2006/2007 Academic Senate

MINUTES
December 4, 2006

I. **The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. and attendance was taken. Fifty Senators were present.**

Ex Officio:
   Present: Van Selst, Sabalius, Gorman, Lessow-Hurley, Veregge, Kassing
   Absent: Gutierrez

Administrative Representatives:
   Present: Sigler, Najjar, Lee
   Absent: Phillips

Deans:
   Present: Merdinger, Wei, Hegstrom, Stacks

Students:
   Present: Bridgeman, Reyes, Dresher, Patel, Henderson, Sakadjian

Alumni Representative:
   Present: Thompson

Emeritus Representative:
   Present: Buzanski

Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):
   Present: Norton

General Unit Representatives:
   Present: Thames, Griffith

CASA Representatives:
   Present: David, Fee, Perry, Canham
   Absent: Hooper

COB Representatives:
   Present: Campsey, Gehrt, Jiang

ED Represent:
   Present: Rickford, Maldonado-Colon, Parsons

ENG Representatives:
   Present: Meldal, Backer, Gao

H&A Representatives:
   Present: Desalvo, Harris, Belet, Van Hooff, Leddy
   Absent: Vanniarajan

SCI Representatives:
   Present: Bros, McClory, Kaufman, Hamill, Hilliard

SOS Representatives:
   Present: Peter, Hebert, Von Till

II. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes –**
Minutes of November 20, 2006 were approved as amended by Senators Buzanski, Norton, and Hebert.

III. **Communications and Questions –**

A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair Lessow-Hurley said, "If there are no objections, I'd like the President to give his remarks before mine." [President Kassing gave his remarks.]

Chair Lessow-Hurley said, "I'd like to thank Don [President Kassing] for hosting the Senate last night. It was really a lovely event. We appreciate your hospitality.

As you just heard from the President, he has not signed the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policy at this time. I was made aware of that decision at 4 p.m. last Thursday. We had some good conversation about it on Friday, and I'd say the President listened to me very patiently. We also had a good conversation about it today at the Executive Committee meeting. I think the Senate leadership and the administration are going to work to put together a process that will address the concerns that have surfaced. I shared with the President that as Chair of the Senate, my concern here is for relationships and for the governance process. I think we can craft any kind of policy we need on this campus in the proper relationships and with the right kind of processes. I realize that everyone is much overloaded. That was an issue that surfaced in the Executive Committee conversation. The RTP policy involved a tremendous amount of attention to details, and it is a difficult policy to craft and hang together. One of the things I'm finding as Chair is that some of our larger policies that have been crafted on the floor, sometimes have internal contradictions that have to be sorted out. We want to get this one right. We had a lot of conversation about the relevance of the Senate, and one of the ways we are going to make ourselves relevant is to attend to this issue with an enormous amount of attention. As we move forward, everyone is going to have to be carefully and conscientiously engaged. I'm going to ask the Faculty Affairs unit to address all the legal issues that might potentially surface before the policy ever comes to the Senate floor again. I'm further going to ask that the Deans and AVPs that sit as members of the Senate conscientiously bring the issues to the Council of Deans and get their feedback I want to ask that everyone here attend and attend to the debate. As Chair, I'm going to make every effort to see that everyone gets a hearing when the policy is revisited.

On a different note, I'd like to call your attention to issues that are coming forward such as the mandate for *Accessibility of Websites and Instructional Materials.* I'm sure the Provost will share with you the process she as an executive of that process will put in place and we will have a Sense of the Senate Resolution on the floor at the January 29, 2007 meeting to endorse the need for accessibility for persons with disabilities to all instructional materials. The campus conversation on February 7, 2007 is in the planning stages and you will get more information as we get the details in place. We'd really like everyone to attend this conversation on *Access to Excellence.*

I'd like to acknowledge and congratulate Senator Benjamin Henderson. Senator Henderson came to me early in the semester and said he was concerned about student advisement, as we all are, and he was thinking about practical ways to support students that need assistance in navigating their way through the campus. He recently crafted a resolution that was passed by the Associated Students (AS) Board that directs AS to publish a functional map of the campus. I'd like to acknowledge him for that.

I'd also like to thank everyone here for their hard work. Everyone has been so wonderful. I'd like to wish everyone a wonderful holiday season and a joyous and fulfilling new year. I'm looking forward to seeing everyone on January 29, 2007."

Senator Norton said, "I'd like to call the Senate's attention to Appendix B at the back of your Senate handbook entitled *Responsibilities of Academic Senates within the Collective Bargaining Context.* I have various reasons for not being enthusiastic about this document, but the fact remains that it is basically an agreement between the statewide Academic Senate and the Chancellor, and it was endorsed by this campus. If you look at page 4 of the document, section b. it says, "The primary right, sole right, to recommend RTP policy belongs to the faculty represented in the Senate. I suggest that it is unwise that the President should not make every effort to accept the faculty view on RTP policy."

B. From the President of the University –
President Kassing thanked everyone that attended the Senate Christmas party at his house yesterday [Sunday, December 3, 2006].

President Kassing said, "I just have a couple of comments. It looks like the WASC [Western Association of Schools and Colleges] essays are really coming together well.

Also, our football team beat Fresno and they are going to the New Mexico Bowl. The game is on December 23, 2006 at 1:30 p.m., and will be televised on ESPN. The conference puts money forward for our participation in the game, so it's not institutional money. We are taking the cheerleaders and the band with us. Associated Students will be helping us with this and paying for the cheerleaders to go. Our only institutional expense will be paying for the band to go.

We discussed the RTP policy at the Executive Committee meeting today. Judith [Chair Lessow-Hurley] and I have had several conversations about this over the last three weeks. There are some concerns surfacing in a couple of places such as the Professional Development Plan (PDP), and sampling for the University Committee. There are four areas that we still would like to see a little conversation on. I appreciate very much the Executive Committee's effort to listen and give us a chance. They [the four areas] tend to be anchored in some legal concerns and we will articulate those as intensely as needed, so we can get them resolved and get the policy put in action. That is my last comment. I have to catch a 5:00 p.m. plane, because I have a 7:30 a.m. meeting in Long Beach tomorrow morning."

IV. **Executive Committee Report –**

A. **Executive Committee Minutes –**
   November 20, 2006 - None

B. **Consent Calendar –** Approved as is.

C. **Executive Committee Action Items:**
Senator Veregge presented *AS 1343, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring and Thanking Dr. Khaled Hosseini (Final Reading).* **The Senate voted and AS 1343 passed.**

V.   Unfinished Business - None

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

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

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) -
Senator Hebert presented *AS 1345, Policy Recommendation, Amending By-Law 6.7, Policy Recommendations to include Rationale and Estimated Effect on Workload (Final Reading).* Senator Stacks presented an amendment to section   6.7.1 b) to delete "Either" in the first line and replace "or an estimate" after "financial impact," in the 2nd line with "and where possible". Senator Stacks withdrew her amendment. Senator Buzanski made a motion to return the policy to the Organization and Government Committee. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion failed. **The Senate voted and AS 1345 passed.**

C. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA) Committee -
Senator Meldal presented *AS 1344, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of Policies S73-4 and S97-1, Second Baccalaureate Registration Priority (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1344 passed with 2 abstentions.**

D. University Library Board (ULB) - None

E.   Professional Standards Committee (PS) - None

VII.   Special Committee Reports – None

VIII.   New Business –
A. University Budget Presentation
Vice President (VP) Rose Lee presented the 2006-07 Budget Report.

VP Lee said, "I have a powerpoint presentation this year. I selected about 15 pages of critical information to present. First, I'd like to thank Cynthia Haliasz and her staff for putting together the annual report, as they do every year.

Fiscal Year 2006/2007 is the second year under the Governor's 5-year compact. For this fiscal year, the university's total estimated resources are $466 million. About $160 million is state appropriation or public funds. We are increasingly becoming a state-assisted versus a state-funded university. Also, because our 150th Anniversary is coming up, Cynthia looked up our budget 150 years ago and it was $300,000.

The Executive Summary is on page v. Our state appropriation is approximately $160 million and student fees are $88 million. When you combine the two, our total general fund budget is approximately $248 million. This represents a 4.6% increase from the prior year operating budget and nearly $11 million in increased funding.

The first category is mandatory costs. These are costs/programs that we must fund. We have a budgeted FTES [Full Time Equivalent Students] of 23,367. If this number does not look familiar, that is because this is the gross FTES target. Starting with this year, our FTES target has been divided into resident versus non-resident FTES. The target we must meet is resident student target of 22,471 FTES. There is nearly $3.1 million of increased funding for 373 new FTES. In addition, we borrowed 239 FTES from the coming year (2007/2008), bringing our target to 23,606 FTES for this year.

Student fees remained at the 2005/2006 level. There was a state buy-out so that there was not a fee increase for students. The state gave us the equivalent in funding. There has been a change in the way we financially manage our general fund budget. Student fees are now being deposited in trust. This means that we have greater flexibility in the way that we manage our funds, but it doesn't change the amount of funding that we have available. Now, instead of calling it the general fund (since student fees are deposited in trust), we call the budget our CSU [California State University] Operating Fund. This is a combination of the $160 million in state appropriation and the $88 million in revenue that we collect. However, it is still considered the general fund operating budget.

Then, of course, there was rebenching of FTES in that a full FTE for graduate students is now defined as 12 units. It is important to note that this new definition for graduate students did not result in retroactive funding for past graduate FTES. Our funding for 2006/2007 reflects this new definition as well as funding for future fiscal years.

On page 7 are the sources of funds for budget planning for 2006/2007. There are three columns: base, one-time, and a total column. Base funding is permanent funding. One-time funds are typically balances rolled-forward from the prior year. From 2005/2006, we had $2.1 million of unexpended benefits that was rolled forward. The university has been averaging between $1 and $2 million in unexpended benefits every fiscal year. We generate these savings because we don't spend every single dollar of our salary budget. Next line item is roll forward from central accounts. Those of you that were on the Senate last year will recall that the Resource Planning Board (RPB) recommended that we setup a reserve. The $2.3 million base reserve and the $2.3 million one-time reserve represent about 2% of the general fund budget. If that amount is unspent, as it was in 2005/2006, we roll it forward and we make it available for allocation in the following year. In addition, there are some miscellaneous accounts. The total adds up to $6.8 million.

In 2005/2006, we had $3.4 million of base dollars that were not allocated out permanently. This was the fiscal year the legislature gave us unexpected funding for new FTES in August. We allocated the funds out on a one-time basis to meet the enrollment. This means that it was available for allocation in 2006/2007. In addition, any time we feel we have a permanent increase in revenue collections, such as in transcript or other fees, we make a technical adjustment in the revenue budget. We estimated we had approximately $400,000 in excess revenue to schedule, as shown on line 6. On line 7 is the second year of the reduction of Athletics' general fund budget, which is a $750,000 reduction. Line 8 is the increased funding for our new FTES. We

had $3.1 million available to support the 373 new FTES. On line 9, we are expecting about $175,000 in facilities use revenue. Also, International and Extended Studies (IES) had a balance of about $1 million in one-time funds that we put into the budget allocation pot.

For the first time, $1.9 million of the Lottery was categorized as base funding. Since the lottery budget was established, we have been receiving about $2 to $2.3 million each year. The Resource Planning Board (RPB) and other groups reviewed the budget. It was decided that $1.9 million could be allocated out in a permanent way. However, we kept $200,000 as a reserve or for one-time allocation. Line 14 indicates that we had $9.7 million available for this year for base allocation and almost $12 million for one-time.

The next category has to do with mandatory or externally required expenditures. We needed to fund ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] as we need to meet compliance requirements.   There were also unfunded (from the state) compensation increases for Unit 8 that were part of a 3-year contract. The CSU system as a whole has had a police officer vacancy rate of around 15 to 20%. Due to this vacancy rate, salary negotiations with the union resulted in a three year contract that gave salary increases above 3%. In addition, we must fund health premium increases. You'll see this line item every year because health premiums increase in January and the campus must fund six months of premium increases until the following fiscal year. Then, 12 months of funding is provided permanently in the base budget. In addition, we needed funds for other compensation increases because our pool was short.

Let me point out line 23. We are half way through 2006/2007, but the two largest bargaining units, CSUEU [California State University Employees Union] and CFA [California Faculty Association], have not yet settled. CSUEU will be voting sometime this month to ratify an offer from the Chancellor's office.   The negotiated agreement is over three years, and it is over the amount we have been funded for salary increases. For this year we were funded 3.64% for salary increases. The offer to the CFA is also over 3.64% for 2006/2007. If the offer is accepted, the campus needs to come up with the difference.   Our estimation is that the university will have to around $600,000 in compensation above what is available in the compensation pool (3.64%).

The next section starts on line 25, previously approved allocations. Those are items that we've previously approved and therefore we have to continue funding. The first line item is the one-time reserve. We have $2.3 million allocated. Line 27 allocates funds to the Academic Affairs Division to meet the FTES target. Then there is an enrollment reserve for excess FTES that will be rolled forward to 2007/2008 as one-time resources should we not need it for additional FTES. Line 29 shows that we allocated $500,000 for Lottery Faculty Development grants. Lines 30-40 show funding for high priority items. Some of these items include security for the Student Services Center (SSC), and base funding for the Library."

Question:
Senator Henderson asked, "How much money has been allocated for advising? The reason I ask is that I know there are only 8 advisors in the SSC for 29,000 students." VP Lee said, "I don't have that number in front of me. I do know that advising occurs in several different areas/depts.around campus." Note: Need to follow up.

VP Lee said, "On page 8 is a summary of the University Planning Council (UPC) allocations that were made this year. I don't know if we have time to discuss in detail. Under *Enhancing Academic Quality,* there were three categories of allocations including curriculum reinvigoration, enrollment management, and investment in faculty. There are also allocations under *Enriching the Student Experience* and *Improving Our Campus Work Environment and Infrastructure*. We did not address *Strengthening Community Alliances* this year.

On page 12 there is a breakdown of our total 2006/2007 budget by campus organizational division. By far, the Academic Division has the largest share. This is not general fund; this is the total $482 million. The spreadsheets following provide the numbers to generate this pie chart.

On page 14 is a pie chart illustrating the same budget by functional use including scholarship and fellowship, plant operation and maintenance, instructional support, student services, academic support, public service, and instruction."

Question:
Senator Peter said, "On the pie chart you have plant operations and maintenance at 11.1%, but on page 15, line 11, you have operation and maintenance of plant at 12.7%. I don't understand the relationship between the numbers in the pie chart and this." An audience member pointed out that this was a fiscal year 2004-05 comparison.

VP Lee said, "On page 19, you will see the difference between the 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 general fund budgets. We have nearly $11 million of new funding.

I'm not going to spend much time today on pages 21-46. However, I'd really like for you to look at these pages. These are all of our revenue funds such as parking, housing, continuing education, and lottery, followed by a section on the budgets of our auxiliaries. If you have questions, please send them to Cynthia or me.

On page 46 is the Athletic budget. Lines 1 through 5 are the revenue lines. Line 1 indicates the decrease in general fund allocation over the last 2 years. On line 2 are the Student IRA [Instructionally Related Activities] fees that support Athletics."

Question:
Senator Peter said, "First, I'd like to commend the President for getting the general fund support for Athletics under control. I had a question about line 13. I don't understand how we went from $109,035 in 2005, to $1,154,100 this year? That seems odd." VP Lee said, "I don't have the details here." President Kassing said, "That is a good

question, and I noticed it too. I think I know what is going on. This format [the budget report format] is probably 13 or 14 years old, and I don't think it is lining up with how the Athletic Department has to report to the NCAA [National Collegiate Athletic Association]. I think we need to line this up with how the NCAA is requesting the information be reported to them now. I think the categories have slipped around on them and they don't know where to put it." VP Lee said, "Actually, we back into that number. What we do is we fill all the other line items and categorize them, the remaining expendtitures fall into a catch-all category. There are literally 50 to 100 operating expense line items, separated by sport, that we collapse into categories. Note: we'll see if for next year's report we can break it down into NCAA categories. Certainly, what we can do is breakdown that $1,154,100 and if there is a large item in there, we will take it out and identify it separately." President Kassing said, "This format goes back to 1993, and I would suggest that if the Senate is comfortable with a different format than it is [currently] reported in, we could change the format. We hesitated because this is the format that the Senate is familiar with, but it is not working. I think we should bring it into the Senate the same way we report it to the NCAA." Senator Sabalius said, "Maybe for the first two years that you change the format, you could bring it [to the Senate] in both versions." President Kassing said, "Sure."

Senator Sabalius said, "Last year I noticed that the budget went up from about $12 million to $17 million and I asked why the big jump. President Kassing said it was because we had hired a new director and coach, and there was a transition going on so they needed more money. I thought that the high level of funding was only for the one year, but for 2006/2007 the budget is in the same ballpark. Are we to expect that the total Athletic budget will be that high for years to come?" President Kassing said, "Yes, what you are not picking up is line 2 [Student IRA Fees] that is making the difference." Senator Sabalius said, "I like it as long as the general fund is not going over 2%. What I regret is that we prematurely forfeited our [Athletic Department] debt repayment of $3 million last year. If the Athletic Department runs a surplus, which it looks like it may do this year, why can't we cut the general fund to 2% right away?" VP Lee said, "Actually Romey [Senator Sabalius] 2007/2008 is the last year, so we are there." Senator Sabalius said, "It [general fund support for Athletics] is still at 2.3% this year right?" VP Lee said, "That is correct, but with a program this big you can't just drop a big reduction on them at the last minute."

Senator Buzanski asked, "Considering we are having such a good year, why is the projected budget [Athletic Revenue] for 2006/2007 considerably less? VP Lee said, "Sometimes Athletics revenue has all kinds of things in it like corporate donations, etc. I'll have to break that down to see what was there." President Kassing said, "The other thing I would say is that when this budget is presented to Rose [VP Lee] and I, we insist that it is conservative. Your point is a good one. This budget was done is July, so that number has changed." VP Lee said, "There is a lot of variation in the Athletic budget. It is a difficult budget to manage, because you have to project donations and lots of other things."

Senator Buzanski asked, "Do you have a long-term or short-term plan to convert the parking lot North of the Business Tower into a facility of some type? There was some talk about a new humanities building some time ago." VP Lee said, "There are some thoughts about what to put on that location. Let me just say that we have been working very hard on major capital planning. You'll notice we don't have a major capital project for 2006/2007. We put in a request for a Science building, either a renovated building or a new one. We did not get the funding. Building costs have skyrocketed and they have tightened up the process. Basically, they have $300 million system-wide to give out for major capital projects. The competition is fierce. What they are basing all campus requests on is an academic master plan that identifies where the growth will be for about five years by discipline and hegis codes. Until we have such a plan in place, we are not able to substantiate our request for an $80 million science building." In answer to your question, yes, about five or six years ago there was talk about creating a new humanities building." Senator Norton asked, "Who is working on this?" VP Lee said, "Our Capital Planning & Design department is working with VP [Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Budgets] Bill Nance who is coordinating with all the deans."

B. Presentation by Associated Students Executive Director
Cheryl Vargas, Executive Director of Associated Students, gave a presentation.
Ms. Vargas said, "I have been with AS for two months. I started on October 11, 2006. I come from being an Executive Director for non-profits. I have over 20 years of non-profit experience. Most recently I was the Executive Director for the Northwest YMCA in Cupertino for four years. Prior to that I was the Page Mill YMCA Executive Director. I am a San Diego State University Alum. My Baccalaureate degree is in Health Sciences, and my Masters degree is in Public Health. I have a wide variety of experience including athletics, human services, marketing, and public relations.

Within AS there is an operations side which is my focus. There are eight departments, and I have eight managers that report to me. Some of these departments include Transportation Solutions, Budget, the Child Development Center, the Printshop, and the Recreation Department.

For those of you that don't know, the Cheer Team is part of AS and not Athletics. We have worked very diligently with them. There are 24 students on the squad, and 21 of them will be going to the bowl game.

One of our biggest accomplishments in AS has been facilitating and supporting advancement of the wireless program on campus. We are excited about that.

On the government side, I work with the AS government. There are 13 AS board members plus the three Executive Committee board members. We have 13 committees that spin off of that.

We are a $6.4 million auxiliary. We turn that money right around and serve the students on campus through our program expansion.

Most recently in October 2006, we had our one-year celebration of the Tommie Smith and John Carlos statue supporting activism on campus. We continue to strive for that.

One of our upcoming events in September is our AS 55 Awards Ceremony which celebrates the unsung heroes on campus. Nominations and procedures for that will be coming out in the early spring. If know of students that should be recognized, please submit a nomination.

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

    A. Statewide Academic Senator(s) - None
    B. Provost –
Provost Sigler reminded the Senate that the *Access to Excellence* discussion will be held on February 7, 2007, from 11:30 to 1:00 p.m. More information on the event will be distributed in January 2007.

The Educational Effectiveness Report is in its final draft form and is due in the WASC office on December 14, 2006. The WASC visiting team will be at SJSU the first week of March 2007.

Seventy faculty searches have been recommended for the coming year.

The campus plan for making instructional materials available for disabled students has three components. The first is access to the web. The campus will be developing some guidelines to ensure our most popular webpages are accessible. The second component deals with procurement of electronic materials and information technology. Employees from Administration and Finance are attending workshops to learn what they need to do. The third component is instructional materials. The Senate will be involved in developing policy on how to make instructional materials available to students with disabilities. A Sense of the Senate Resolution on this subject will be brought to the Senate at the January 29, 2007 meeting. The library, the bookstore, and the Center for Faculty Development will all need to be involved in this matter. A policy needs to be adopted before the end of the Spring 2007 semester.

    C. VP for Administration and Finance --
VP Lee announced that the Trustees budget for 2007/2008 is out. You can view details on the CSU website. In January the Governor's budget will also be out.

    D. VP for Student Affairs-- None
    E. VP for University Advancement -- None
    F. AS President --
AS has been working on advisor resolution. AS is also trying to setup a meeting with the new mayor. AS wished all Senators a happy holiday season.

X.   **Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.