Minutes – Senate Executive Committee
April 17, 2001
Faculty-Staff Centre


1. Agenda (Wright)


2. Minutes (Wright)


3. Announcements (Huckle)

This being my last SEC meeting, I want to express my pleasure at working in the Senate and thank each of you for your participation.

4. University Administration (Marlin)

Thanks to the many faculty and staff who participated in Future Aztecs Day on April 7. Approximately 5,000 students with their families visited the campus. We plan to be over our enrollment target for this fall so as to avoid the problems we had last year.

An energy fee was discussed in the Cabinet Budget Committee meeting recently. This is garnering support as we look at the reality of what we will have for a budget if we don’t have some additional funds to pay for the costs of energy.

At the Senate meeting a compilation of retention activities will be presented.

Discussion:

Senator Kornfeld: Has a decision been made about release time for committee chairs next year? Provost Marlin: The Senate Officers have made their request. The release time will be the same as this year. Additional funding allocations must wait until the budget is finalized.

4.1 Foundation (Gen Mgr Sladek)

The Foundation is listening to your comments. Thanks to Dr. Boddy for suggesting we form an ad hoc committee of our Board of Directors to look at how to best integrate University needs with the Redevelopment Project.

Assoc Gen Mgr Bloom: The Redevelopment Plan will be discussed at the May 3 Senate meeting. We sent out a survey regarding how we can better meet the University needs related to enrollment growth that is anticipated over the next ten years. We are looking at putting in an office building and pursuing a theater complex that would be available as a lecture hall. The fraternity project will be done in 2002. Other projects include redevelopment of the religious centers, the Elderhostel, the relocation of the Health Center, and a potential hotel/conference center. We have looked at the eastern extension of the campus and more attention is being given to the land down to Alvarado, including C lot, creating a continuum of uses between the campus and Alvarado.

4.2 Office of Technology Transfer (Dir Office of Tech Transfer Gordon)

This office primarily deals with intellectual property that derives from faculty that has commercial value.

Discussion

VP Cobble: Patent and copyrights are part of this process.

5. Committee Reports
5.1 Officers’ Report (Short)


An SDSU Planning Memo authored by Chair Huckle and Vice Chair Short will be presented to the Senate as a report for discussion.

Discussion:

Senator Kornfeld: There does not appear to be anything about enrollment. There must be a lot of planning about enrollment. Chair Huckle: The first paragraph mentioned enrollment growth but if you wish to add something on retention and enrollment please do so.

Senator Boddy: Regarding facilities planning, as stated here, there have been discussions of large groups from all walks of the University that have been very helpful. Discussions about buildings relate to enrollment, opportunities for Foundation development, etc. Yet, as a participant in those groups, once those discussions take place there is no process for recommendations that goes forward to the President and Provost. It would be very important to create a group, similar to budget planning, with representation from the various divisions and the Foundation and Senate to look at all of the Master Planning areas. I hope that the officers do not make a recommendation but set in motion some proposal like this by early Fall.

Senator Kornfeld: Perhaps there should be a paragraph regarding Year-Round-Operations. Senator Zimmerman: Off-Campus Sites would be appropriate to include as well.

Included in the Agenda on pages 2-4 is a resolution designed to censure Chancellor Reed.

Discussion

Senator Farber: I have been in correspondence with Senator Kornfeld regarding this issue. She had made the point that she could support a resolution that was broader and more local than Pomona’s resolution. I would much prefer to see us do a motion that addresses some of the issues that go beyond the contract issues. We will draft a resolution and bring this forward to the Senate.

A list of outstanding referrals was included in the Agenda and can be found on the website at http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/dept/senate/committees/index.html.

5.2 Academic Policy and Planning (Kornfeld)

AP&P will recommend the Senate adopt the following response to the CSU Academic Senate resolution on the Ed.D. If adopted, the response shall be forwarded to the CSU Academic Senate, the Chancellor, and all other Senates in the CSU.

We support the idea of seeking authorization from the California legislature for the CSU to develop and offer an independent Ed.D. We also urge that this resolution be broadened to include other independent applied doctoral degrees.

Discussion:

Senator Zimmerman: Did you discuss putting something in here about appropriate funding? Senator Kornfeld: The discussion at AP&P goes on at some length about that. We were noting that appropriate funding is never quite given. If we wait to approve doctoral programs until there is appropriate funding, they would never happen.

Senator Boddy: It would be helpful if we are seeking authorization that you include a statement that we believe the Ed.Ds are badly needed and therefore we support them. There is also a timing issue in the last sentence. Another way of phrasing this is to add a nuance that the State of California needs these other applied degrees.

AP&P and the UCC will recommend approval of the following revision to the Policy File IV-E-7. If approved, the new policy will also replace the existing language in the SDSU Undergraduate Curriculum Guide p. 15.
Undergraduate Course Requirements

1.0 Regardless of the length of the term, Short-term all courses shall meet certain conditions to ensure lasting learning.

2.0 All Short-term courses shall not only meet the required number of hours but shall also offer students an opportunity to prepare, to study, and to cogitate for the required hours, as stated in the General Catalog.

2.1 A unit of credit hour represents 50 minutes of lecture or recitation combined with two hours of preparation per week throughout one semester of 15 weeks. Two hours of activity (as in Exercise and Nutritional Sciences) or three hours of laboratory (as in Physics) are considered equivalent to one hour of lecture.

3.0 A course offered in a term of less than 15 weeks shall contain the same contact hours, preparation time, content, and requirements as the same course offered over a 15-week semester.

4.0 The approval of the department or program and of the college dean shall be required to schedule all short-term or weekend courses.

4.1 Departments or programs shall not schedule a one-unit course over a time span of less than four consecutive calendar days.

Discussion:

Senator Zimmerman: This means that all courses that are offered in Summer Session have to go through the approval of the department or program dean? Senator Kornfeld: They always do, it is the current practice. Our idea is that people know that this is a formal process and that the departments and deans will approve them with an eye to these regulations and policies.

Senator Kornfeld: Is Section 4.1 clear? What we mean there is that we will not have any courses offered in a time span of less than four consecutive days. Chair Huckle: For instance we have a conference on the History of Childhood. We propose to give students a unit of credit for participation. This policy means that you could not meet on Friday from 6-8 and from 12-5 on Saturday and Sunday and fulfill this requirement. You have to spread it so the weekend before you have a preparation and the weekend after you have a follow-up. Senator Kornfeld: You could have a paper due on Monday or Tuesday and that would fulfill this policy.

Senator Cademy: How much is accomplished here – if you move Friday to Thursday night you’re covered. What is the purpose? Senator Kornfeld: This comes from the UCC. Our IVC representative strenuously opposed anything more than four days because she believed it would ruin guest lecturer visits.

5.3 Academic Resources and Planning (Shackelford)

Our various energy conservation measures are having a positive effect. The Campus Fee Advisory Committee is considering the possibility of increasing student fees to help cover energy cost increases. The most recent estimate for next year is somewhere between $3M and $6M on energy increase. We will have 1000 more FTES and $7.5M to fund the increased enrollment. Our direct cost will be $3M, leaving $4.5. If we had $4.5 going to the General Fund all we could do would be to provide for the general classes and not pay a thing additional.

Discussion:

Senator Short: Energy has overwhelmed everything, but what about Athletics? Senator Shackelford: IAA is committed to operating within revenues. There is a deficit of $1.5M. That is being handled by playing around with trust funds and various little cash flow games. Next year, when we have a change from money gained from away games vs. what we pay them to play here, there is approximately a $650K adverse shift. The General Fund expenditure for Athletics uses every bit of $6M.

5.4 Curriculum (Papin)

The Eighth 2001-2002 Catalog and Courses report will be presented to the Senate.
5.5 Campus Development Committee (Wilson)

The Campus Development Committee will move that the University Senate approve the following criteria for the relocation of the statue of Montezuma: 1) Maximize visibility of the statue to students, faculty, staff and guests of the University; 2) Find a site that complements the statue, particularly with regard to scale; 3) Ensure the safety and security of the statue given its value as a work of art; 4) Ensure the appropriateness of the site with respect to campus traditions, the aesthetic value of the statue and the historical importance of the artist, Donal Hord; 5) Consider the cost of the relocation; 6) Provide the statue a place of prominence to achieve the recognition it deserves, recognizing the symbolic importance of the statue to faculty and alumni of earlier generations; 7) Prefer a site at which the statue might be illuminated at night.

Discussion:

Senator Genovese: Why is this being relocated? Senator Wilson: The Trolley project will affect it.

Senator Kornfeld: This implies that the mascot issue is over and that Monty is coming back. This issue is not closed. Senator Short: We are concerned about securing a work of art. This is divorced from the issue of whether or not we remain Aztecs. CDC was disturbed by its position in the walkway and wanted to make sure there were criteria before it is moved.

A presentation will be made to the CDC at their May meeting regarding the redevelopment of Aztec Center. Website is www.hhpa.com/aztec forum. There are three designs being considered by Associated Students.

Discussion:

Chair Huckle: This is a good example of the difficulties of not having a planning process that incorporates the auxiliaries. The fact that this set of plans is as far along as it is without consultation shows a serious absence in campus process. Senator Kornfeld: Does the Senate have any veto power? Chair Huckle: There is no requirement that there be discussion with any planning group in Associated Students. The University also has no liability. If AS defaults on their mortgage, they would raise fees.

5.6 Constitution and Bylaws (Genovese)

No report.

5.7 Committees and Elections (Zimmerman)


The Committee on Committees and Elections will move approval of the following appointments to committee chair for 2001-2001: Academic Policy & Planning: Eve Kornfeld; Academic Resources & Planning: Gordon Shackelford; Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Pat Dintrone.

5.8 Diversity, Equity and Outreach (Donahue)

The Diversity, Equity and Outreach Committee will present their report on Impaction Policies at SDSU (agenda pages 9-16) to the Senate and move that a University-wide review of our impaction policies and procedures be conducted as soon as it is practical to do so.

Discussion:

Provost Marlin: It would be helpful to put your numbers in context. The earlier numbers were pre-Proposition 209 when we had a number of special enrollments based on race. It is hard to make those comparisons. Also, as we implement impaction, we take great pride that we have not diminished the overall diversity. The number of African-Americans has
gone down, but the number of Hispanic students has gone up. Without putting this in context it is very misleading. The arguments for selectivity you list are very unfamiliar.

Senator Donahue: The DEO committee response is more of a grass-roots response. People who belong to DEO are not a part of the Enrollment Management Group. Provost Marlin: The DEO director is invited to all the meetings. I find this report misleading, given what is going on on campus.

Senator Cobble: The statement that SAT scores result in de facto discrimination has to be proven. You mention that UC President Atkinson is de-emphasizing the SAT culture in admissions. They haven’t done this, they are studying it.

Senator Donahue: If people set up a policy that they know will result in a diminution of a certain select group, this is de facto discrimination. When they pursue this, it becomes an institutionalized policy. This is an expression of sentiments from a variety of sources in the community.

Senator Kornfeld: There is much in here that I take issue with, starting with the first paragraph. I was on AP&P when we began talking about this; and I don’t ever remember the second motivation that you mention, that there “was an attempt to move SDSU to a status in which the university could exert a greater selectivity among the students who apply here” anywhere in our talks, I am also troubled by the paragraph on discrimination and institutional discrimination. I would like to see some contextualization. When we decided on the 80/20 ratio and campus impaction principles were passed, we did not have Proposition 209 to limit us and we fully expected to be able to continue to use racial and ethnic categories as one means of selecting our 20%. As a historian, I am troubled by the collapse of the chronology because it leads to the sense that we knew where we would be when we started. Human beings never know. I am also troubled about admissions and enrollment which seem to be confused. There are also various statements on Prop 209 that concern me and the final discussion of other issues seems a committee statement but not the Senate’s views. It might be worth AP&P to look at impaction again.

Senator Papin: On page 12 you list the percentage of decline in African-American students. Looking on page 15 the data is only given for 1999. We need to see the same data for 1997-2000 to see if students coming out of high school have been dropping. If you look at 1999, the figures look good even if you include the statewide figures.

Senator Donahue: These tables are offered in support of the paragraph, “The attached tables show that the proportion of students (and the absolute numbers of students) from under-represented groups among high school graduates in our service area who may be UC and CSU eligible is quite small. There exists a premise that the more selective we become, the more competitive we will be in attracting people from these under-represented populations.” Those remarks are about the direction enrollment management seems to have taken. There are very few people who are eligible. This is an argument that deals with support for what happens in our particular impaction rationalizations.

5.9 Faculty Honors & Awards (Zimmerman for Little)

The Faculty Honors & Awards committee will move the Senate approve emeritus status upon retirement to the following faculty: Douglas Cargille, Librarian, 7/1/01, 23 years; James A. Clapp, Professor, Pub. Admin. & Urban Studies, 6/1/01, 33 years; Louis R. Franzini, Professor, Psychology, 6/1/01, 32 years; Larry J. Shaw, Professor, Teacher Education, 8/26/01, 33 years; Ita Sheres, Professor, English, 6/30/01, 30 years; Gordon M. Thompson, Associate Dean for Education, 5/1/01, 32 years.

5.10 General Education (Scott for Banks)

The General Education Review process has been working in two ways. First, to look for a way to assert that GE needs to be more of an integrated program for the students, we will present a working draft expressing those sentiments and identifying ways integration can be achieved in individual courses. This is not to exclude joint courses or groups of courses as an alternative to be built into GE. The idea is to make every course reach out and help students integrate their knowledge. The other part is the individual categories. Humanities and Fine Arts are more difficult and are still out. Social Science is much more modern. The idea is to continue consulting with faculty throughout the semester. We hope to get back to the Senate in the Fall Semester. This is a working draft. Please send your suggestions to banks@mail.sdsu.edu.

Discussion:

Chair Huckle: Are you dividing the Humanities course offerings that are interdisciplinary? Dean Scott: That will be up to the departments who look at the criteria.
5.11 Graduate Council (Cobble)

The Graduate Council will include a review of distance education in the agenda of the Senate. We have cleaned up all the 500-level courses that came to us from the Curriculum Committee. We are not done with the 600-level courses. We will be submitting these for approval of the Senate.

Next year all departments must accomplish a formal assessment process as part of their self study. The Chancellor’s office is insisting that we review to see if the undergraduate degree has to be more than 120 units. The minimum has become the norm. This is being folded into the academic review process. The letters which will be going out to departments will also have a section that Jane Smith will administer, that the departments should look at their curriculum. If it’s 120, it will be left alone; if more than 120 then it has to go through UCC, then come to review and then the Senate.

5.12 Personnel Committee (Rogers)

The Personnel Committee, while continuing to monitor the issues raised regarding Work Load and Compensation in the context of YRO, does not feel it has sufficient information to make recommendations in this area which is subject to negotiations between CSU and CFA.

Given that the Teacher/Scholar Model is indispensable in achieving SDSU’s goal of providing quality education for its students, it must be maintained in all aspects of Year-Round Operation. During state-supported summer terms, however they are ultimately configured, the same levels of financial and other support for faculty research must be in place as during the other terms. As efforts are made to “assist students in making more rapid progress toward earning their degrees” (CSU Mandate, 12/6/00), quality education at SDSU must remain predicated on having faculty actively engaged in furthering the understanding and knowledge in their respective fields and receiving the kinds of support necessary to sustain high levels of professional engagement.

The Committee will move approval of the following Policy File Language on retention:

III-B-13 Principles of Faculty Retention and Development

1.0 In order to achieve its research goals, to increase its competitiveness for students, and to attract and maintain a large cadre of diverse faculty, San Diego State University shall be committed to the growth, development, and wise use of its faculty.

2.0 The University shall develop a comprehensive and systematic faculty development plan based on the following principles:

2.1 The professional development and well-being of faculty shall be central concerns of the university.

2.2 Faculty development shall be guided by the teacher-scholar model.

2.3 Faculty development shall call for actions by the University administration, by departments, schools, and colleges, and by the faculty themselves.

2.31 Colleges shall direct departments and schools to regularly review and, if necessary, revise their Reappointment-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policies and to regularly bring these policies to the attention of their faculty.

2.32 Departments and schools shall work with newly hired faculty to clarify expectations in the RTP process and to provide suitable assistance for the preparation of RTP materials.

2.33 Departments and schools shall establish mentoring programs for probationary and other faculty.

2.34 Consistent funding opportunities for development shall be available to faculty throughout the
year:

2.35 Faculty shall be provided assistance in writing proposals for both external and campus-based funding.

2.36 Assigned time to reduce teaching loads for instructionally-related research, scholarship, and creative activity shall be regularly available to faculty.

2.37 Sabbatical leaves shall be funded and offered frequently to tenured faculty.

Discussion:

Senator Kornfeld: I wonder about the order of Sections 2.31-2.37. Faculty development has more to do with retention than RTP. Senator Rogers: We started first with retention, then moved to funding. Senator Kornfeld: Maybe 2.3 should mention retention. Senator Rogers: Retention is subsumed under development. Senator Kornfeld: 2.31 and 2.32 aren’t integrated.

Senator Zimmerman: Retention is the overarching goal; development is a critical part of that.

Chair Huckle: 2.31-2.37 do not mention administration. Something is wrong with the shape of this. There are some puzzling ways in which the sequence doesn’t work. It’s so general it doesn’t matter. 2.36 does not mention curriculum. Nothing is said about program development.

The report was referred back to committee for revision.

5.13 Research Council (Cobble)

No report.

5.14 Staff Affairs (Cademy)

No report.

5.15 Student Affairs (Hayes)

The Committee will move that the Senate approve the following revision to the Policy File:

PROPOSED POLICY FILE LANGUAGE TO REPLACE SECTIONS VII-A-9 AND 10

VII-A-9 Alcohol Abuse and Illegal Drugs

The University shall facilitate the prevention, assessment, early intervention and treatment of problems arising from alcohol abuse and the use of illegal drugs, and it shall enforce with appropriate disciplinary actions University policy and applicable local, state, and federal law.

1.0 Prohibitions and Restrictions

1.1 The unlawful possession, use, distribution, or manufacture of alcohol or illegal drugs on the campus or during University-sponsored activities shall be prohibited.

1.2 Except for alcohol in student rooms where a resident is of legal drinking age, all residence halls shall be free of alcohol, and illegal drugs. Students who are 21 years of age or older may possess in their rooms a limited amount of beer or wine for personal consumption.

1.3 The University shall restrict the serving of alcohol to authorized facilities that carefully monitor and supervise the use of alcohol.

2.0 Enforcement and Sanctions

2.1 Persons who violate alcohol or drug policies shall, in addition to any legal consequences, be subject to individual disciplinary sanctions, up to and including suspension and expulsion from the University. Organizations that violate
alcohol or drug policies shall be subject to loss of campus status, funding and other forms of support up to and including suspension or permanent expulsion from the University.

2.2 When circumstances are compelling and the student is under 21 years of age, parents or guardians will be notified. Compelling circumstances include the following:

   Significant disruption of the campus community
   Harassment
   Vandalism
   Disorderly conduct
   Obstructing a University official
   Violent behavior, which includes threatening others or representing a danger to self
   Alcohol poisoning/drug overdose
   Repeated serious episodes of intoxication or being under the influence
   Drug dealing
   Driving while under the influence

2.3 University offices such as Judicial Procedures, University Police, The Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life, Office of Student Life and Development, Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and Housing and Residential Life which are charged with the responsibility for enforcing alcohol and drug policies and imposing sanctions for violations shall be adequately supported to carry out their responsibilities.

3.0 Prevention and Treatment

3.1 The University shall provide substance-free housing and shall establish environments and designated areas in the residence halls.

3.2 The University shall develop and support effective prevention, assessment, early intervention and treatment programs for alcohol and illegal drug use. These programs shall be available to students through Counseling & Psychological Services and Student Health Services, and to staff and faculty through programs supported by the Center for Human Resources.

3.3 The University shall periodically evaluate the impact of interventions to reduce alcohol and illegal drug abuse and to mitigate the negative personal and interpersonal consequences thereof.

3.4 The University shall inform students of campus policies and sanctions for the abuse of alcohol and illegal drugs through such channels and forums as the following:

   Orientation programs
   New member education programs
   Residential life handbooks
   The SDSU website
   Greek Guidelines
   Residence hall meetings
   Recruitment activities
   Statement of Student Rights and Responsibility

Within the rules of applicable state and federal laws and regulations, the University shall also communicate to students and organizations instances when sanctions are invoked.

Discussion:

Senator Zimmerman: Does this policy say the University shall provide substance-free housing, including alcohol regardless of age? Judicial Officer Long: The University would like to programmatically provide special communities for students who select substance-free housing and focus in on the types of activities that do not involve alcohol and drugs. While it is true that all the halls are alcohol free for those under 21, there has been a push to have special communities where the focus is on healthy lifestyles.

VP Ext Affairs Mahinan: You mention a “limited amount” of beer or wine – did you want this to remain vague? Is hard liquor part of that? VP Kitchen: A six-pack of beer or .7 liter of wine is what we had in mind.

Senator Kornfeld: What happened to previous 4.1 regarding elimination of alcohol advertising? Senator Hayes: The University was not ready to endorse that and it didn’t look like this policy would go forward with that included. VP
Kitchen: It is not a dead issue. We have long-term contracts and commitments but this subject is still open for discussion.

Parliamentarian Gaughen: There are a few deletions from the old policy. In the old policy, distilled liquor is not permitted on campus; the proposed policy is silent and thus, permissive. The old policy talks about types of activities for which alcohol would be approved; that is not in the new policy. The old policy allocates to each of the Vice Presidents who would be the appropriate university administrator to approve requests to serve alcohol; that is not in the new policy.

5.16 Undergraduate Council (Scott)

No report.

5.14 Staff Affairs (Cademy)

No report.

5.17 Other Committees

5.17.1 Off-Campus Sites (Zimmerman)

The Off-Campus Centers Committee will recommend that the administration in consultation with colleges and departments begin to identify academic programs appropriate to be offered at existing off-campus centers. The committee recognizes that this process needs to be undertaken as part of an overall planning process for the main campus, YRO, and off-campus centers.

6. Academic Senate (Boddy)

No report.

7. Associated Students (Mahinan)

AS concluded elections with a 6.51% turnout. Ron Williams has been elected AS President. Issues of concern continue to be ABX 133 regarding funding and the Aztec Center Expansion.

8. California Faculty Association (Schulze)

No report.

9. Old Business

None.

10. New Business

None.

11. Minutes, Reports and Agendas.

Minutes were received from Academic Policy & Planning (3/8/2001), Personnel (3/22/01), and Undergraduate Council (2/12/01)
Committee Annual Reports can be found on the Senate website:

12. Adjournment

The SEC adjourned at 5:15pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Penny Wright  Jackie Jones Bleecker
Secretary of the Senate  Administrative Coordinator