

The Senate welcomed President-elect Mohammad Qayoumi.

Professor Jonathan Roth will be giving a presentation at 2:30 p.m. today on the Veterans to College Program.

The Senate congratulated Senators McClory and Lessow-Hurley for 30 years of service to SJSU.

Chair Kaufman attended the Honors Convocation last Friday evening, and said it was a “wonderful event that honors our high achieving

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

April 25, 2011 –

Senator Van Selst asked what the plan was for the faculty-wide vote referenced in item 3 of the Executive Committee minutes of April 25, 2011. Chair Kaufman responded that the

that members of the PS Committee had found that very few faculty members had students come to their office during established office hours, and that the PS committee did not think class size would pose a problem. In addition, the PS Committee found that the majority of communication between students and faculty was done via email.

Senator Silber commented that he had taught classes of 245 students and even the day before a Chemistry exam, there were very few students coming to office hours. However, Senator Silber did have a lot of questions by email. Senator Silber feels very strongly that 2 physical office hours are more than enough.

Senator James Lee asked if faculty teaching more difficult classes could have more than two physical office hours under this policy recommendation. Senator Ng responded that they could.

Senator James Lee noted that the old policy said that faculty would establish office hours in consultation with the department chair and the new policy recommendation does not. Senator Ng responded that this policy recommendation did say that the faculty member would consult with the department chair in section II.D.

Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that the current policy was passed in 1968 and had not been revisited since then. Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested the committee consider creating a requirement that the policy be revisited every five years.

Senator Starks commented that a previous university he had attended, the faculty had moved to online “chat” hours with students. Senator Starks suggested the committee look into whether this was a possibility for SJSU. Faculty at Senator Starks old college preferred this method of communication.

Senator Buzanski noted that the 1968 Faculty Office Hours Policy was a tremendous improvement over what existed before that, which required all faculty to be at work from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. In addition, office hours were to be held between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., and you were allowed one hour off for lunch.

Senator Kauppila suggested that the committee consider amending section II.D. to say “physical” office hours.

Senator Van Hooff noted that when you reduce the office hours for faculty, you increase the office hours for the chair of the department. This is because if the faculty member is not there, then the student goes to the chair. Senator Van Hooff suggested that the committee consider language that requires the faculty member to be in the office for the duration of the office hours time frame.

Senator Frazier suggested that the committee consider changing section II.D. so that instead of “a more limited schedule of office hours,” it c

Questions:

Senator Gleixner asked the committee to consid

responded, “Certainly.”

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

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1457, Policy Recommendation, Continuous Enrollment Requirement for Report in Progress (RP) Units (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner explained that this was a way of requiring enrollment in some form for students that are working on their thesis.

Questions:

Senator Stacks asked for clarification as to whether the current policy states that students that have signed up for a 299 thesis class and get the RP grade can still enroll for one additional semester before having to pay additional fees. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct and gave the following explanation. The current practice on our campus is that students can miss one semester without having to file a formal leave of absence. Senator Gleixner noted that I&SA Committee members were concerned about whose fault it was that a thesis didn't get completed on time. In some instances it is the reading committee's fault, so this extra semester gives a buffer before blame is put on who was the hurdle.

Senator Van Selst inquired as to whether a student that took a one unit course in the winter, could then take the spring and fall semester off and still be considered continuously enrolled. Senator Gleixner responded that this was not the intent, and the one-unit language was meant to be fall and spring through special session. The reason it is done through special session is to avoid the large 0-6 unit fee. It will overlap spring and fall, so there wouldn't be a requirement for them to register for winter or summer.

Senator Sabalius inquired as to whether the students that enroll have to pay for the other student fees at a fixed rate like the athletics fee. Senator Gleixner responded that through special session they do not. Senator Sabalius asked if they were only paying for their units. Senator Gleixner responded that this was correct.

Senator Stacks asked if there had been dis

working on their thesis. Senator Kauppila commented that the MLK library deals with graduate student access in the summer on a case-by-case basis. Graduate Students just need to contact the library.

Senator Van Selst noted that according to the catalog, continuous enrollment is considered at least one unit per academic year. This resolution is talking about continuous enrollment in a different way that makes it very confusing. Senator Van Selst suggested that the definition of continuous enrollment needed to be strengthened in the policy resolution.

Senator Miller said that number 3 states that “students that enroll in classes with the RP option will be notified by MySJSU of this policy,” and she inquired as to what happens if they don’t receive a grade. Senator Gleixner responded that in this case they would be fine. If they get a grade of some kind in the class then they are done.

Senator Gleixner presented *AS 1459, Policy Recommendation, Freshman Housing Requirement at SJSU (First Reading)*. Senator Gleixner explained that this is the Senate version of the Housing Policy that exists already in the impaction plan.

Questions:

Senator Buzanski asked if the committee would consider changing section III.A. to read, “The Housing Exemption Committee is an administrative agency authorized by the Academic Senate, but not reporting to any Academic Senate committee, but reporting annually to the Academic Senate.” Senator Gleixner said the committee would consider this.

Senator Beilke asked if the committee would consider adding a “parental exemption” under section II.C. Senator Gleixner responded that section II.C. already has an exemption if you are living with your parents.

Senator Laker asked for clarification as to what was meant by “personal principles” in section I.B.2. Senator Gleixner responded that there were people on the committee that strongly felt that they could not regulate adults and felt that if an adult had strong principles against living on campus then they should have a voice and be heard. Senator Frazier, a member of the I&SA Committee, commented that he could not bring himself “to require adult civilians to live anywhere, and therefore this was in the spirit of compromise.”

Senator Heiden asked if the committee would consider further clarifying “personal principles” before bringing it for a final reading.

Senator Lessow-Hurley said that she believed it was a “violation of federal law” to discriminate based on marital status and suggested that the committee consider eliminating this item from II.C. Senator Gleixner responded that the committee had searched the housing policies for other universities and found it was a very common practice to have marital status as an exemption. Senator Lessow-Hurley noted that this did not mean they were not violating the law.

Senator Laker asked what the timeline was for bringing the resolution for a final reading. Senator Gleixner responded that she planned to bring it back in the early fall.

Senator Kimbarow expressed concern about having a cutoff age for making the decision to live in housing, because lots of adult students may want to live off campus and this runs counter to the intent of the policy. Senator Kimbarow asked what the rationale for the cutoff age was. Senator Gleixner responded. The cutoff was inserted because some of the committee members were strongly opposed to requiring students to live in housing, and this was a compromise. At the very least, these committee members felt that these students should be able to have someone hear their argument.

Senator Lin asked if this policy would be implemented in the Fall 2011. Senator Gleixner responded that it would not, but would come for a final reading in the fall.

Senator Buzanski informed the Senate on parlia

the means to deal with this when assigning student housing.

Senator Kauppila suggested the committee consider changing the “troublesome personal principles phrase” to “other reasons.” Senator Gleixner responded that the more help that the committee could give to the appeals committee by specifying categories, the easier it would be for them in the future, but the list wasn’t meant to be a conclusive.

Senator Mansour suggested that students may think that they are not eligible to apply if they don’t see their category listed in the exemptions.

Senator Peter asked how these exemptions differed from those in the current housing policy, and when the Senate would have to approve this resolution to influence the next cycle of admissions. Senator Gleixner responded that that wording in the impaction policy was vague and did not list exemptions. The housing policy itself was approved by the Chancellor’s Office, but not specific exemptions. The difference between this policy and the housing policy is the personal principles, and living with parents exemptions. Everything else is the same. Also, the Exemptions Committee already exists on campus. This resolution just adds a few people.

Senator Gleixner clarified that students that are over 21, or those that graduated from a high school that is within 30 miles of SJSU’s main campus, are exempt from the requirement for all first-time frosh to live in housing.

Senator Kimbarow asked if, under section II.C.2., a majority of students wouldn’t be coming right out of high school and still be living with their parents when they completed the application. If so, how would this policy achieve the objective. Senator Gleixner clarified that there may have been a mistake in language, and that it wasn’t meant to say living with their parents at the time of application, but should say living with their parents in the Fall when they attend college. Senator Kimbarow asked that the committee reconsider this, because he felt the Senate could be setting a policy that would exempt 80% of the students.

Senator Peter asked what would happen if the Senate didn’t pass this resolution by mid Fall 2011. Senator Gleixner responded that if this policy isn’t passed, the existing regulation will continue in effect and even students living with their parents will be forced to live on campus. Senator Gleixner noted that on the positive side, the existing housing policy got very little questions and very few exemptions.

Senator McClory commented that she had two students that didn’t meet the existing exemptions categories, and asked that the committee consider adding additional categories. One student was attending high school in Arizona while living with one parent, but will be attending college here and living with another parent in San Francisco. Senator McClory noted that her concern was that a student living with a parent in San Francisco, or 50/60 miles from campus, would be exempt. Senator Gleixner responded that this was how the current policy was written. Senator McClory suggested that the committee might want to consider adding language that specified the geographical area for the living with a parent exemption.

Senator Heiden asked the committee to consider requiring a student applying for financial hardship to fill out something that can be reviewed. Senator Gleixner responded that this was in the resolution. Senator Heiden added that some parents decide that their child is not eligible and refuse to fill the forms out. Senator Gleixner noted that the clause, “is eligible to apply,” was a result of trying to give undocumented students an avenue to apply for financial hardship.

Senator Lessow-Hurley asked if we are going to be tracking students that do not live on campus, because it would be nice to know if the requirement to live in housing is truly beneficial to students as stated in the second whereas clause. Senator Gleixner commented that campus housing is doing a lot to improve the quality of living in student housing “in terms of campus engagement.” In addition one program, the Center for Engineering Living and Learning (CELL), already has a number of programs such as tutoring in student housing, and they report a 98% retention rate.

Senator James Lee asked if the committee would consider creating a personal issues category that would allow a student to be exempt if living in housing would be detrimental, or would interfere with other students’ success (such as a student that is on probation or parole).

Senator Beilke asked the committee to consider not requiring students to have to fill out a form for financial hardship, because some students might have parents that refuse to fill out the form, such as students with divorced parents, and it could penalize the student. Senator Laker responded that if a student is facing these challenges, there are people on the campus that can and will assist.

VII. Special Committee Reports –

Professor Jonathan Roth gave a presentation on the Vets to College Program.

Professor Roth is Chair of the Veterans Advisory Committee. The Veterans Advisory Committee came about as a result of a recommendation by the Veterans’ Taskforce, and was made a permanent committee under the Student Affairs Division by President Kassing. The Veterans’ Advisory Committee works with both veterans and military students.

The Veterans’ Advisory Committee has been instrumental in a number of projects and programs on campus including a establishing a Veteran Student Organization (VSO) (that is 100 members strong now), creating a Salute to Spartans Newsletter (now in its 3 have.358veterkto consid2.7(in’s)

A study done by the Veterans' Taskforce (President Kassing made The Veterans' Taskforce permanent by establishing the Veterans Advisory Committee) indicated that only half of our student veterans had been screened for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), and of those screened about 30% suffer from PTSD.

Dr. Rona Halualani was the first Chair of the Veteran's Taskforce, and Dr. Halualani came up with the idea to include military students as a diverse group. This made a lot of sense as the military has its own culture, and many of the problems and issues facing military students trying to return to civilian life are similar to those faced by other minority groups.

The Chancellor's Office has also established a program for veterans called, "The CSU Troops to College Program." This program was created to make campuses more military-friendly, and to assist veterans with their return to college. However, like many of our mandates, the CSU Troops to College Program does not have any funding attached to it.

Professor Roth suggested posting signs outside of all faculty classrooms that welcome returning veterans. Professor Roth also noted what a powerful tool art was in helping returning veterans adjust.

Senator Merdinger suggested establishing a Se

