

**2007/2008 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
May 5, 2008**

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Van Selst, Lessow-Hurley,  
Kassing, Henderson  
Absent: Gorman, Sabalius

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Sigler, Najjar  
Absent: Phillips, Lee

**Deans:**

Present: Parrish, Merdinger, Stacks,  
Wei

**Students:**

Present: Reyes, Grabowski  
Bridgeman, Castillo  
Absent: Lazarowich, Zeier

**Alumni Representative:**

Absent: Thompson

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Present: Norton

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Sivertsen  
Absent: Romo, Liu

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Fee, Schultz-Krohn, Hendrick, Kao, Canham

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Roldan, Jiang  
Absent: Campsey

**ED Represent:**

Present: Maldonado-Colon, Rickford, Langdon

**ENG Representatives:**

Present: Backer, Meldal  
Absent: Gao

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Desalvo, Van Hooff, Belet, Butler  
Absent: Mok, Vanniarajan

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: McClory, Bros, Kaufman  
Absent: Hilliard

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Hebert, Von Till  
Absent: Zia

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes – The minutes of April 14, 2008 were approved as is.**

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Lessow-Hurley made the following announcements:

Three Presidential candidates will be on campus this week. Open forums will be held on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at 10:30 a.m. in Engineering 189. The Chair encouraged Senators to attend, and to get their feedback to an Advisory Committee member via email. Email contact information for all the Advisory Committee members will be sent out this afternoon.

Dean Belle Wei was congratulated for receiving the Don Beall endowed Deanship for the College of Engineering.

Chair Lessow-Hurley attended the forensic team debate about the suspension of blood drives at SJSU. There were several hundred people there, and it was an impressive event.

Associated Students were in Sacramento protesting the impact of the budget cuts on the CSU in late April.

The campus had a very successful Day of Service on April 25, 2008.

Dr. Halualani will be presenting a Goals Advisory Report to the Senate at 4:00 p.m. today. She will be arriving on a plane from London and coming straight to the Senate for her presentation. The Senate will break whenever she gets here to allow her to give her report. The Goals Advisory Committee (GAC) selected three goals that were approved by President Kassing. They include improving retention and graduation with an emphasis on improving advising structures and practices, faculty excellence towards student success, and internationalizing SJSU.

The Chair announced that AS 1393 would not be coming forward as indicated on today's agenda.

## **B. From the President of the University –**

President Kassing made the following announcements:

The budget discussions continue with some uncertainty. We should have the May revise in a few days.

The President thanked Senators for participating in the campus efforts to communicate our concerns about the budget. The President particularly praised Associated Students for their efforts in this regard.

This is an important week with the Presidential candidates being on campus. The President thanked Chair Lessow-Hurley, Vice President Najjar, Senator Peter, Annette Nellen and those that participated on the Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees for the Selection of the President.

The President announced that he would have to leave early, because he is hosting the candidates at his house this evening.

The GAC took a hard look at what we learned from WASC, our own experience, and came up with the three goals. They will make a wonderful platform for the work ahead.

About 1,100 people participated in the Day of Service on April 25, 2008. All of us should be very proud to be a member of this university. This is a strong reflection of who we are and what we are about.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**April 14, 2008** – Senator Norton asked in what capacity Senator Von Till attended the Executive Committee meeting. Chair Lessow-Hurley commented that she is the Faculty-at-Large Representative elected by the Senate to the Executive Committee, because there is no Past Chair this year.

**B. Consent Calendar – None**

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Chair Lessow-Hurley presented *AS 1388, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing our Appreciation of Don W. Kassing (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1388 was approved unanimously.**

**V. Unfinished Business - None**

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

**A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None**

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

**C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

Senator Bros presented *AS 1392, Policy Recommendation, Developing Values (Norms) for the Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Surveys for Use in Periodic and Performance Evaluations (First Reading)*. Senator Bros said, “This policy recommendation is to take care of an issue that arose when we rescinded S03-3. The issue was that we no longer have a policy for norming. Some of the issues have been that the faculty absolutely have to have a say in what instruments are used for norming. What we have done is work with the CFA and Faculty Affairs to come up with a procedure that would allow us to collect this important norming data, but still allow faculty the choice.”

**Questions:**

Senator Van Selst asked, “In 2.3 the second to the last line where it says, “Results from these specific SOTEs shall be available only to individuals associated with the computation of norms,” presumably the intent of the committee was not to overrule prior academic votes on

universal SOTES for those departments and colleges that use them?” Senator Bros said, “Correct, these are the ones that are being sent directly to the departments. Only those SOTES that are not normally selected for use in the performance and periodic review are the ones that would be sent directly to the Office of Institutional Research.”

Senator Hebert asked, “Why the middle 60%? This tends to bias department, college, and university norms upwards. Why are we doing this rather than using all the scores?” Senator Bros said, “I think the idea behind using the middle 60% is to provide some kind of error bar to understand what the variability is within in that college or department.” Senator Hebert said, “Yes, but there are other ways to calculate the error bar without throwing 40% of the data out. It makes me nervous when we thrown data out, especially when it will systematically bias the results.” Senator Bros said, “I can’t tell you why the Office of Institutional Research decided to use this particular metric. That wasn’t our issue that is just the way it is right now.” Senator Jiang said, “Actually, we are not throwing data out, the wording is not that clear.” Senator Bros said, “The 60% is the range around the average.”

Senator Peter asked, “In the event that some departments elect to norm and others don’t, the date of the last norm may be different for some departments. Is that correct?” Senator Bros said, “For that department, yes.” Senator Peter said, “Then I would suggest that on the SOTES in the future it state when that department last normed itself so that people would know what the data means.”

Senator Kaufman asked, “Do you have any idea what participation might be?” Senator Bros said, “For departments to opt out of this is actually to their detriment. What will happen is that if large scores are left out the averages will go up, so the standards for their faculty will be less. Plus, they will not have any averages or norms for their department. What we would like to do is let people know that backing out of the norming process is not in their best interests. The percentage right now is about 92%.”

Senator Hebert asked, “It says the SOTE instrument shall be administered for courses that were not selected by faculty for periodic and performance evaluations.” This semester I asked for two of my courses to go into my file. However, I thought that we had been using SOTES in all the courses, so what SOTES would be administered other than those requested for faculty performance review?” Senator Bros said, “All of them. Some departments have voted that all of their SOTES will be used for norming, but that is not true for all departments. That means that for those individuals that only have SOTES for two classes a year, the rest of the SOTES from all the other classes they teach would go directly to the Office of Institutional Research. They would never see them.” Senator Hebert said, “In my case none of them would be used in the norm.” Senator Bros said, “The last sentence says, “all SOTES collected for the norming semester will be used for computing norms.”

Senator Van Selst said, “Is there anything that would prevent the Freedom of Information Act from yielding these SOTES for all classes?” Senator Bros said, “I’m not sure who you mean yielding them to?” Senator Van Selst said, “Anyone that asks.” Senator Bros said, “Right now, as I understand it, the information you get is not considered confidential. It goes in your dossier, correct? I’m not sure why the Freedom of Information Act would

apply. I just a little confused about your question?”

Senator Meldal said, “Current thinking is to strip all personal data from the file, so that in the end there is no way to get back from the data to the person.”

Senator Kaufman asked, “If only one person is teaching a class that semester and that is the norming semester, couldn’t you go back and identify who taught the course.” Senator Meldal said, “The intent is to strip the data to the point that cannot occur any more, so class numbers are unlikely to survive the stripping.”

Senator Van Selst said, “Could I suggest that the committee consider adding another resolved clause to that effect.”

Senator Schultz-Krohn said, “I’m curious, if there is a faculty member that is trying to collect a sufficient number of SOTEs over a period of time could they still use that data during the norming semester?” Senator Bros said, “Yes, what we didn’t want to have happen was for people to forget their SOTEs and then do all the classes and look through them and pick their best groups. We didn’t want to encourage that procedure. The idea is that the process happen as usual where the faculty and/or department decide which SOTEs are appropriate for RTP, and then any other classes would go directly for norming and wouldn’t be used for any other purpose.”

Senator Canham made a motion to make the resolution a final reading. The Senate voted and the motion failed.

#### **D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1385, Policy Recommendation, Incorporating Accessibility into the Curriculum Review Process (First Reading)*. Senator Peter made a friendly amendment to change the 4<sup>th</sup> Resolved clause to read, “that the University recognize that the success of the efforts covered by this resolution can only be assured if substantial financial resources are provided by the University. Chairs, Deans and University administration shall support faculty during the semester in which a course is being made accessible by providing resources in the form of student assistants, assigned time, and/or realignment of the faculty member’s service responsibilities.” **The Senate voted and AS 1385 was approved as amended with 3 Nays and no Abstentions.**

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1390, Policy Recommendation, Mandatory First-Year Experience (FYE) Course to Supersede S04-2 (First Reading)*. Senator Kaufman said, “This is a first reading of a policy resolution that was brought to C&R. The idea is to institute a mandatory first-year experience course for all incoming true freshmen. Each of those freshmen would have to take a course during their first semester here that satisfies one of the five core GE areas, and at the same time that course would satisfy the requirements of first-year experience. If you look in the guidelines on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page, you’ll see what the learning outcomes envision for the first-year experience courses. I summarized what some of the five learning objectives are for the student, such as why am I here? How do I get through? What is my plan for doing so? How do I find my way around? And, it is good to

interact with people.”

**Questions:**

Senator Backer asked, “Why is this restricted to just general education courses? There are many courses that exist for the major that could also serve as first-year experience courses.” Debra David (Associate Dean for the First-Year Experience Program) said, “Let me clarify why the decision was made not to include courses in the major. Research on first-year experience seminars has compared courses that emphasize disciplinary content and courses that emphasize the learning objectives here, specifically around academic success. They find that courses that are discipline-specific do not have the same positive impact.” Senator Backer said, “In the College of Engineering, we have an introductory course for Engineering students that has a higher retention rate than MUSE or Science courses. At least for us, that is not true. My second question is that it says on the resolution that there is no financial impact, and that there are only 20 students in the class. What is your take on that?” Senator Kaufman said, “I agree with you on that. Taking into account faculty workload, it is going to have an impact.” Senator Backer said, “Why are teaching assistants not allowed to be directors for these seminars?” Senator Kaufman said, “As I understand it, direct contact with the faculty member is one of the things that shows up in the research as being beneficial for first-year students.”

Senator Norton asked, “Is this a Senate committee that you are creating?” Senator Kaufman said, “You mean the First-Year Experience Oversight Committee?” Senator Norton said, “Yes.” Senator Kaufman said, “It is an administrative committee.”

Senator Bros asked, “What data do we have on the current success of the MUSE program in terms of meeting these objectives?” Debra David said, “The current data indicates a 3% increase on average in retention rate from those students that do not take a MUSE class. At other institutions that have had first-year seminars in place longer than ours the average retention rate is between 5% and 15%. We have not had a lot of uniformity in our first-year experience courses. This would increase the uniformity, so I would hope that this would increase the retention rates. That calls for an evaluation.”

Senator Hebert said, “Does the last resolved clause mean all departments must develop a course?” Senator Kaufman said, “It does not.”

Senator Rickford said, “I think it is critical to have really detailed data on the MUSE courses and the potential of these kinds of courses. I was curious about the 3%. Is that a significant amount? What kind of students does that 3% apply to, and are these students really the ones that we are really concerned about? I think there needs to be a lot more data revealed before we move forward on this.” Debra David said, “In terms of who is affected, the MUSE classes are open to the general student population. We don’t know for sure, but we think it is a random cross-section of the student population. In terms of what period of time, I looked at first-year to second-year, and second-year through however long the student had been here, and the 3% average holds from first-year to second-year, and each year thereafter.”

Senator Wei said, “We probably don’t want to dictate how each department or college accomplishes the objectives here. I just have to emphasize that in order to do a good job this will require lots of resources and a sense of ownership.”

Senator Meldal said, “Would the committee consider unlinking this from the general education disciplines and have broader learning objectives as the criteria for approval of first-year experience?” Senator Kaufman said, “This is a first reading and the committee will consider anything.”

Senator Peter said, “Among those things to consider are the place of American Institutions requirements which are not technically general education, and might or might not fit this rubric. The other question again is resources. When I mentioned this to my department chair, this was his first concern. The question is what kind of incentives or mechanisms will be in place to reward departments that offer the multiple twenty-student sections that will be required to make this happen? Also, I believe there are substantial resources to do that now with the existing programming and the departments would willingly teach the multiple twenty-student sections if the rewards were there. The rewards are critical to making this work.” AVP Cooper said, “Just a quick response to the resource issue. As some of you may remember when first-year courses started there were extra funds added. The way it was funded this year is the average cost per FTES for the whole university, so a twenty person class has 1.7 FTES, and the average funding per FTES to the colleges is about \$3,800, so it is revenue neutral with respect to FTES cost across the whole university. In regard to the question about the American Institutions classes, the concern was that the American Institutions classes are mostly joined with the Social Sciences general education areas. However, there are a couple that are not, and that is an interesting idea. The concern was that there are too many learning objectives already, and to add any additional ones would be really challenging.”

Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “I am thinking that when we have so many unfunded mandates, we might need some data as to who it is that takes the MUSE courses. Are these students that are already successful? Could we get data on this?” AVP Cooper said, “We looked at both ethnicity and the need for remediation. Initially it appeared that the FYE classes were more effective for those students that needed remediation than those that did not. I would argue that that effect seems to be washing out somewhat. I’m not sure it is more effective for the students at risk than for other students, but it is at least as effective for students at risk as for other students.”

Senator Hebert said, “Can transfer students enroll in these courses?” Senator Kaufman said, “No.”

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1391, Policy Recommendation, Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects, Rescinds F90-4 (First Reading)*. Senator Kaufman said, “The original policy this is meant to replace is F90-4, and it has been 18 years since that policy was implemented. It has been almost a year since the IRB Task Force gave us its recommendations for changes to the policy, and I am happy we’re able to bring it to the floor today. The policy is about 20 pages long and is attached to the back of the whereas clauses.

I'd like to thank the IRB Task Force that took nearly two years putting together this policy. It has significant changes from F90-4, which is why F90-4 isn't attached for comparison."

### **Questions:**

Senator Bros said, "There is a part of B1 that is underlined that says "but should be registered with the IRB," why is that and how will that information be used?" Senator Kaufman said, "This serves as a reminder that if you involve humans in a study, even under an exempt category, it still needs to be registered." Senator Stacks commented, "The Principal Investigator (PI) may think their work is exempt but the IRB will tell them for sure."

Senator Hebert said, "Exclusion from IRB Review comes up in two places, but we are never told what that means." Senator Kaufman said, "I'm assuming you are under "Protocol Review." Senator Hebert said, "Under the Policy Review." Senator Kaufman said, "This just reiterates the point that Senator Stacks just made that exemption is not the same as exclusion. Even if the research is considered exempt it doesn't mean it can avoid being reviewed. The IRB Panel must deem it exempt." Senator Hebert said, "There is an exemption category, but then we have this exclusion." Senator Kaufman said, "I believe it just means that there is a difference between it being listed as exempt and you being excluded from having to have that verified." Senator Hebert said, "So, would anything be excluded?" Senator Kaufman said, "No, and I think that is the point of the statement which says it may be exempt, but that doesn't mean it is excluded." Senator Hebert said, "Is there a mechanism by which one could carry out research, but not do so under the auspices of SJSU?" Senator Kaufman said, "Yes." Senator Hebert said, "Can you give me some examples?" Senator Kaufman said, "If the research had approval from another IRB at another university." Senator Stacks said, "There is one section that says if you do this outside of your role as an SJSU faculty member, then you don't have to go through the review process. However, you have to make it clear that you are not doing the research as a faculty member of SJSU."

Senator Peter said, "Can you summarize the improvements that this policy is designed to create for faculty? Is it designed to expedite the approval process, or to reduce the need for the current regime to go through the paperwork, etc.?" Senator Kaufman said, "When the task force issued recommendations they issued this policy and procedural recommendations. The procedural recommendations included streamlining the process so that when you register something that is exempt you get a response in a promised amount of time. The previous policy said nothing about that. Many of these things are already in place or going in place as we speak. From a policy point of view, this is a much clearer document for figuring out what you need to do, who you need to speak to, and what the timelines are."

Senator Stacks said, "It turns out that there are some specific issues that have come up that weren't addressed in the previous policy. One issue dealt with membership and trying to create subcommittees of the IRB. By doing so, it was to create cohorts of people that had more parallel training and interests. This was trying to get at some of the training issues around the IRB, but it doesn't change any of the operational things. Another issue was



giving a little more clarity to a PI that took issue with the results of say an expedited or full review and states what they can do in terms of coming back to the committee. I believe there was another task force recommendation with regard to the policy. In the past, our policy tried to identify what research was. Rather than doing that the IRB Task Force recommended that we use the federal guidelines. There are also some interpretations with regard to children. Children are usually a protected category so they could never be in the exempt category. There is one situation whereby you can do exempt work with children, as long as it is sort of normally defined educational activity and it is not going to be identified in terms of any individuals. Lastly, there are issues around agencies. If agencies are asking for some review of their procedures and it is only going to be internal to that agency that can be exempt work, whereas before it was expedited. The situation where that still wouldn't be the case is if you had a Social Work student and they were going to use that type of analysis in their thesis. Then it would still have to be expedited."

Senator Hebert said, "A few years ago I was teaching a methods course, and I designed a study where my students would observe who walked out of a building and talked on a phone first by ethnicity. My question is would this require a review by IRB?" Senator Kaufman said, "Yes." Senator Hebert said, "I would argue that human subjects are not involved. If you look at the scope of the policy it says, "although an activity may be considered research, it may not involve human subjects... When observed behavior takes place in a public arena or a hotel and is observed as aggregate behavior in such a way as to preclude in post facto identification of individuals." Nothing my students recorded would allow the identification of any individual. Therefore, this experiment did not involve human subjects. I think this needs to be cleared up so we all know what to do." Senator Kaufman said, "I see your point."

#### **E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –**

Senator Backer presented *AS 1383, Policy Recommendation, Campus Planning Board (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1383 passed with no Nays or Abstentions.**

Senator Backer presented *AS 1389, Policy Recommendation, Revision to By-Law 13, Representative, Academic Senate, CSU (First Reading)*. Senator Backer said, "This policy clarifies what constitutes a temporary and permanent vacancy for the CSU Statewide Senate. I have attached the current by-law and the proposed by-law."

#### **Questions:**

Senator Sigler said, "Can you explain the differences between the current policy and the proposed policy?" Senator Backer said, "Yes. Basically, 13.1.1 is the same as 13.1.a. 13.1.2 is the same as 13.1.b. The difference is in 13.1.3 to 13.1.5. 13.1.3 says if you are elected to the CSU Statewide Senate you vacate your seat on the SJSU Senate. The big difference is in 13.1.4 and 13.1.5. They clarify when someone has a temporary vacancy and a permanent vacancy. The change substantially is in the permanent vacancy in 13.1.5.a. If a CSU Statewide Senator will be absent from the SJSU campus or unable to perform the duties of a Statewide Senator for more than one semester the seat is deemed vacant. This was not clear in the old by-law, and 13.1.5.b just explains how the election will be conducted."

Senator Van Selst said, “In 13.1.4 for the temporary vacancy it says that if the CSU Senator will be unable to perform his or her duties for a period of one semester or less, the Vice Chair of the Senate will serve as the CSU Statewide Senator. However, if the Vice Chair is unable to do it, then the Chair of the Senate may designate any elected member of the current SJSU Academic Senate to act as the temporary CSU Senator. Can you clarify who the elected members of the Senate are?” Senator Norton said, “That would be the elected faculty members, and excludes students.” Senator Backer said, “I will check that in the handbook.”

Senator Meldal said, “In 13.1.5.a. it says if the CSU Statewide Senator will be absent or unable to perform the duties, wouldn’t it be sufficient to say unable to perform the duties?” Senator Backer said, “No, we talked about this and felt unable to perform duties might mean due to illness, whereas absent from the SJSU campus could mean being on sabbatical for one year.” Senator McClory said, “The reason we worded it this way is that if someone is absent from the campus then they are not in touch with the needs of the campus and they are supposed to be representing the campus.”

Senator Bros said, “In section 13.1.5.b. it talks about a special election, who would be responsible for conducting that election?” Senator Backer said, “The Senate just like any other special election.”

Senator Buzanski made a motion to make this a final reading. Senator Norton said, “It can’t be a final reading, because it is a by-law amendment.”

Senator Van Selst said, “For other committee members the standard for being deemed vacant is missing two or more meetings in a row and then it is up to the Chair of the committee, was there any thought by the committee of having this say missing two or more meetings?” Senator Backer said, “No, we didn’t consider that.”

## **VII. Special Committee Reports –**

### **A. Faculty Diversity Report by AVP Joan Merdinger, Faculty Affairs**

(Note: the following report was provided by AVP Joan Merdinger for inclusion with the minutes and is not taken directly from the recording of the Senate meeting.)

#### **Diversity Presentation to the Academic Senate May 5, 2008**

Thank you for the invitation to speak to the members of the Academic Senate today. President Kassing, Provost Sigler, Vice Presidents Lee and Najjar, Chair of the Academic Senate Lessow-Hurley, Senators, and members of the SJSU community.

The Office of Faculty Affairs is asked annually to provide an update on faculty hiring and retention, particularly with regard to the commitment of the University to recruit and maintain a diverse community of faculty members. Our focus today is on recent hiring and retention data for tenure-track faculty; as you know, significant resources are

expended to recruit, appoint and retain these new tenure line faculty members who are likely to spend much if not all of their careers on our campus.

As context for this, it is important to be aware that we follow federal Affirmative Action guidelines, and we do that by our significant outreach efforts during all faculty searches; we use print, web and discipline-specific outreach efforts to create as large a pool as possible for each of the faculty searches. When the final date for the search is reached, each applicant in the pool has an equal opportunity to be selected as a finalist to be brought to campus for the final round of departmental interviews.

We also follow E.O. 883, the Chancellor's directive on Guidelines for Nondiscrimination and affirmative action programs in employment

Our campus specific policies that guide affirmative action and equal opportunity are:

- S 89-15 Non-discrimination, equal employment opportunity and affirmative action for faculty
- S 98-8 Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Regular Faculty
- S 01-13 Commitment to a campus that values diversity and equal opportunity

What have we done in 07-08?

During AY 2006-2007 we conducted 70 searches which resulted in 44 tenure-track hires; these new tenure-track faculty began their employment with us in Fall 2007. That was about a 63% (62.8%) success rate. This year, AY 2007-2008, we are conducting 75 searches. In September of this year we will have the final numbers on our 08-09 tenure-track hires. My report today focuses on our tenure-track faculty who began in the Fall of this academic year, Fall 2007.

We have followed the same practice for the last three recruitment cycles. Departments submitted 5 year recruitment plans to their College Planning councils or other such committees, with the Dean indicating that sufficient funds would be available to hire new tenure-track faculty members, within an 80/20 ratio: that ratio indicates that there will be no more than 80% tenured and tenure track to 20% temporary. No positions were rolled over from previous years; national searches for temporary faculty at 1.0 were examined on a case-by-case basis.

Appropriate paperwork needed to be filed with our office in order for searches to proceed.

As many of you know, each year we have a discussion about the importance of beginning searches early, in order to recruit the best candidates; these people are also the most competitive in the job market. The budget of the State of California makes this an increasingly difficult job although we are all in agreement that earlier searches are better than later ones. In 2006-2007 we created a new calendar which encourages Colleges to

submit applications during the summer up through October. We also received additional money from the UPC in 2006-2007 and in 2007-2008 to advertise in publications that focus on diversity recruitments campus-wide.

We have been tracking tenure-track hiring for a number of years, and our first handout **Table 1** focuses on our newly hired tenure track faculty. You can see that in **07-08**, looking at the number of total appointments, at the top of the page, we hired **44 new tenure-track faculty members**.

We hired no African American faculty or American Indian faculty, 19.6% Asian and Asian American faculty, 4.5% Hispanic/Latino faculty, 27.3% Unknown, and 52.3% White faculty. As an aside, the number of new faculty who are not reporting race and ethnicity is a trend that is increasing, making it difficult to capture the true diversity of the newly hired faculty. One of the important reasons for this is reported on in the Spartan Daily today regarding multi-racial identification; as you know, the census bureau revised its categories for ethnicity and race in the last census and the department of education is planning revisions that will go into effect in 2010. The CSU is also in planning stages for its own revisions that will likely mirror those of the federal government.

Gender is also reported with our new tenure-track faculty members who arrived in 2007; our new tenure-track faculty members were 45.5% male and 54.5% female.

If we go back even further than this table indicates, our records indicate that we hired 79 tenure-track faculty in 1991-1992, the best year for hiring on record.

Looking at **Table 2**, in 2007-2008, 65.5% of our tenure/tenure-track faculty is white, and 29.6% is made up of minority faculty members (unknown = 4.8%), 10 years ago in 1992-1993, the faculty was 78.4% white and 21.6% minority. This is about an 8% change in 15 years.

How do we compare with the numbers from the CSU for all tenured and tenure-track faculty? In the CSU (most recent data = Fall 2006) 72.8% of the faculty are white; 25.9% are minorities.

We are doing somewhat better than the CSU in overall minority faculty.

The makeup of faculty gender at SJSU is changing more rapidly. In 2007-2008, 56.9% of our faculty are male and 43.1% are female. Compare those percentages to 70.2% male and 29.8% female in 1992-1993. This is about a 13% change in 15 years; a little less than one percentage point a year. These percentages have moved more rapidly than those that inform us about ethnicity and race.

Retention is another topic that is an important one. We report annually to the Chancellor's Office about our resignations. In the last year that has comparison data, AY 2005-2006, the average rate of tenured and tenure-track faculty resignations was 2.3% of

all tenured and tenure-track faculty, our rate at SJSU was 1.7%, significantly lower than the CSU average. Retention rates for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year tenure-track faculty in AY 2006-2007 was 97%.

Annually we also look at the total number of tenured and tenure-track faculty over now a 15 year time span. You can see from the table that since 1992-1993 we have lost a significant number of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Note that the biggest losses occur at the time of a "Golden Handshake." We had one such "Handshake" in October of 1993 and again in July of 2004. Following those downturns, we hired 10 faculty in 1993-1994, and 19 in 2004-2005.

Another important data point: our Office ran a report in the Summer of 2007 to find out how many of our faculty members were eligible for FERP, the Faculty Early Retirement Program. To be eligible for entry into the FERP program a faculty member must be tenured and 55 years of age or older; 42% of our faculty were eligible. We have a disproportionately older population of faculty making it even more imperative that we hire more tenure-track faculty to replace the upcoming large number of retirements. An aside here is that almost 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of all graduates of doctoral programs are non-US citizens, and hiring such candidates is important if we are to achieve another of our goals, that of truly internationalizing our curriculum.

In summary, at SJSU we have made progress towards creating more gender, ethnic and racial diversity; our progress is more visible with respect to gender. We appear to be plateauing now and at the point of exploring more options.

We need to begin with programs that can be helpful to our commitment to hiring & retaining a diverse community of faculty. Our undergraduate and graduate programs give us access to the next generation of teachers and scholars, therefore, we need to recruit students to and to expand the McNair Scholars Program and to continue to expand our student pipeline to doctoral education with our current programs such as the Alliance for Minority Participation scholarships, the Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) and the Minority Biomedical Research Support (MBRS). We need to offer graduate assistantships and TA opportunities to our SJSU students to capture their interest in our profession as professors and researchers; that means developing those students' interest in doctoral and terminal degree study. In addition, we have excellent lecturer faculty members who are interested in applying for tenure-track positions. These faculty can make use of the CSU Forgivable Loan Program for doctoral study allowing them to return to tenure-track positions in the CSU and repay the loan through employment.

Finally, we were one of six campuses nationwide to be awarded an ACE/Sloan Faculty Career Flexibility award. One of the initiatives that helped us to compete successfully for the award included the initiative to award funding to Deans and Chairs for campus visits to Universities and colleges with large numbers of underrepresented doctoral students to educate such students about the benefits of working at SJSU as a career option. Another of the initiatives is to collect information from focus groups with tenure-track faculty

who are underrepresented and who are non US citizens to explore issues regarding retention and work-life balance. This initiative is in collaboration with the Campus Climate Committee.

There are both challenges and opportunities ahead. Do you have any questions for me?

**Questions:**

Senator Kaufman said, “Just a comment, I wouldn’t sell the increase in minority faculty as short as you have, if you do the comparison of the percentages you started with to the percentages you ended with, it is nearly a 40% increase.” AVP Merdinger said, “I think it is important to be honest. There are some years we have better success, and other years where our success is not quite as good.”

Senator Peter said, “Do we have data on the pools of candidates so we can compare our hiring rate with the pool?” AVP Merdinger said, “That was a practice that we ended post the Connerly v. State Personnel Board ruling in 2002 or 2003. Those pools are collected but that information is no longer used at the time the pool is allowed to go forward. That responsibility has been delegated to the Dean of the college. The Dean of the college oversees a look at the pool and the decision to go forward.” Senator Peter said, “Is there some way to compare how well we are doing in our hiring versus the pools of applicants?” AVP Merdinger said, “Let me just say that there was a recent Bureau of State audit regarding hiring practices in the CSU that affected the hiring of managers as well as faculty. The response by the Chancellor’s Office is that there will be more and clearer directions and that material that was previously unavailable to us may become available. There is some movement on the horizon about that. It really related to Proposition 98 and the interpretation of that particular case.” Senator Peter said, “Do we have data on those candidates that we made offers to that turned us down? Did we study them and find out why they said no and went somewhere else?” AVP Merdinger said, “We do have that data and that is reported annually to the Chancellor’s Office. There are a variety of reasons. In our area we are affected by the cost of living, workload, and beginning salary. We are tracking that. We are also looking at whether we get our first choice candidate. In many instances we are getting our first choice.”

Senator Sivertsen said, “I’m glad to see these statistics. I have been Interim Chair of the Campus Climate Committee for several years now. The results of the Campus Climate surveys have recently come out, and the groups that most often identify themselves as being uncomfortable on this campus are totally absent from this report. This is the reason many of us in the Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual Transgender community feel uncomfortable, because we are not acknowledged in the community or given the opportunity to talk about what our issues are, or to identify ourselves. I would hope that eventually that this campus could get itself to a recognition place that this campus is made up of a whole lot of people including the Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender community. State law says you cannot discriminate against us, and gender identity is a part of state law, and yet we continue to be totally absent in both this kind of data and in the data on student applicants to this campus. There are elements that affect the

Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender community that we do not address, because we leave it absent. We are a sizable number of people on this campus.”

Senator Bridgeman said, “I noticed that the percentage of African-American faculty is the lowest that it has been in the last 15 years, is there a reason for that? Also, could there be changes in the recruitment process to recruit not just from the west coast but from the east coast and the south?” AVP Merdinger said, “The Ace/Sloan Award gives a little bit of extra money to address some of those concerns.”

Senator Van Selst said, “When we talk about the percentages being better, what are the goal numbers we are comparing to? What is the target?” AVP Merdinger said, “I think you have a good point about where are we going. Are we trying to mirror the student population, or to mirror the doctoral degree granting institutions? I think it is probably a matrix that you put together that relates to a number of variables. One third of all doctoral degrees are now granted to non-U.S. citizens on temporary visas or that have green cards. I think that your question of where are we going is a good one, and one that the Senate needs to be involved in.”

Senator Jiang said, “In looking over the data, I see a general decline in full-time faculty members from a high of 886 to a low of 713. What are the implications of this?” AVP Merdinger said, “Senate bill ACR 73 is one of my favorite kind of bills that has an unfunded mandate and says we need to move to a 75/25 ratio. That bill was passed at least three years ago. The idea was to return to a higher number of tenure/tenure-track faculty compared to lecturers, but it wasn’t funded.”

Senator Butler said, “In terms of minority retention, do we have exit data on why those people that have been hired don’t stay?” AVP Merdinger said, “We do have an approved exit survey, and we do collect that information. However, we haven’t been collecting it for a long period of time. We also report some data about resignations to the Chancellor’s office. In addition, our intention is to use some of the Ace/Sloan Award money to find out what our minority retention issues are.”

President Kassing said, “Since Provost Sigler has taken over, we have hired 154 full-time faculty, which if you go back to the earliest 3-year cohort is an improvement of 148%. I would just point out that the current Provost has made a real effort to address those numbers, but it takes time. Also, I saw some numbers three or four years ago that said the number of African-Americans coming out of doctoral programs was something like 3,600. Of that 3,600 number 600 went into private universities, so there are only 3,000 African-American faculty available for between 5,000 and 6,000 universities. Just doing the straight arithmetic, if Provost Sigler is conducting 70 searches there would only be one African-American candidate. I would argue that we need to grow our own. We need to encourage promising young students to look at this profession, this life we live as a career. We need to be much more aggressive about recruiting students. We could change this ratio in 7 or 8 years.”

Senator Wei said, “Forty-two percent of our faculty are going to retire in the next 10 years, and we have difficulty attracting faculty due to our workload and high cost of living. I wonder if in strategic planning our leadership has looked into this issue, because the faculty are the core of the university.”

Senator Rickford said, “I’d like to reiterate everything President Kassing said. The data shows that from 2002-2003 to 2007-2008, we went from 30 to 22 African-American, and from 47 to 42 Hispanic/Mexican-American faculty. I think it is incumbent upon us to ensure that we support and retain these minority faculty members. My question to you is, is it a result of retirement or FERP that has led to this steep decline?” AVP Merdinger said, “One of the things that accounts for the drop of all faculty members around that time is the 2004-2005 Golden Handshake which accounted for the loss of 32 people. We’ve also had some acceleration of FERP during times of bargaining. This accounts for a big drop on two different occasions.”

## **B. Goals Advisory Committee Report by Dr. Rona Halualani, Special Assistant to the President for Strategic Planning and Inclusive Excellence**

Dr. Halualani said, “Vision 2010 is a year and a half away from being fulfilled. When I came aboard I conducted a mid-point assessment of how we were doing so far. From that assessment, it was decided that the Goals Advisory Council (GAC) would reconvene and try to reprioritize some of our strategic planning goals. We have 7 large goals with a total of 28 to 32 sub-goals. That is a huge strategic planning vision. If you look at most institutions of higher education they have between 3 to 5 strategic planning goals. We really needed to hone in and structure down. That is what we did this past March. The GAC met and decided to identify 3 goals of focus. I will have Chair Lessow-Hurley send you an electronic version of the handout this afternoon. We also talked about how the strategic plan, Vision 2010, was a living document, so that if there were some new emergent challenges that we needed to address we could. The first goal of focus is improving the retention and graduation rates of those university students that fall below the university average. Namely those identified in the WASC report including African-American, Latino, and first-generation students across the board. The emphasis will be on improving advising structures as advising plays a key integral role in the retention and graduation rates of our students. The second goal I call faculty excellence toward student success and has to do with the notion of being creative with teaching loads in academic departments and programs. There is specific and yet vague wording in this goal. What it says is that by 2010 the university will enable academic departments and programs to rearrange their teaching load and to use such rearrangement to focus in on research and/or student success activities. This is an opportunity for us at this university during times of budget cuts to think creatively about rearranging our teaching load. It would be different models for different departments. There is no new state money allocated towards this goal, and you still have to meet your target FTES in the college. This is really going to require some creativity and flexibility. The third goal is internationalizing SJSU. I’m passionate about this goal. The goal states that by 2010, SJSU will develop a coordinated, integrative, and intensive plan for how to internationalize SJSU across every corner, crevice, and niche in the campus including curricular, co-curricular, staff, faculty, student exchanges, training, you-name-it we want to do it in this plan. These 3 goals are goals we should be proud of.”



## **Questions:**

Senator Van Selst said, “The GAC advises whom? Also, what was the Senate’s role in the original 7 goals?” Dr. Halualani said, “The GAC makes recommendations to the President who can approve or deny them, and then he passes them on to the University Planning Council (UPC).”

Senator Bros said, “Can you give us some examples of creative ways to decrease our teaching workload?” Dr. Halualani said, “It really depends on departments and deans to consider what works best for them. There are several different ways to do it, but one size doesn’t fit all.”

Senator Henderson said, “One of the first goals is to improve retention/graduation rates, so does this include additional resources?” Dr. Halualani said, “That is going to be one of the goals, and there is going to be a process where we create a plan and discuss all the ways that could be achieved and EOP could be one of the programs, and possibly some new innovative programs.”

Senator Wei said, “Have you thought about how this is tied to our resource generation, because we are talking about developing new programs and internationalizing the campus which will require resources. Another thing is the need for performance goals so that we know when we are getting near our goals. That is very important.” Dr. Halualani said, “Absolutely, given limited resources, the first step is to do an inventory of what we are already doing towards the goals. This will allow us to see what we are doing and not doing, and if we are duplicating our efforts. Then we need to have a conversation with the powers that be about what we should be doing, and deciding where we need to put our resources. This is the first step in that exercise. We also need performance goals. These will be written up for every goal when we start to think about operationalizing them.”

Senator Bros said, “This time around are we going to be looking at the entire budget instead of just an amount off the top?” Dr. Halualani said, “I can’t say for sure. I’m trying to move us in that direction of thinking about strategic planning first as a budget practice.”

Senator Butler said, “Is the GAC a standing committee of the Senate, and who is on the committee, i.e. are there any African-American representatives?” Dr. Halualani said, “No. The Senate created the committee and it is composed of the Provost, the VP of Student Affairs, a Dean, the Chair of the Senate, the Vice Chair of the Senate, and a Faculty-at-Large member elected by the Senate, and myself as the facilitator/non-voting member.” Senator Butler said, “I have concerns that out of the 66 minority full-time faculty members, there is not one on the committee addressing African and Mexican-American needs. I don’t see where that voice is there.” Chair Lessow-Hurley said, “I’d just like to say that the call for the Faculty-at-Large member went out several times across the campus. I would just hope that as these seats come open on the strategic planning committees, and there are three of them (the GAC, the RRB, and the UPC), that people make an effort to recruit folks that have the kinds of perspectives that we really need to hear from. Do not delete these emails when there is an opportunity like that, and get your statements in. That is really the best way to get your voice heard.”

Senator Langdon said, “Do we have any kind of baseline for these goals?” Dr. Halualani said, “Yes we do, and as we move from the goal stage we will be creating those specific baseline points.”

Senator Parrish said, “I was just wondering strategically if you have discussed how you are going to interface with the new President and how that is going to affect the goals you’ve set as priorities?” Dr. Halualani said, “I will meet each candidate along with the President’s staff at 8:30 a.m. every morning and that will be a question.”

Senator Reyes said, “I was wondering if it was possible to add students to the GAC?” Dr. Halualani said, “The Senate would have to change the policy.” Provost Sigler said, “The GAC just identified the goals. The GAC won’t be developing the plans for implementing the goals. Those plans will be developed by the campus community. That is where the faculty and students will play a role.”

Senator Peter said, “I just want to encourage everyone here to put these 3 goals in the form of questions for our 3 presidential candidates that will be here this week, and then to give us [The Advisory Committee] feedback.”

Dr. Halualani said, “I’d like to invite all of you to an important Campus Climate Data Presentation Forum on Thursday, May 15, 2008, from 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Ohlone Room of the Student Union.” Senator Sivertsen said, “The staff and the administration Campus Climate Surveys are now finished and will be online within a few days.”

## **VIII. New Business – None**

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

### **A. Associated Students President –**

Senator Henderson said, “Good Evening everyone. Associated Students passed numerous resolutions in support of EOP, a gulf coast civil works project, and acknowledging President Kassing. We are working with LARC to bring more student awareness to services. We are also working with the Smoke Free Campus and the City of San Jose as well as continuing our lobbying effort around the budget. We just had our AS 55 Banquet recently where we roasted President Kassing. We also had a successful Spring Fling last week. We had over 2,000 students attend our March for Higher Education to Sacramento, and we almost filled two buses. It went very well.”

### **B. Vice President for University Advancement – None**

### **C. Statewide Academic Senator(s) –**

Senator Van Selst said, “The primary thing that the Executive Committee of the CSU Statewide Senate has been dealing with lately has been legislative activity around the budget. If there are any of you that would be interested in doing local legislative outreach contact either me or Nancy Stake in the Public Affairs Office. Having a student, faculty member, and administrator appear in the legislator’s office at the same

time has been very well received and very powerful. In terms of CSU activities, the Access to Excellence implementation plan will take up most of the summer. A newsletter was just published that gives you more incremental updates. Next Thursday and Friday are the last meeting of this year's CSU Statewide Senate and the first meeting of next year's CSU Statewide Senate. Other than that there has been a lot of angst over the Lower Division Transfer Project and again we will be looking at a lot of work on that."

**D. Provost –**

Provost Sigler said, "It gives me great pleasure to announce that we have hired a new Dean for the College of Business. He brings impressive credentials and wide experience. In my conversations with him, I was very impressed. The faculty that attended the forums were also very much in support of his candidacy. Two other items that are related to the conversations we have had this afternoon. When I left my office this afternoon, in my out box were signed letters for all the faculty that are going to be receiving release time next academic year as part of the UPC's efforts to reconfigure workload particularly to give faculty time to work with students on projects related to student success. The other item is that last Friday, I had the wonderful opportunity to attend the McNair's Scholars event. That is an extraordinary program. We had a presentation of the research the students have been conducting with the faculty. We also had an opportunity to hear from the students that are graduating and heading for prestigious doctoral universities. All of these students are first-generation college students and most are students of color. I do hope that they do come back to this university. Carlos Sanchez, who is a professor in the Philosophy department was one of the speakers at the ceremony. He talked about his experiences as a SJSU student, and his experiences as a student at a doctoral university. He was talking about the fact that he went to the University of New Mexico, and he thought since he was Mexican-American that he would fit right in. However, he was the only Latino student in the Philosophy department, but he persevered and graduated largely due to the support he received as a McNair Scholar. I think we need to support programs like that. I also encourage you to recruit students for programs like that. I also want to thank you for your service on the Senate."

**E. Vice President for Administration and Finance – None**

**F. Vice President for Student Affairs – None**

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.