

**2003/2004 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
May10, 2004**

- I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty Senators were present.**

message they had for us was that we really needed to be spending our time with the Governor, because they said the local legislators really do understand the CSU budget crisis. It is the Governor that needs to hear from us more. We will be following-up on that.

Also, on May 5, 2004, Greg Wolcott, Monica Rascoe, Arash Shokouh, and myself held an orientation for the incoming Associated Students Board of Directors and Officers. The orientation went very well. The students were very interested in learning about the Senate committees, and what they had gotten themselves into by being elected. I am hoping that by having the outreach so early in the year, we will see almost all of our student senators at the first meeting of the 2004/2005 Academic Senate next week. We will continue to have discussions with them monthly so we can address any questions they have about the university, about committee service, etc. We hope this will get more students participating in our activities here. I also discovered in the Associated Students by-laws, that some of the Associated Students Board members are assigned to sit on up to four Senate committees. I will also be working with Rachel Greathouse and Greg Wolcott to get that changed, because that is setting them up for failure.

If you are thinking of chairing a policy committee next year, becoming Senate Secretary/Chair of Committee on Committees, or running for the Faculty-at-Large position

technology in the \$14, along with some special collections assistance. CFAC, the President's Interns, and the student members of the Univ

making these issues into things that damage the university as a whole. These are the most important things to keep in mind. It is very easy in the heat of the moment to overstate some things, and to overact, which can cause damage unintentionally to the institution as a whole.

Among the strengths I hope I carry with me are one—a strong faculty background. To coin a phrase, I feel your pain. I really do understand and share the same values you do. My second strength is that I have only one agenda. The agenda is to make SJSU as strong and proud as I can. I don't have any other agenda. I think that my job will be fairly easy. The difficult part will be to convince everybody else that I really mean that."

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**April 12, 2004** – No questions.

**April 19, 2004** – No questions.

**B. Budget Advisory Committee Minutes – None**

**C. Consent Calendar – None**

**D. Executive Committee Action Items –**

Senator Katz presented

for the Executive Committee.

Senator Buzanski proposed a friendly amendment to include an additional whereas clause stating that Senator Crowley has been most instrumental in creating a new fundraising foundation. Chair Nellen will get specific language from VP Ashton.

Senators Veregge and Lessow-Hurley presented

Senator Lessow-Hurley said, "I would like to begin by giving you a little history about this resolution. You will recall that the Senate's role in budgetary matters for some years was accorded to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). The issues the BAC dealt with were largely budget priority items that would be funded from lottery funds. In the course of some discussion at the Senate retreat, we were made aware of a budget process/document that emanated from Long Beach, that I

budget. This is a very complex campus with lo

are really moving along." Senator Katz said, "For those of us that are not budget experts, in the early stages getting piece by piece by piece of the budget was quite confusing. We were also sworn not to talk about anything involving possible faculty cuts. Only once we got a sense of the whole, could we get down to business. So, we really couldn't get down to business until May. The other thing I feel is very, very positive is that there has been a commitment between the Administrators to do everything possible not to cut into the instructional academic budget." Senator Veregg

"Scheduling Office Hours" section to read, "As a general rule for Unit 3 teaching faculty, one hour of office hours per week for every three WTU of teaching courses is adequate." **The Senate voted and the Branz amendment passed.** Senator Sabalius presented an amendment to remove the last sentence of the paragraph under the section "Absence" that reads, "When scheduled office hours must be cancelled, faculty members should provide other office hours, at a designated time, by email, or by appointment." **The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment passed.** Senator Shokouh presented an amendment to remove the last line of the "Online Consultation" section that reads, "If it serves students' needs, faculty members, who teach courses other than online courses, may designate up to fifty percent of regular office hours for on-line consultation." **The Senate voted and the Shokouh amendment passed.** Senator Branz presented an amendment to change the 3rd paragraph, 2nd line, under the section "Scheduling Office Hours" to read, "A faculty member who serves as a program coordinator (or director) or a department chair (or school director) is expected to schedule additional office hours, by appointment, for consultation of students on the matters not related to the courses he/she teaches." The Senate voted and the Branz amendment failed. Senator Brent presented an amendment to add a new 2nd paragraph under the section "Scheduling Office Hours" that reads, "Regardless of how many WTUs they teach all full-time faculty will hold at least 2 hours of in person office hours per week." **The Senate voted and the Brent Amendment passed. Senator Donoho presented a friendly amendment** to change the "Online Consultation" section, 1st line to read, "Faculty

leadership is largely determined by who sits around the table. I have had the good fortune to have some very good people on the Professional Standards Committee. I would like to acknowledge them—Senators David McNeil, Nancy Stork, Ram Singh, and Swathi Vanniarajan. We also had a subcommittee that worked specifically on RTP. I would like to acknowledge them also—Joan Merdinger, Peter Lee, Senator Abdel El-Shaieb (who is chair of that subcommittee), Senator Shannon Bros, Michael Gorman, and Senator Debra David. This subcommittee has held about five forums, and has put an extensive amount of time into RTP. Please join me in expressing your appreciation for the work of this Professional Standards Committee."

Senator Bros said, "What I wanted to talk to you about today is proposed changes to the RTP. Over the past year, under the direction of Senator Katz, we have tackled RTP. We have collected a lot of information on this process. We got some information from previous committees, and we also conducted several different forums. We conducted them with the Council of Chairs, the College RTP Committees, the Council of Deans, the current University RTP, and also the Academic Senate. We asked two questions at these forums. What are your concerns with the RTP process? What are your feelings about the documentation that goes along with RTP? We got a lot of results, but I'm just going to share some of the top concerns.

One of the major concerns was that the needs of the departments and colleges were too diverse for a one-size-fits-all model. A lot of people felt that decisions about RTP should be made at the department or college level. Most people felt there was way too much documentation involved in the process, and that the standards in use are currently ambiguous. Everyone felt that the Peer Review process was inadequa



open, a lot more people are involved, and it is done every year.

We are proposing that the Performance Reviews are done on the 3rd and 6th years, instead of the 2nd and 4th years. The kinds of information that would be needed to meet standards in this process would be the Professional Development Plan, with comments from the Dean and department RTP Committee, the contract, and any support materials. Other than that, the system would be very similar to what it is now. It would go to the department RTP, the Chair, the College RTP, the Dean, and eventually the President and the Provost. Also, any candidate, at any review level, can request a performance review at any other year.

One of the things that we have decided to do with this is change the role of the University RTP Committee. This is another big proposal. What we have decided to do when we undergo a performance review is if there is a "no" recommendation from any performance level, the University RTP Committee will act as the body to resolve the dispute.

The ideas that are different from what we have now are that the current review period is the 2nd, 4th, and 6th years, and we are proposing only two reviews. The criteria are one of the

**VIII. New Business – None**

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

- A. Associated Students President – moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.**
- B. Statewide Academic Senators – moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.**
- C. Provost – moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.**
- D. Vice President for Administration – moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.**
- E. Vice President for Student Affairs – moved to the next meeting due to lack of time.**

**X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.**