EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 5, 2007

Present: Kassing, Kaufman, Lessow-Hurley, McClory, Sivertsen, Van Selst,
                Von Till, Henderson, Backer, Bros, Lee, Sigler, Najjar

Absent: Meldal, Kaufman

1. The consent calendar was approved.

2. Updates:

    a. The Executive Committee discussed a draft response to a proposed CSU policy
        re Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeat (DWIR). Senator McClory will
        incorporate additional feedback from Undergraduate Studies, redraft and send
        out to the campus for input.

    b. The Executive Committee discussed the proposed Red Cross Blood Drives vis-à-
        vis the campus non-discriminatory policies. The President's office is continuing to
        work on a campus response to the issue.

    c. The Executive Committee revisited the question posed by the Campus Planning
        Board (CPB) as to who has jurisdiction over large interior spaces on campus.
        President Kassing indicated that the Space Advisory Committee had that
        responsibility, but it was noted that there might in fact be an appropriate role for
        the CPB. The Organization and Government Committee (O&G) is currently
        working on a revision to the Campus Planning Board policy. Senator Van Selst
        will recommend changes to O&G.

    d. The Executive Committee discussed the Draft Access to Excellence responses
        from other campuses. Rona Halualani will prepare SJSU's campus-wide
        response this weekend. The Executive Committee discussed whether the
        Senate should do a separate response. It was suggested that there was no need
        for this, unless the Senate felt that Dr. Halualani's response failed to capture the
        Senate's concerns. The Executive Committee decided that Chair Lessow-Hurley
        would put out a last call email to the Senate to get suggestions to Rona. Chair
        Lessow-Hurley will also circulate Rona's draft back to the Senate. Chair Lessow-
        Hurley will then draft a letter indicating the extent to which the Senate aligns itself
        with the report that will be sent forward.

3. The Executive Committee discussed CSU Information Technology Advisory
    Committee (ITAC) recommendations regarding email. Two concerns were raised.
    The first was related to specific provisions of the recommendations. The
    recommendations have been crafted to respond to legal concerns, but raise several
    issues that might have an impact on faculty work. The second concern was related to
    the lack of consultation with faculty, and more generally, the ongoing lack of an
    appropriate channel for gathering input related to issues of this kind which are
    surfacing with increasing frequency. The concept of a new policy committee was
    discussed. One suggestion was to create a faculty affairs committee. Chair Lessow-
    Hurley will talk with the O&G committee about it.

4. Vice President Phillips reported that an Advising Council had been created to look at the overall issue of advising on campus, co-chaired by AVP's Bob Cooper and Eloise Stiglitz. The Executive Committee discussed how the faculty members on the council were chosen. Provost Sigler commented that she had requested recommendations from the Deans. It was noted that Senate involvement in the selection process would be useful and appropriate going forward.

5. Updates from the Policy Committee Chairs:

    a. Senator Sivertsen circulated a draft of the Access to Instructional Material policy. There was discussion about a question that came up during the first reading as to whether the guidelines were part of the policy and could therefore be debated separately by the Senate. It was determined that the guidelines were debatable. There was also a concern about the clarity of the guidelines. Senator Sivertsen was asked to bring the policy back to Instruction and Student Affairs for clarification. Given the meeting schedules, this may result in postponing the second reading until the December Senate meeting. The matter must be resolved before the end of the semester.

    b. Senator Von Till said the University Library Board (ULB) was looking into the issue of city censorship of pornography in the library. The ULB will be bringing a resolution reminding the city of its agreement with the university not to restrict access to materials in the library. The ULB is also working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution commending the library for getting all the books back on the shelves so quickly after the recent earthquake.

6. The Executive Committee gave suggestions for changes to the Draft Access to Excellence response being prepared by Rona Halualani. Responses included the following:

    -   Students are referred to in a narrow way, and are not looked at as people. Nothing is said about their social growth, or how they learn to cope in the world. There is nothing that speaks to students becoming critical learners, or to the challenges that occur as result of the diversity of our student body. There is also nothing about their lives on campus and no mention of Student Affairs.

    -   The goals should include decreasing the number of students, increasing teacher learning, mentorship, hands on experience, getting up-to-date equipment and the support staff to maintain it, redefining WTU's, and giving more attention to research.

    -   There were a lot of things that were in Cornerstones that were not done. In fact, a review of Cornerstones principle number four reveals that none of it has been done.

    -   There was concern that it was not a well structured or well written document. Among other things, it lacks a coherent hierarchy of goals and objectives.

    -   There is a reference on page 9 to shifting reliance from tenure/tenure-track faculty to non-tenure track faculty, suggesting that this could lead to a "potential

erosion of quality." This is offensive to lecturers. We need to support and nurture our lecturers.

- If we increase the number of high school students going to college by one-half, then we will not be able to decrease remediation.

- It is not clear what the plan promises to key constituencies.

- There needs to be an effort to develop public understanding of the role and needs of the university.

- The promises should be things that are accountable, metric.

- Advances in technology have not decreased the time it takes to do things, necessarily enhance teaching and learning, or solve all our problems. Research shows that inquiry-based learning is critical for the success of the kinds of students we work with, and we need the resources to support those kinds of approaches.

- Items that should be touched on include faculty workload, diversity, retention/graduation rates, and ACR ratios that include reassigned time.

- Research is being lost down the line.

- We keep taking on more students, when we need fewer students to make these things happen. The prevailing message is that there simply is no limit to the number of students we can serve.