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9. **Other Information Items**

10. **Other Business**

11. **Adjournment**
The Senate Executive Committee was called to order at 2:05 pm.

1. **Agenda** (Bober-Michel)
   MSP Approved the agenda of September 20, 2015.

2. **Minutes** (Bober-Michel)
   MSP Deferred; to be approved at the October meeting.

3. **Announcements** (Deutschman)
   3.1 New Structure to Minutes
      Deutschman explained how agendas and minutes will be organized in the future, improving their readability and organization.
   3.2 Faculty Numbers
      Following up on a question posed at the September Senate meeting, Deutschman provided a graph that shows growth/progress in faculty hiring. The numbers are provisional, however, so each might be slightly higher or lower. Note that departures (resignations, retirements) have occurred less predictably than in the past, affecting Senate membership and rotation.
   3.3 Pell and SUG Numbers
      Deutschman said that he would provide this information at an upcoming Senate meeting; the #s are not available until after census (end of September).
   3.4 Feedback on Financial Sustainability
      Again following up on a request, Deutschman provided the URL where faculty can provide feedback on the draft report.

4. **Academic Affairs** (Enwemeka)
   - **IV leadership change.** The Provost announced a change of leadership at Imperial Valley; the Dean will return to faculty (at the end of September). An interim Dean will need to be appointed, and quickly. The Provost and a team are headed to IV on Friday, September 18 to chat with many people (including the Advisory Board); he has made several calls to leaders soliciting their input for the interim position. Hopefully someone will be appointed by next week, giving him/her a week to interact with the current Dean before his departure. Then—we must search for a permanent replacement. The timeline is aggressive; by or before Thanksgiving, a Search Committee should be in place.
   - **DUS leadership change.** The Provost also noted a change of leadership in Undergraduate Division, with Dean Chase leaving near the end of the Fall semester for a position at WASC. Here again he briefly outlined basic parameters for the search. For this position, he would like to see an interim well ahead of December 1.
• **Georgia programs.** There are now 82 students enrolled (including one international), with negotiations underway for the next phase of the contract (5 months). The first phase (15 months) closes on November 27. We are negotiating this letter of agreement with pull-backs to ensure we don’t operate at a loss. A team is headed over there this coming weekend to launch the negotiation discussions.

**Verity:** What are the numbers? How will we attract more students?

**Provost:** Key is removing all the hurdles students face in applying – including the National Entrance Exam. The exams many take now would qualify them to admission at the SDSU/main campus, but not the campus in their own home country. The goal, then, is to use our admissions standards. International students are disadvantaged, too; for example, their transcripts must be translated into Georgian. Transcripts also can’t be sent electronically; they must be physically mailed. Yet another issue is visa issuance; prospective students must also go to a different county in order to get one for Georgia.

The Provost reiterated that all these hurdles are from the Georgian side, not ours. He added that #s are low because we have limited visibility. We don’t “look” like a “real” option for prospective students; we’re not well known yet. But the ones we’re getting are truly top-notch.

Overall, then, we had 182 seeking admission, with 82 accepted. The original goal, however, was 500. Georgian universities have lower admission standards, so more choose to go that route.

5. **Officers’ Report** (Ornatowski)
   5.1 Referral Chart
   Our two outstanding referrals will be addressed today.

6. **Old Business**
   6.1 Discussion of Annual Agenda (requested by Mark Wheeler)
   Wheeler asked for this item, but didn’t elaborate. It was tabled since he could not attend today.

7. **New Business: Action Items**
   7.1 *Executive Session: Naming  2:30 pm time certain*
   MSP  Move to Executive Session

   7.2 *Executive Session: Personnel*
   MSP  Move out of Executive Session

   7.3 Faculty Honors and Awards (Deutschman on behalf of FHA)
   The Committee recommends emeritus status for:
   • Theophilus Addo (Management Information Systems, 28 years)
   • Edith Benkov (European Studies, 32 years)
   • Elizabeth Cobbs (History, 17 years)
   • Paula Kalustian (Theatre, Television, and Film, 26 years)
   • Michael Sabath (Public Affairs/Imperial Valley, 22 years)

   7.4 General Education (Bliss)  *3:00 pm time certain*
7.5 Faculty Affairs (Imazeki)
This version of the report is mostly clean-up (to ensure wording/labels are consistent—i.e., sections where appropriate, rather than courses or classes). The committee continues to recommend three common quantitative questions and two open-ended. There’s also language to “advise” programs, departments, and schools on items they might want to include.

According to Imazeki, all current forms will need to conform though no specific process or timetable is set in the policy revisions. There also is no plan in place yet to advise faculty/chairs/directors of the policy update.

Input from this discussion will be completed prior to the October Senate meeting.

7.6 Campus Development Committee (Shinn) **3:15 pm time certain**
AVP Shulz provided the Fall report.

He explained that the Campus Development Committee meets regularly – in fact, monthly if necessary. One of its charges is to approve schematic designs; recent examples include EIS, Destination SDSU, CES classroom renovations, and the student recreation field.

He noted that Destination SDSU is a program, not a project, and continues our overall move to a mission revivalist feel. Student Services was probably the first of this style but we “mastered” it with the Student Union.

He elaborated at length about the move to create spaces (often courtyards) that allow for community and interconnection. He focused on flow, noting how the “suspension” bridge across College Avenue now leads into the Student Union, not around it. All this influences how EIS will look.

The goal with EIS is to clean up a really (aesthetically) terrible corner of SDSU. The project will take advantage of the ways students already move thru this section of campus. It’s a grand space, with an array of courtyards. It will indeed be the center of STEM programs @ SDSU.

Schulz described the banner program, the idea being that banners are themed and the overall feeling is cohesive. Phase 3 of this targets city-owned poles so approval is needed.

The freeway marque will be totally updated – especially the electronics which are woefully out of date. Funds for this come from several different sources (all non-instructional, of course).

Schulz emphasized the need for a design standards document so we don’t have to argue basic points with every project.

Lastly, he targeted the “entrances” that beg for improvement – and highlighted the Campanile Entry Gateway. It’s really a return of the monument that was removed to build the trolley; it will be a true photo destination. The committee originally approved the project in December 2014 – but the permit process is still underway.
Several: How is this paid for?

Schulz: The PBAC allocation paid for the drawings ($400,000+) and there’s a portfolio of funds to cover the rest. No campus general funds were used.

Deutschman: AR&P approved this expenditure awhile back; there would no way to get donor funds if plans weren’t in place. The cost really isn’t a lot for so much benefit.

Chase: Noted the many positives – and said people don’t believe the Student Union is LEED certified; few in this category have such lovely architecture. Representatives from Northwestern came here to see it.

7.7 Academic Calendars for 2016/17 and 2017/18 (Chase)
Chase will ask the Senate to make an adjustment to the 2016/17 and 2017/18 calendars; each will slightly end the close of Fall semester but without them, students would be moving into the dorms too far ahead of the first day of class – and that could be quite problematic.

8. New Business: Consent Calendar (Committee Reports)
8.1 ASCSU Report (Eadie, Ornatowski, Wheeler)
8.2 University Relations and Development Report (Carleton)
8.3 Undergraduate Curriculum (Verity)
8.4 Response to the Referral on Student Peer Evaluations (AP&P/Schellenberg and Faculty Affairs/Imazeki)
Both Committees feel no policy change is warranted. But faculty do indeed need guidance on ways to ensure their syllabi are clear; it’s best to address this sort of thing in the Curriculum Guide.

McClish: Agreed with this strategy.

Ornatowski: Noticed that the original referral was really about specific cases where it’s clear the issue was communications breakdown. And in each it’s easy to see why students were upset; however, neither instance warrants a policy change.

Imazeki: Noted that CTL already provides a workshop on course design that covers the issues noted here.

8.5 JMS New Program Approval (Schellenberg)

9. Other Information Items

• Class Size Task Force: Deutschman noted that the Class Size Task Force has not had much progress in the last few weeks; it needs a chair, and that “appointment” will happen shortly. Then all should be back on track. He noted that the chair may be from outside the original group.

• Provost: Explain that faculty owe about $35,000 for borrowed books from the library—and that’s just the replacement cost; the fines themselves aren’t included in this figure. Some of those who owe are retired, actually – but there is no consequence for nonpayment.
10. Other Business

11. Adjournment

The SEC adjourned @ 3:50 pm.
To: SEC/Senate  
From: Douglas Deutschman, Chair SDSU Senate  
on behalf of the FHA committee  
Date: 9/13/2015  
Re: Action

The Faculty Honors and Awards committee recommends that the Senate approve emeritus status for:

Theophillus B. Addo, Associate Professor of Management Information Systems, July 16, 2015, 28 years
Edith Benkov, Professor of European Studies, August 18, 2015, 32 years
Elizabeth Cobbs, Professor of History, August 18, 2015, 17 years
Paula Kalustian, Professor of Theatre, Television and Film, July 1, 2015, 26 years
Michael J. Sabath, Associate Professor of Public Affairs/Imperial Valley Campus, July 31, 2015, 22 years
II. FOUNDATIONS OF LEARNING

B. Social and Behavioral Sciences

New course
FIN 250. Financial Literacy (3) [GE]
Financial health, investments, life, property and liability insurance, residence and auto purchases, retirement and estate planning, tax planning, time value of money, and use of credit.

C. Humanities

1. Literature

New course
SPAN 250. Women's Literature in the Hispanic World (3) [GE]
Prerequisite: Completion of the General Education requirement in Communication and Critical Thinking I.2., Composition.
Literature of Hispanic women authors and the cultural, literary, historical, and sociopolitical questions raised by their texts. Not open to Spanish majors. Taught in English.
IV. EXPLORATIONS OF HUMAN EXPERIENCE

C. Humanities

New course

PHIL 335. Philosophy of Business Ethics (3) [GE]
Prerequisite: Upper division standing and completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities.
Philosophical examination of the moral status of various business practices. Evaluation of moral arguments and theories regarding ways to run businesses and corporations. Analysis of moral issues that arise in everyday practices of businesses. This course cannot be used in place of Management 444, which is required of College of Business Administration majors.

Change in course description, addition to GE, prerequisite, title

*REL S 315. Yoga: Theory and Practice (A) (3) [GE]
Prerequisite: Three units of religious studies and completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities required for nonmajors.
Yoga introduces cultural, historical, and philosophical aspects of yogic tradition since its earliest history to modern days. Texts, traditions, and prominent figures in yogic tradition providing a conceptual basis for the yogic practice.

Change in course title

REL S 350. Experiencing the Sacred (C) (3) [GE]
Prerequisites: Three units of religious studies and completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities for nonmajors.
Nature and scope of religious experience; transformations of consciousness and self through altered modes of human awareness and mind-body relationships. Yogic and ascetic experience, Shamanic trance and spirit possession, ecstatic experience and mysticism. Techniques of compassion.

*Cultural diversity course

Report prepared and respectfully submitted by Curriculum Services on behalf of the General Education Curriculum and Assessment Committee.
September 2015

TO: Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee
RE: Action

---------------------------------------------------

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends approval of the following policy recommendations:

(Note that the first section is presented in track change mode first, then with all changes approved. This is followed by suggested changes to the RTP materials posted on the Faculty Affairs website. The final paragraphs provide the rationales for these suggestions)

1. Add these new sections to the Policy File under Existing Policy File section 5.0: 5.11 to 5.15. Renumber existing sections to the new numbers 5.16 to 5.20, with one deletion to section 5.16 as noted.

5.0 Written Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness [Section 5 in Track Changes mode]

5.1 All class-course sections taught by faculty employees shall be evaluated by students unless consultation with a college has resulted in an agreement by the dean of the college and the college peer review committee to evaluate fewer sections. In cases where student evaluations are not required for all course sections, sections chosen for evaluation shall be representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment, and shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair or program director. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the course sections to be evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. Results of evaluations may be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File provided that individuals involved in evaluations and personnel recommendations or decisions are provided secure access for these purposes. In cases where students evaluations are not required for all classes, the classes to be evaluated shall be jointly determined by the faculty employee and the department chair or school director. In the event of a disagreement, each party shall select 50 percent of the total classes to be evaluated. Results of evaluations are stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the faculty member’s Personnel Action File.

5.11 For the purpose of clarity and comparability across campus, responses to all quantitative items should be rated from 1 to 5, with 1 the lowest (worst) and 5 the highest (best). These numbers should correspond to the following descriptors, in the following order: 1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Good, 5=Excellent. Responses of “not applicable” or “does not apply” should be placed at the end.
5.12 Each form shall contain three common questions that together constitute universal reference points or common ground across the university’s faculty evaluation process. The following common questions shall be the first questions on each form:

- Rate the instructor’s overall organization and presentation of the course material
- Rate the instructor’s focus on the student learning outcomes listed in the syllabus.
- Rate the instructor’s teaching overall.

In addition to these quantitative items, each form shall contain at least two open-ended, qualitative items prompting students to provide written comments. The common open-ended questions shall be:

- What were the instructor’s strengths?
- In what ways might the instructor improve this course?

5.13 Any additional evaluative items should be limited in number—no more than ten additional quantitative items and no more than one additional qualitative item. Additional items should emphasize criteria that are credibly evaluated by students (such as clarity of instruction, usefulness and timeliness of feedback on assignments and exams, perceived fairness, punctuality and reliability, ability to stimulate student interest, ability to communicate one’s subject matter or expertise, and problem-solving ability), rather than criteria that students are not particularly well qualified to judge (such as the instructor’s knowledge of the subject matter or teaching methodology).

5.14 If included on the form, demographic items (such as class standing, major, and so forth) and student self-evaluative items (such as hours spent on the class) should be listed last and clearly distinguished from instructor evaluation items.

5.15 The evaluation results report shall contain a composite mean of the three common questions as well as an overall average of all quantitative items.

5.16 Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course or section. The format of student evaluations shall be quantitative (e.g., 5 point Likert scale) or a combination of quantitative and qualitative (e.g., space provided for student comments).

5.17 Student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular evaluation process shall be identified by name in order to be included in the Personnel Action File.

5.18 The results of student evaluation of instruction shall be an important element of the evaluation of instruction but not the sole indicator of instructional quality.

5.19 The results of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness for temporary faculty employees shall be included in their periodic evaluations as required.

5.20 The results of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness for probationary and tenured faculty employees shall be part of the WPAF as required.
5.0 Written Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness [Section 5 with Changes Accepted]

5.1 All course sections taught by faculty employees shall be evaluated by students unless consultation with a college has resulted in an agreement by the dean of the college and the college peer review committee to evaluate fewer sections. In cases where student evaluations are not required for all course sections, sections chosen for evaluation shall be representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment, and shall be jointly determined in consultation between the faculty unit employee being evaluated and his/her department chair or program director. In the event of disagreement, each party shall select 50% of the course sections to be evaluated. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. Results of evaluations may be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File provided that individuals involved in evaluations and personnel recommendations or decisions are provided secure access for these purposes.

5.11 For the purpose of clarity and comparability across campus, responses to all quantitative items should be rated from 1 to 5, with 1 the lowest (worst) and 5 the highest (best). These numbers should correspond to the following descriptors, in the following order: 1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Good, 5=Excellent. Responses of “not applicable” or “does not apply” should be placed at the end.

5.12 Each form shall contain three common questions that together constitute universal reference points or common ground across the university’s faculty evaluation process. The following common questions shall be the first questions on each form:
- Rate the instructor’s overall organization and presentation of the course material
- Rate the instructor’s focus on the student learning outcomes listed in the syllabus.
- Rate the instructor’s teaching overall.
In addition to these quantitative items, each form shall contain at least two open-ended, qualitative items prompting students to provide written comments. The common open-ended questions shall be:
- What were the instructor’s strengths?
- In what ways might the instructor improve this course?

5.13 Any additional evaluative items should be limited in number—no more than ten additional quantitative items and no more than one additional qualitative item. Additional items should emphasize criteria that are credibly evaluated by students (such as clarity of instruction, usefulness and timeliness of feedback on assignments and exams, perceived fairness, punctuality and reliability, ability to stimulate student interest, ability to communicate one’s subject matter or expertise, and problem-solving ability), rather than criteria that students are not particularly well qualified to judge (such as the instructor’s knowledge of the subject matter or teaching methodology).

5.14 If included on the form, demographic items (such as class standing, major, and so forth) and student self-evaluative items (such as hours spent on the class) should be listed last and clearly distinguished from instructor evaluation items.
5.15 The evaluation results report shall contain a composite mean of the three common questions as well as an overall average of all quantitative items.

5.16 Student evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process shall be anonymous and identified only by course or section.

5.17 Student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular evaluation process shall be identified by name in order to be included in the Personnel Action File.

5.18 The results of student evaluation of instruction shall be an important element of the evaluation of instruction but not the sole indicator of instructional quality.

5.19 The results of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness for temporary faculty employees shall be included in their periodic evaluations as required.

5.20 The results of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness for probationary and tenured faculty employees shall be part of the WPAF as required.

2. Add the following as guidelines in RTP materials posted at the Faculty Affairs Web site. [Not included in the Policy File but added to the FA website]

Relevant Criteria for Interpreting Faculty Evaluations at the Department, College, and University Levels.

The following criteria should be considered by committees and individuals who use faculty evaluations to assess the performance of faculty. They are also designed to help instructors better understand the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching.

- **Course modality (face-to-face, hybrid, online)**
  Online courses might yield lower faculty evaluations than face-to-face courses because of possible difficulties raised by the use of technology (e.g. connection problems).

- **Course types (seminar/lecture/lab/studio)**
  Seminars, labs, and studios have a tendency to be evaluated higher than lecture-based courses because of their relatively small class size and the interactive nature of the course type. In addition, generally speaking, the smaller the class, the higher the variance across terms.

- **Course levels (lower division/upper division/MA, MS/PhD)**
  Students’ motivation may be greater in upper-division (more specific) than lower-division (more general) classes, which may affect the students’ evaluation of the instructor.

- **Class function (prerequisite/major/elective)**
  Students’ motivation may be greater in elective/major than prerequisite classes, which may affect the students’ evaluation of the instructor.
• **Class size (e.g., 7/35/150/300/800)**
The larger the class size, the more difficult it is to engage students in the course. Engagement inevitably influences the instructor evaluation. Furthermore, small sample size is highly variable and more extreme.

• **Academic discipline**
Disciplines engage students differently and therefore comparisons across disciplines should be avoided.

• **Team taught vs. single instructor**
Team taught courses may create challenges for coherence and consistency, as well as confusion about evaluation. For example, if three instructors collaborate on the teaching of a course, it may be difficult to sort out which student comments and assessments correspond with which instructor. In addition, if an instructor is in charge of a large class that includes laboratory sections, teaching assistants may be the ones supervising those labs. A distinction should be made in terms of evaluation of the instructor and evaluation of the teaching assistants.

• **Student experience with evaluation process**
Lower-division students and new transfer students have less experience with courses than seniors have and this may affect the students’ evaluation of the instructor.

• **Student response rate to questions**
Low response is not necessarily an indicator of bad teaching; it simply does not allow generalizing results reliably to the whole class.

• **Difficult issues or challenging topics**
Faculty who teach courses related to cultural diversity and other challenging subjects often receive low evaluations, as do faculty of color who teach predominately Euro American classes.

Rationales:
[Rationales for suggested policy changes and material for FA website]

These recommendations are based on the recommendations in the University Senate Task Force on Faculty Evaluations Final Report, January 9, 2015. A major aim of this is to create comparable metrics for the RTP process. These recommendations are designed to standardize some aspects of faculty evaluations across the campus and to provide more detailed guidelines for interpreting student evaluation scores to reflect variations among courses being evaluated. This recommendation is also intended to help instructors better understand the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching.
The Faculty Affairs Committee decided that the recommendation from the Task Force on Presentation of Statistical Results from Faculty Evaluations were potentially valuable but could not be easily adopted for universal use across the campus. The Committee recommends that consideration be given to linking course student learning outcomes to the second question in 5.12, directly through the evaluation website.
September 15, 2015

TO: SEC
FROM: Cezar Ornatowski
Bill Eadie
Mark Wheeler, SDSU Representatives to ASCSU
SUBJECT: Report on September 2015 ASCSU plenary

Various Items of Interest

Jennifer Eagan, CFA liaison, expressed disappointment with Chancellor White’s 2% salary proposal. 5% is the “going rate” for recovering from the recession. UTLA teachers are getting it; Chabot College instructors are getting it. Many public employees are getting it. CSU faculty deserve it.

Chancellor White’s reported:
- Working on a new CSU mission statement.
- Will be on campuses for 4 new presidential searches, 2 to be concluded by January, 2 by March. Will take suggestions about how presidential searches are conducted. Wants to make sure that search advisory committees are reflective of a campus.
- The question of open presidential searches in a “delicate” matter. Many high-profile administrators at other institutions, “80% of them won’t apply” if they know they’ll have to go public during the search. So the searches are closed, with respect to the goal of finding the best candidate possible. If all candidates were to agree to campus visits, then it could open. But that’s a very low probability. So is the search “secret”? No, it’s “confidential.”

Lou Monville, CSU BOT Chair:
- The CSU was relatively successful in the last budget go-round at the legislature, and the Senate deserves a good bit of credit for that.

Steve Relyea, Executive Vice Chancellor, CFO:
Health care and insurance costs are rising rapidly. Demand for admission to the CSUs is higher than ever. In general, the system faces many challenges, on both the expenses and the revenues sides. Question time included comments that the CO seems to be pursuing all revenue sources except a restoration of state funds, which seems like the wrong message to send.

Loren Blanchard, the new Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Students Affairs: Introduced his vision regarding student success and how the campuses can nurture it. In accepting the job, he was particularly impressed with the CSU’s graduation initiative. Took questions and provided responses, including on the issue of the increase of non-resident /
international students, the diversity of (differences among) the various far-flung CSU campuses, and certain CSU practices and policies.

Steven Stepanek, Faculty Trustee reported on the summer meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees on July 20-21, 2015, which discussed the following, among other items:

The compensation challenges faced by the CSU as background for future proposals. For 2012-2013, 41% of the CSU budget was spent on salaries and wages, 18% on employee benefits and 41% on all other operational expenses. Healthcare employer paid costs increased 10.2% in calendar year 2011, 4.3% in 2012, 9.8% in 2013, 3.0% in 2014 and 2.6% in 2015 for a total 5-year increase in CSU costs of $110,825,000. The breakdown of total compensation expense for 2014-2015 by employee types: Faculty $16.1 million (49.1%), Staff $12.6 million (38.1%), Management (MPP) $4.0 million (12.5%) and Executives $100,000 (0.3%).

One graph on CSU base salary presented to the BOT showed that while the increases in CSU salaries during the past two years are consistent with increases in education salaries and local (L.A.) and national salaries, the CSU has a three-year lag behind education salaries and a four-year lag behind local and national salaries. In the report to the Board the following appeared under graph: “In summary, the data offers a compelling story for the need to continue addressing compensation issues in the CSU. Despite efforts in the past three years, the gap between CSU compensation and other relevant markets continues to grow.”

A joint meeting of the committees on Governmental Relations and Finance received an update on legislation bills and the Report on the 2015-2016 Support Budget. Regarding the CSU support budget, by the time the Governor signed the state budget the CSU was receiving its total request for a $269.0 million increase in funding, bringing state support for the CSU to $3.0 billion out of a $115.4 billion state General Fund budget. This is the first time in nearly a decade that the CSU funding request to the state is being fully met. The increases to the CSU support budget include the following:

2% Compensation Pool Increase $65.5 million
3% Enrollment Demand (10,400 FTES) $103.2 million
Student Success and Completion Initiatives $38.0 million
Academic Facilities Maintenance & Infrastructure Needs $25.0 million
Information Technology Infrastructure Upgrade & Renewal $14.0 million
Mandatory Costs $23.1 million
Center for California Studies – cost increases $0.2 million
Total $269.0 million

In addition, the following one-time funding was provided:
Deferred Maintenance $25 million
California Dream Loan Program (unspecified matching of state and CSU funds)
Basic Skills Partnership Pilot Program ($10 million in CCC budget)
Resolutions

At the September 2-4 2015 ASCSU plenary meeting, four resolutions were passed:

**AS-3222-15/FGA Support for SB 707 (Wolk) Gun-Free School Zone**
Supports legislation that would prohibit a person with a concealed weapon permit from bringing a firearm onto K-12 school grounds or higher education campuses (the bill makes exception for certain law enforcement personnel).

**AS-3224-/FGA Support for SB 172 (Liu) Pupil Testing: High School Exit Examination: Suspension**
Supports legislation that would temporarily remove the California High School Exit Examination, or CAHSEE (which assesses proficiency in English language arts and mathematics) as a condition of high school graduation for the academic years 2015-2016 through 2017-2018.

**AS-3230-15/APEP Establishing a Task Force on the Requirements of CSU General Education (GE) Mathematics / Quantitative Reasoning (B4) Credit**

**AS-3232-15/APEP On the California High School Exit Examination**
Acknowledges and applauds the efforts of Senator Hancock and Assembly Member O’Donnell, which culminated in SB 725, Hancock. Pupil testing: high school exit examination: exemption.

Three resolutions received their first reading

**AS-3223-15/FA Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy (HR-2015-08)**
Calls for a suspension of the new CSU Background Check Policy (HR-2015-08 asks the ASCSU and the Chancellor’s Office to establish a task force to study the policy and make recommendations regarding appropriateness of background checks for specific areas of faculty responsibility on campuses.

**AS-3228-15/ FA Addition of an Emeritus/Emerita Faculty Member to the CSU Board of Trustees**
Calls on the ASCSU to advocate for the addition of an emeritus or emerita faculty member to the CSU Board of Trustees. It also requests that the Chancellor’s Office support legislation amending the Education Code to that effect.
AS-3229-15/FGA California State University 2016-17 Support Budget Preliminary Plan
Commends the CSU preliminary plan for the 2016-17-support budget. It also urges the Board of Trustees to seek additional funding to provide a compensation pool increase for all employees beyond the administration’s proposed 2%. 

Over $628M has now been raised for The Campaign for SDSU. The following gifts have been received since the last report:

Alumni Linda and Tom Lang have pledged $500,000 to support the College of Business Administration, the College of Engineering and the Veterans Program.

Alumna Cheryl Hintzen-Gaines has bequeathed $100,000 to support Veterans Programs at San Diego State University.

Alumnus Floyd W. Pickrell, Jr. has pledged $250,000 to support the Fowler Challenge Fund for Athletics.

Hal and Debby Jacobs made a gift of $125,000 to support athletics.

Alumnus Joseph Fisch made a gift of $36,000 to support Friends of Music and Dance in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts.

ASHRAE San Diego has made a gift of $26,050 to support an endowment in the College of Engineering.

A gift of $22,000 from the Filanc Family Trust will support athletics.

Faculty Emeritus Kenn Ulrich and his wife Joyce have increased their initial bequest by $243,750 for a total of $393,750. Their gift will create the Lee Rae Ulrich Costume Design Memorial Fund in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts.

Alumni Dennis and Janet Cruzan have made a gift of $30,000 to support athletics.

The Price Philanthropies Foundation made a gift of $15,000 to support scholarships in the College of Health and Human Services.

The James Hervey Johnson Trust has made a gift of $100,000 to support the College of Arts and Letters.

A gift of $15,000 from the Sigma Pi Educational Fund of San Diego will support the Aztec Club.

Alumnus Art Flaming and his wife Gwen have gifted $30,000 to support athletic scholarships and $20,000 for the Fisher Basketball Endowment.
Alumni Association:

Strive is SDSU’s first crowdfunding platform and the mission of the site is to promote university fundraising initiatives through alternative channels. The site modernizes annual fund giving and focuses on projects conceived by San Diego State University students, faculty, and staff. The goal of crowdfunding at the university is to diversify giving options, raise funds for our campus partners, and ultimately increase alumni participation and donors to the university. Through Strive, alumni and friends of the university are given the opportunity to choose the causes they are most passionate about, and then spread the word through their network(s) about their contribution(s) and the importance of the cause(s).

To date Strive has launched 12 projects. Highlights for our first month are as follows:

- 5 of our initial 7 projects which premiered at launch funded before the campaign end date.
- A $2,500 gift to the Thresher project was received to close out the campaign. This gift was from a first time donor.
- A $2,015 gift to the Comic Archive project was also received from a first time donor to close out the campaign. This gift was matched by the donor’s company making the total for the gift $4,030.00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Date Launched</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Money Raised</th>
<th>Unique Donors</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comic Archive in the Library</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$6,391.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>First Project to fully fund through Strive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresher Project through Zahn Center</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,250.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Alumni Network Scholarships</td>
<td>8/31/2015</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$840.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztec Mural Project</td>
<td>9/3/2015</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Nutrition Plan</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$1,108.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Scholars Graduation Support</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$3,488.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marching Band Support</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,528.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>See Table Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Philanthropy Aztec Proud</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$13,125.00*</td>
<td>1,057*</td>
<td>Strive used to increase awareness. Donors and dollars came in via campus tabling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock and Roll Mural Support</td>
<td>7/21/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,126.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Funds mostly raised through direct mail in Spring 2015. Strive used to close out campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Letters Alumni Scholarship</td>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Surf Research Internship Support</td>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztec Football Cal Game Project</td>
<td>9/12/2015</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Project only launches on an Aztec victory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campaign, Presidential & Special Events:

President Hirshman and Vice President Carleton hosted several stewardship lunches and dinners for key donors to the Campaign for SDSU.

On Thursday, August 13, a reception for the Presidential Staff Excellence Zuma Award recipients was held at the Parma Payne Goodall Alumni Center. The Zumas recognize the contributions and efforts made by staff in support of the University, the community and their fellow employees.

Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Complex:

The Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Complex (EIS) received approval by the CSU Board of Trustees in May and demolition began this month, with construction scheduled to begin in October.

Since April, the EIS Campaign has raised almost $3.49M with 7 namings and two $1M gifts. Engineering alumnus, Bill Leonhard, has pledged $1M to name the Entrepreneurial Center and Cymer, Inc. has pledged $1M to name the entry plaza of the complex. Communications regarding the EIS Complex have ramped up as, earlier this month, the EIS Campaign website was launched and the EIS-dedicated issue of the 360 Magazine was mailed to thousands of alumni, donors and friends of San Diego State.

Media Relations:

- **Total Media Clips**
  - Month: 569
  - YTD: 1,479

- **National Hits**
  - Month: 93
  - YTD: 228
  - Ann. Goal: 3,600

- **Major Hits**
  - Month: 15
  - YTD: 26
  - Ann. Goal: 230

- **Faculty Quoted**
  - Month: 116
  - YTD: 241

Media Relations: Major media coverage this month included:

- KFMB’s Move-In Day segment picked up by Yahoo News and Yahoo Sports;
- The latest Kepler discovery in Huffington Post, Yahoo News, CNET, Science Daily;
- News about SDSU once again being named one of the most LGBT friendly colleges in the country picked up by Washington Post, Huffington Post, Out Magazine and LGBT Weekly

Experts Quoted: Faculty experts were quoted by media all over the country including:

- Dan Eaton on CNBC talking about parental leave rights;
- Carl Winston talking about Anaheim’s tourism (Los Angeles Times, MSN Travel);
- Rebecca Lewison on KGTV about how the drought is affecting wildlife;
- Tanis Stark on the 10th anniversary of Hurricane Katrina on KPBS.

National Markets: Key San Diego media coverage included:

- Move-In Day and the opening of Zura Hall (KUSI, KSWB, KFMB, KGTV);
- The first day of school with Brad Perry from KUSI;
- and a live KUSI interview with President Hirshman.
Additional coverage in our target markets this month included:

- Zahn Innovation Platform announcement (San Diego Union-Tribune, KNSD);
- the re-opening of the Joan and Art Barron Veterans Center (The San Diego Union-Tribune, KPBS, FOX5 and KFMB);
- a San Diego Union Tribune feature on the success of SDSU Strive;
- a feature on linguistics professor Douglas Bigham in San Diego Magazine, talking about his unique course offerings;
- a feature in the San Diego Union Tribune about the $2.5 million grant awarded to SDSU to improve care for older Americans.

**Merit Student Achievements**

Recognizing individual student accomplishments and sharing with their friends, families and home towns via social media and traditional media.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August Achievement</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Student Open Rate</th>
<th>Student Click Rate</th>
<th>Media Outlets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robosub Participants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date</th>
<th>Annual Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with Merit Pages</td>
<td>7,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools Reached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Impressions</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Senate Executive Committee / Senate

From: Larry S. Verity, Chair
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Date: September 9, 2015

Re: 2016-2017 General Catalog

INFORMATION (31-09-15)

ART

1. Change in program.

   Art Major
   With the B.A. Degree in Applied Arts and Sciences
   (Major Code: 10021) (SIMS Code: 660501)
   Emphasis in Graphic Design
   (Major Code: 10091) (SIMS Code: 660557)
   Impacted Program. (no change)
   Preparation for the Major. (no change)
   Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement. (no change)
   Major. A minimum of 33 upper division units in art to include Art 341, 342A, 345; six units selected from Art 313, 441, 442, 450, 454; six units selected from Art 445B, 445C, 541, 542, 545; six units of upper division art electives; six units of art history (Art 371, 557 through 578, and 593); Art 577 recommended.

   Change(s): Addition of Art 313 as optional required elective.

2. Change in program.

   Art Major
   With the B.A. Degree in Applied Arts and Sciences
   (Major Code: 10021) (SIMS Code: 660501)
   Emphasis in Painting and Printmaking
   (Major Code: 10021) (SIMS Code: 660573)
   Impacted Program. (no change)
   Preparation for the Major. (no change)
   Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement. (no change)
   Major. A minimum of 30 upper division units in art to include six units of art history (Art 371, 557 through 578, and 593); six units selected from Art 340, 346, 403, 404, 406, 407, 410; three units selected from Art 500, 503, 504, 511; nine units selected from Art 344, 407, 408, 410, 411, 416, 443, 446, 506; six units of upper division art electives.
Change(s): Total upper division units reduced by three units to 30 units and required upper division electives reduced from 12 to nine units.

FINANCE

1. New course.

Finance

FINANCIAL LITERACY (C-1)
FIN 250. Financial Literacy (3) [GE]
Financial health, investments, life, property and liability insurance, residence and auto purchases, retirement and estate planning, tax planning, time value of money, and use of credit.

KINESIOLOGY

1. Change in program.

Athletic Training Major
With the B.S. Degree in Applied Arts and Sciences
(Major Code: 08375) (SIMS Code: 556522)
Paragraphs 1-3 (no change)

Preparation for the Major. (no change)
Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement. (no change)
International Experience. (no change)


Change(s): Removal of Nutrition 304 reduces upper division units from 47 to 44.

PHILOSOPHY

1. New course.

Philosophy

PHIL OF BUSINESS ETHICS (C-2)
PHIL 335. Philosophy of Business Ethics (3) [GE]
Prerequisite: Upper division standing and completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities.

Philosophical examination of the moral status of various business practices. Evaluation of moral arguments and theories regarding ways to run businesses and corporations. Analysis of moral issues that arise in everyday practices of businesses. This
course cannot be used in place of Management 444, which is required of College of Business Administration majors.

**RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

1. Change in course description, GE, prerequisite, title.

   Religious Studies
   
   **YOGA THEORY AND PRACTICE (C-2)**
   
   REL S 315. Yoga: Theory and Practice (A) (3) [GE]
   
   Prerequisite: Three units of religious studies and completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities required for nonmajors.
   
   Yoga introduces cultural, historical, and philosophical aspects of yogic tradition since its earliest history to modern days. Texts, traditions, and prominent figures in yogic tradition providing a conceptual basis for the yogic practice.
   
   **Change(s):** Course now offered for GE. Title updated from *Sacred Texts of Yoga* to what is reflected above. Description updated to better align with course content. Prerequisite updated to reflect GE expectations.

2. Change in course title.

   Religious Studies
   
   **EXPERIENCING THE SACRED (C-4)**
   
   REL S 350. Experiencing the Sacred (C) (3) [GE]
   
   Prerequisites: Three units of religious studies and completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities for nonmajors.
   
   Nature and scope of religious experience; transformations of consciousness and self through altered modes of human awareness and mind-body relationships. Yogic and ascetic experience, Shamanic trance and spirit possession, ecstatic experience and mysticism. Techniques of compassion.
   
   **Change(s):** Title updated from *Varieties of Religious Experience* to what is reflected above.

**SPANISH**

1. New course.

   Spanish
   
   **WOMEN'S LIT HISPANIC WRLD (C-4)**
   
   SPAN 250. Women's Literature in the Hispanic World (3) [GE]
   
   Prerequisite: Completion of the General Education requirement in Communication and Critical Thinking I.2., Composition.
Literature of Hispanic women authors and the cultural, literary, historical, and sociopolitical questions raised by their texts. Not open to Spanish majors. Taught in English.

2. New course.

Spanish

SPAN FOR EDUCATORS (C-2)

SPAN 408. Spanish for Educators (3)

- Prerequisites: Spanish 301 and 302, or Spanish 381 or 382.
- Project-based collaborative analysis of linguistic and cultural competencies in Spanish required to interact with K-12 schools and their Spanish-speaking communities.

Report prepared and respectfully submitted by Curriculum Services on behalf of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
On 1 April 2015, Faculty Affairs (FA) and Academic Policy and Planning (APP) received the following joint-referral from senate officers accompanied by the attached memo from the Student Grievance Committee.

“Advise the Senate on the recommendation of the Student Grievance Committee that: any “peer evaluations” or peer estimations of coursework completed shall be based on a clear rubric and shall not account for more than 5% of the final grade of the course.”

We would like to thank the Student Grievance Committee for their work on this and other issues, and their efforts to raise this issue for broader consideration and discussion across the university. After thoughtful consideration and discussion of the referral and memo, both committees view the use of peer evaluations in the determination of grades to be an important issue, but not one that rises to the level of a formal policy change. In the committees’ view, the provided grievance examples likely could have been avoided through better communication and clearer expectations on the part of the instructor, echoing the Student Grievance Committee’s consistent findings in favor of the students and their admonitions to the involved faculty. However, precluding such grievances through a “global” limiting percentage for this practice was viewed as overly restrictive to “local” situations where effective peer evaluation is a core component of a course’s structure and goals. Thus, faculty should retain the right to structure their courses in the most effective manner that promotes student achievement, but appreciate their intrinsic responsibility for providing an effective, productive, and inclusive learning environment for all students.

We strongly endorsed the SGC’s consistent recommendations that instructors provide clear syllabus language and peer evaluation rubrics. Such rubrics are an obvious component of an effective grading policy (as required for all syllabi), and provide an explicit means to establish clear student expectations and responsibilities. We also encourage faculty to design a strong formative component for any peer evaluations, which provides multiple “low-stakes” opportunities for (1) evaluators to build their capacity for effective feedback, (2) evaluatees to “up their game” if merited, and (3) instructors to identify and resolve potential issues.
Peer evaluation can be an effective means for formative and summative assessment of collaborative learning, which is an established “High Impact Practice” that promotes student proficiency in at least three of our seven Essential Capacities for General Education (i.e., Negotiate differences, Integrate global to local perspectives, and Evaluate consequences of actions). We encourage faculty that currently include, or are interested in developing, peer evaluations (and collaborative learning in general) to explore resources on the Center for Teaching and Learning website. In addition, faculty are welcome to contact the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning for additional discussion. In addition, we suggest that a future edition of the SDSU Curriculum Guide would be an appropriate venue to provide recommendations and resources for such pedagogical endeavors, particularly with respect to their integration into courses and communication within syllabi. More broadly, we encourage the entire university community to embrace a reflective approach in their design of effective courses, with a focus on ensuring a productive and inclusive learning environment for all students.

1 This issue of academic freedom is a central and cherished tenet of higher education, but is not a shield from broader educational responsibility. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) addresses this issue in their Statement on Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility (2006):

“There is, however, an additional dimension of academic freedom that was not well developed in the original principles*, and that has to do with the responsibilities of faculty members for educational programs. Faculty are responsible for establishing goals for student learning, for designing and implementing programs of general education and specialized study that intentionally cultivate the intended learning, and for assessing students’ achievement. In these matters, faculty must work collaboratively with their colleagues in their departments, schools, and institutions as well as with relevant administrators. Academic freedom is necessary not just so faculty members can conduct their individual research and teach their own courses, but so they can enable students – through whole college programs of study – to acquire the learning they need to contribute to society.”

(* “original principles” refers to AACU’s Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1940), which can be accessed through the digital “Redbook” at http://www.aaup.org/reports-publications/publications/redbook.)

2 From Section 2.0 of the Academic Responsibilities section of University Senate Policy File: “The syllabus for each course shall describe . . . the course design, required materials, schedule, and grading policies, which may vary by section.”