academic Affairs Division at the November Senate meeting.

**D. Vice President for Administration and Finance** – No report.

**E. Vice President for Student Affairs** – No report.

**F. Associated Students President** –

AS President Kolodziejak thanked Senator Sabalius for his comments regarding the AS Resolution against the student housing administrative rule.

**X. Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.