

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

The campus conversation was a success. Chair Lessow-Hurley is in the process of compiling the responses. The biggest issue reported by the administration, faculty, staff, and students was faculty workload. Senator Meldal will assist in posting a draft of this report as a **wiki** document.

WASC will be here March 7 - 9, 2007. Senators were emailed a summary and the cliff notes version.

notes 0.0005 Tc -0.01(,3 T -19.725 (0 Td(r Lessoaam)gi)-ula5 0 mm)8pliniki 0 heocess of

(ACIP) representative. Chair Lessow-Hurley explained that after selecting Senator Gorman for the position, it became obvious that that there was an extensive time commitment. Therefore, it was decided to split the requi

higher education. There are three components to this system which was put together by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Association for State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The first component is a set of indicators that the university should report on to parents and students, e.g. graduation rates, time to degree, etc. The second component is the value we add to students, or student learning outcomes. And, the third component is the development of attitudes of engagement. One of the instruments suggested for measuring these components includes the collegiate learning assessment which measures the kind of students the CSU is bringing in, and what they look like when they become seniors. Collegiate learning assessment focuses on critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, and argument development. However, this instrument doesn't deal with some of the issues, such as transfer students, and/or the problems 2nd language students have. Another instrument that was suggested is the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) which measures attitudes and student involvement. The CSU is also fortunate to have Senator Jack Scott present legislation at the state level that is related to higher education.

A new office has recently been established called the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research Initiatives and Partnerships. This function of this office is to find out what additional infrastructure campuses may need, and to help faculty connect with others. The focus is on creating partnerships across campuses." The EVC congratulated SJSU on the campus conversation, and is looking forward to getting input from the campuses.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski related some of the concerns the Curriculum and Research Committee has about the requirement to offer the Ed.D. degree in Fall of 2007. Two areas of concern include the lack of funds and qualified faculty to teach this program. SJSU also needs a library with sufficient funds to stock research materials. The Curriculum and Research Committee wants this program be high quality, and they are concerned the development of the program is being rushed. Provost Sigler commented that SJSU had been given a one-year extension on the start date. EVC Reichard assured Senator Buzanski that no campus was being asked to move more quickly than they were ready to move. According to the EVC, if an additional one-year extension is needed, it will be granted. The EVC further explained that "library resources are tied to Senate Bill 724 which does not allow the CSU to alter undergraduate education to establish Ed.D. programs.

The CSU got the Ed.D. in Education, but is required to work with the UC on a joint doctorate in Audiology. The CSU and UC have come up with an affordable 4-year Audiology degree program that would only cost students \$13,000. The fourth year of the degree also includes a paid externship which further reduces the cost. The CSU and UC have been trying to get a marginal

Another doctorate program being considered is in Nursing. The CSU desperately needs enough faculty to teach undergraduate Nursing programs that can meet the state's Nursing demands. Last year, the CSU needed 34 Nursing faculty, compared to 27 for the UC. The CSU has hired a consultant to determine what degrees, other than a Nursing Ph.D., our Nursing departments would be willing to hire, and also to determine what campuses it would be feasible to develop these programs on."

Senator Bridgeman wanted to know if there was "any way to lobby the legislature to cover the cost of tuition increases resulting from budget shortfalls." The EVC noted that "the most effective lobbyists are students." The EVC explained that "the Governor's COMPACT funds enrollment growth and faculty/staff salary increases, and it depends upon the money equivalent to a 10% student fee increase. The student fee increase was avoided last year because the legislature bought it out. This is where student lobbying would be effective. The Governor has not proposed a buy-out for this year."

Senator Norton inquired about "the prospects for faculty workload reduction." The EVC commented that "the CSU needs to develop more online courses to assist in workload reduction. In addition, a recent study in Long Beach showed an average workload of 10.3 units as opposed to 12 units. This was largely due to innovative methods the departments have come up with to assist each other." The EVC does "not believe faculty workload will ever be reduced from 12 to 9 units, because the legislature would then believe the CSU was over funded." The EVC expressed "a need for the CSU to become creative and politically savvy in the way workload issues are addressed."

Chair Lessow-Hurley thanked EVC Reichard for coming and presented him with SJSU's 150th Anniversary coin.

B. Election for Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee

The Associate Vice Chair (AVC), Senator McClory, announced that there was only one nominee for Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee--Senator Kaufman. AVC McClory called for additional nominations from the floor. There were no additional nominees. Senator Buzanski made a motion to close nominations from the floor. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed. Senator Kaufman presented a statement of interest. The Senate voted by secret ballot, and Senator Kaufman was elected unanimously (34-0-0).

VII.

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA) Committee -

Questions:

Senator Buzanski commented that "the Ombudsman is supposed to be a neutral party and help mediate in these situations. There doesn't appear to be a good reason to remove him." Senator Hegstrom explained that "the Ombudsman often steps in on the side of the individual." Senator Meldal further commented that "the Ombudsman Office is supposed to adjudicate fairness issues, and arbitrate. The Academic Integrity policy deals with cheating."

Senator Peter asked how the "new policy would handle a situation in which a student felt he/she was unfairly accused of cheating, but the incident was not reported to the Office of Student Conduct and Ethics." In the past, Senator Peter has referred students to the Ombudsman. Senator Meldal said, "Either the faculty member is in violation of both the old and new policy, or there is no Academic Integrity issue. In which case, it would be a fairness in grading issue which is the Ombudsman's turf." Senator Phillips commented that

Senator Buzanski asked, "Has the committee considered asking SFSU how much they spent on their library? This data could be useful."

Senator Stacks asked for clarification as to whether the analysis of library needs in the first Resolved clause could be the basis for rejecting new programs. Senator Peter said, "Yes, I think we should not create programs that can't be adequately supported."

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) - None

D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) - None

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) -

Senator Hebert presented *AS 1352, Policy Recommendation, Repeal of S00-4, Policies and Procedures for Naming of Colleges, Schools, and Other Academic Entities at San José State University (First Reading)*. The Executive Committee was asked to review the current Naming policy at the January 29, 2007 meeting. Senator Thames and Senator Hebert rewrote the policy in consultation with VP Najjar. Senator Hebert then took the policy to the O&G Committee for review and approval. In addition, Senator Hebert researched how the University of Washington, the University of Minnesota, and Pennsylvania University handled their Naming opportunities. O&G incorporated the best ideas from each of these universities into this revision.

Questions:

Senator Peter asked, "Have you considered expanding (for purposes of these discussions) the Executive Committee to include one or two Senators from the affected academic unit. The Executive Committee won't always have someone on it from the unit being named." Senator Hebert said, "Yes, I did but I decided not to include it at this

needs a little tweaking." Senator Hebert said, "Section 4.3 is really a donor without a donor. To maintain confidentiality, the VP of Advancement is notifying the Executive Committee that there is a prospect who may be interested in this academic entity. A real name is not attached to that prospect until the next step in section 4.4. Section 4.3 is more informational stuff and an opportunity for the Executive Committee to have a clue that these things are coming down the pipeline."

Senator Bros said, "It seems to me that the second sentence in 4.3 about prospective donors is an alternative to 4.3.1, is that an either or situation?" Senator Hebert said, "No, all I was thinking with 4.3 was that if the prospect that the VP of Advancement is talking with, at a stage way earlier than the VP for Advancement ever would have guessed that this person would be interested in a Naming opportunity goes, *Well, how about naming this academic entity after me in exchange for a donation*, then the VP of Advancement would have to notify the Executive Committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting." Senator Bros said, "What I was getting at is that in 4.3.1 you've got an automatic approval process whereas in the previous section, you are requiring the VP of Advancement to get the Executive Committee's approval." Senator Hebert said, "The preapproved list pertains to the academic entity. The prospective donor in 4.3 refers to a person or corporation." Senator Bros asked, "What is the role of 4.3.1?" Senator Hebert said, "What if the Senate wanted to rule out the possibility that Tower Hall would ever be renamed, but it is not on any preapproved list anywhere. That would require explicit approval by the Executive Committee. If on the other hand, it was on this preapproved list, the VP of Advancement would just notify the Executive Committee."

Senator Wei commented that donors are smart, and that they have their own calendars for donations. Sometimes they want to donate right away, for example if there is a merger, or they may wait until year-end for tax purposes. Senators need to keep in mind that this may be a very short time frame." Senator Hebert said, "Under section 4.7.1, it states that "the VP of Advancement is responsible for informing the prospective donor of the Guidelines for Naming (Section 3.0), the types of documentation required, the bodies or offices that must approve of the naming honor and the minimum timeframe required by each body or office to make a decision," and then in 4.7.3 it states that "University officials in contact with the donor should be careful to avoid creating a belief in the donor that any step in the naming proposal approval process is unimportant or a "mere formality." It is the responsibility of the office of Advancement to inform donors that they can't expect to donate \$10 million on Friday and have something named after them on Monday. They need to be informed of the process."

Senator Backer said, "I think what you have done is to streamline the process, but it is still a three-step process and that creates problems. I agree with Senator Hebert about the minimum donation required, but I think the Executive Committee and the faculty really have no awareness of what the right level of a gift should be. This is an unnecessary roadblock or

An email was sent to 30,000 students inviting them to participate in the survey between December 4th and 13th. There were 3,755 surveys returned. Twenty-one students received prizes, the top prize was payment of tuition and fees for one semester. The other twenty prizes included \$100 gift certificates, IPOD shuffles, and parking passes for one semester. The various groups we have made a presentation to include: the Executive Committee, the Associated Students, the Student Union staff, the Student Affairs leadership team, the Peer Mentors, the Orientation Leaders, the Student Housing leaders, the Student Union Board of Directors, the Greek System Presidents, and the Associated Students staff.

The vision for the facilities has three components to it. The first component is the Student Union. The current Student Union is old and isn't the right kind of facility for today's students. The Student Union opened in 1969. The student body has grown a great deal since then. There are many improvements that need to be made to it. The Sport Club and Event Center renovation and expansion is the 2nd component. And, the third component is the Student Health Center. The Student Health Center was built in 1957, and is also very old, and too small for the current student body.

With regard to the Student Union, 11% of the student body does not use the Student Union. That means 89% do use it. That number would increase to 98% if changes are made. The number of minutes per week that students spend in the student union would increase from about 52 to 110. The number one change students would like to see is more study areas. The number two area is food service, the third is appearance and atmosphere of the building, the fourth is more space, the fifth is awareness of activities and programs, and so forth. Let me say at this point that if we do go forward with this project, and certainly we must go forward with some part of the project, the real question is what is the scope that we will go forward with. The next step will be a programmatic study to determine exactly what components go into each of these three projects we are describing. This is the initial survey. We can use this in focus groups in the coming year.

Of those students that live on-campus, 39% exercise exclusively on-campus. Of those students that live off-campus, 57% exercise exclusively off-campus. And, about 15% do not exercise at all. Some students exercise both on and off-campus. Students are interested in more awareness of programs and activities, better equipment, more equipment, evening hours, increased hours throughout the day, and appearance and atmosphere of the building. Forty-eight percent of our student body have an off-campus fitness membership at the present time. This was a big surprise to me. This membership costs them \$288 per year. If we make the changes requested in the Sports Club, the increase in usage will be substantial.

As for the Health Center, students would like to see more variety of services, increased hours of operation, increased quality of services, and easier parking near the building. Some of the services students would like the Health Center to offer include massage therapy, dentistry, optometry, mental health, and acupuncture. At the present time we can't do massage therapy because we have no room. We need additional facilities to do

it. This is something that would be available for faculty and staff as well on a fee basis. The Student Health Center is currently not used by 62% of the student body. That would decrease to only 24% if we make some of the changes students are requesting.

One of the things we were interested in in the survey is if we have to prioritize, what is the top priority project among these three projects. Thirty-three percent of the student body said the Student Union should be the top priority project. However, this percentage is not substantially different from the Sport Club and Student Health Center percentages. You could say roughly one-third wanted each of them as the first priority project. What we are actually considering is going forward with all three projects. That is a very ambitious and bold vision, but we think it will help us a great deal in some of the vision on this campus.

For these projects, there is a total fee increase that would be involved. Before I go into more detail about this, let me comment that the fees collected for instructional purposes cannot be used for these kind of facilities. There are separate fees that have to be levied for these type of projects. The Student Union and the Student Health Center are revenue generating organizations that are run by the state, but have separate fees for their programs.

What we are envisioning is about five years from now, the fee increase would amount to about a \$240 per semester increase. That would be a \$40 per semester increase each year for four years, and an \$80 per semester increase for the fifth year which would be the year these three facilities would open. Between now and then we are considering many options to provide services for students that will be paying for the next four years and not still be here in the fifth year, the year of opening. There are some ways of doing that.

As a reminder, currently 42% of our student body is paying \$288 per year on fitness centers off-campus right now. There will also be some naming opportunities for these facilities as well. We do intend to look at that possibility. Naming opportunities could reduce some of those fees to students.

The Student Union renovation would occur in its current location. I also want to mention that a seismic retrofit would be included. The fifth not a SEB.0003.11.301006 (by) 610744 for Alaska and now

meeting rooms. Club organizations have indicated that they need organization space. The current location of the Event Center might also be able to be enclosed to make a multi-purpose theatre, and there would be more ballroom space. The Recreation Center would be open more hours of the day, have more equipment (including weight lifting equipment), and have more space for martial arts and yoga classes. There would also be an indoor running track. The wellness connection will be associated either with the Sport Center or the Health Center.

The Student Health Center would be very open and inviting with modern exam rooms. It would also have a pharmacy that could adequately serve our students. There is also considerable interest in the Healthy SJSU 2010 project.

On April 20, 2007, there will be a SJSU Day of Service. This is a partnership with San José State University, Communiversity, and the City of San Jose to provide a day of service. Faculty, staff, and students will be working together on all kinds of projects such as painting, and cleanup. We are hoping for 800 volunteers.

Questions:

Chair Lessow-Hurley said, "When we discussed this, we had some conversations about including some kind of accommodations for faculty dining. In a follow-up conversation, I proposed the notion that these facilities might include a dedicated meeting space for the Academic Senate to share with Associated Students to solve some of our technical and acoustical problems." VP Phillips said, "We think that having facilities for dining is a very important component for the community and connections and the learning and belonging model we have in association with Vision 2010. I think there is no question that those type of facilities will be included in the Student Union that we envision here. I also think that having some facilities for this body and Associated Students to meet would be quite appropriate. I do have to say that the needs of the two bodies are different. Nevertheless, I think it is certainly possible to arrange for that facility to accommodate this group."

Senator Bros asked for clarification as to when the new student fee would go into effect, and also asked if the groups VP Phillips has talked to have been receptive to the fee increases. VP Phillips said, "These are facilities students want, and they are willing to step up and pay the piper so to speak."

Senator Peter asked, "How will this increase be approved?" VP Phillips said, "The fee increase is being considered through a consultation process that is taking place right now. The presentation will be made ultimately to the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC) which is scheduled to meet March 16, 2007. By that time, we will have consulted with a number of student organizations. We will also have two town hall meetings. The first is on March 15th at 6:00 p.m. Eventually, it will be decided by the President in consultation with the Chancellor." Senator Peter asked, "So, we are not going to have a campus-wide referendum?" VP Phillips said, "That is correct. This is a large project and we are trying to scope the project." Senator Peter said, "If your survey

data is correct, why not have the election?" VP Phillips said, "If we were to have an election, the most expedient method would be to include it with the Associated Students election on March 20th. We felt that would be a very divisive thing, and inappropriate for the student leaders."

Senator Bridgeman inquired if this was the best time for the fee increase considering the 10% increase students are already facing. VP Phillips said, "Can we afford to wait? It is really going to get costly both in terms of bond and construction costs if we wait. The total construction cost of these three projects is about \$150,000,000. The fee increase supports not only the construction costs but also the soft costs which are the costs of programming design, the architectural drawings, and that sort of thing."

Senator Hebert said, "After five years do the student fees go back down?" VP Phillips said, "No, it would be about 30 years after the bonds are paid off."

Senator Peter said, "Have there been provisions for increasing financial aid to offset the increase in fees." VP Phillips said, "There haven't been any separate provisions put in place, however, the financial aid itself has two components. The first component is the ability to pay, and the second component is the actual cost of education. The fee increase would be included in the actual cost of education." Senator Peter said, "There once was a provision that one-third of all fees would be set aside for financial aid, but I believe the Trustees lifted that." VP Phillips said, "That is correct, they did." Senator Peter said, "So is one-third of the \$240 being set aside for financial aid?" VP Phillips said, "No, this is a separate fee. That is part of the state university fee."

Senator Veregge said, "Was the last student fee increase voted on by students, and along those same lines, when is something considered appropriate for students to vote on?" VP Phillips said, "Executive Order 740 has provisions for two consultation procedures, and the procedure we are using is one of the two identified in the Executive Order."

Senator Gorman asked if there had been any consultation with graduate students. VP Phillips said, "Twenty-five percent of the students that responded to the survey were graduate students. We are talking with a whole variety of students. I don't know that we have any particular graduate organization in our sights. I don't believe there are any." Senator Stacks confirmed the lack of Graduate Student Organizations.

Senator Bros said, "For several years students will be paying for services they can't use. Have you considered partnering with outside agencies to get students what they need during this time?" VP Phillips said, "We have thought about that, and it is something we will be looking at during the programmatic phase."

Senator Bridgeman said, "A good percentage of our students are middle class and many are working two jobs to pay for their education now. A lot of these students don't qualify for financial aid. How do you think this increase is going to affect them?" VP Phillips said, "That is the group of students that will be hit harder than other groups. I don't see any way around that in a plan such as we have in the CSU."

X.