Minutes – Senate Executive Committee
March 24, 2009
President’s Conference Room, MH-3318 2pm


The SEC was called to order at 2:03 pm.

1. Agenda (Renegar for Eadie)
   MP Approved agenda of March 24, 2009 as amended.

2. Minutes (Renegar for Eadie)
   MP Approved minutes of February 17, 2009 which were distributed via the website.

3. Announcements (Benkov)

   The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee has made its decision for Senate Excellence in Teaching Award. We are setting up the award ceremony for the end of April to honor the awardee and the nominees from the individual colleges.

   A majority of the documents for the IVC task force are on the Senate website at http://senate.sdsu.edu. There are three more meetings this Academic Year. IVC Task Force will be bringing recommendations and/or reports to the Senate this September.

4. University Administration (Marlin)

   The current state budget is fiction. We will have no definitive information regarding needed revisions until May. The Legislative Analyst has issued an analysis that indicates that the deficit will most likely get larger. We are not likely to meet the $10 billion threshold in Federal Stimulus money that is needed, as stipulated in the current budget, to retain the $50 million for the CSU that otherwise would have been cut. In addition, there is already $255 million of one-time federal stimulus money in the CSU budget.

   The stimulus package money has gone mostly towards student aid, tax credits and Pell grants as well as research funding. Tom Scott has provided our faculty with information on how to apply for the research portion of these funds.

   Even though we are quite skilled at using prior projections to determine show rates, I have very little confidence in those prior projections. We will see what happens. May 1 is the deadline for ‘intent to enroll’. It is difficult to project how admissions will go with the current crisis.

   On a positive note, last Saturday we had our Explore SDSU event. Many faculty, staff and students volunteered their time for the day. Admitted students and their families also attended. Explore SDSU day provides them with information they need to make an informed decision about our offer of admission. I very much appreciate the assistance that we had to make this event a success.

Discussion:
VP Scott: We are receiving announcements at a furious rate. NIH has announced three new mechanisms that will be used for increases in the size and duration of awards. Yesterday, we submitted four major equipment grants from the Department of Biology. We have three infrastructure proposals under development as well. Each of these are within the $2-4 million
range. We also have supplemental awards being submitted. The NSF is planning to distribute $2 billion for just research projects by going back to their declined proposals from October to the present and funding more of those. We had 15 proposals that we submitted that were denied and we have encouraged these individuals to contact their project officers to increase their chances of receiving funding. **Senator LaMaster:** When will we start to hear from the students that have been accepted? **Provost Marlin:** Once we get close to the deadline more information starts to come out. We are not sure how the economy is playing into this. It costs $250 to accept the admission offer. Sometimes students would pay the $250 but still walk away. There are so many factors it is difficult for me to interpret. We do a guarantee of housing if they let us know by a particular date before we guarantee housing to returning students.

5. **Auxiliaries and Affiliates Reports**

5.1 **Associated Students (Velasquez)**

The University Affairs Board, as well as students we surveyed, are in favor of designated smoking areas instead of a total smoking ban on campus.

Please nominate faculty and staff for the Faculty and Staff Appreciation Awards.

GreenFest will be taking place April 15-17. This event promotes sustainability and Aztec pride. The cost is $5 for staff and faculty.

5.2 **Academic Senate (Ornatowski)**

**Information:**

Vice-Chancellor Richard reported that the CSU has increased its enrollment by 1,700 FTES (due to increased retention and higher unit loads). Applications are up over last fall; it is imperative that CSU universities not over-enroll next year.

Eight resolutions were passed:

**AS-2877-08/AA Voting Rights for Academic Council on International Programs**

**International Program (IP) Coordinator Liaisons**

Urges the BOT to grant voting rights to campus IP representatives included in the CSU Academic Council on International Programs.

**AS-2878-08/AA Support for Campus Processes for Votes of No Confidence**

Urges the BOT and Chancellor to support the right of faculty to a no-confidence vote in MPP administrators.

**AS-2880-08/AA Energy Conservation, System Sustainability, and System Cost Savings**

Urges increased energy and resource conservation at individual universities.

**AS-2881-08/FA Support for Improved Faculty Development Opportunities for Lecturers**

Urges and affirms CSU’s commitment to professional development and research support (for instance, travel funds to conferences and assistance in securing external support) for lecturing faculty.

**AS-2882-08/FA Opposing Restrictions on Educational Exchanges with Cuba**

Urges opposition of restrictions on educational travel to Cuba imposed by the U.S. Dept. of the Treasury.
AS-2883-08/FA Affirmation of Equal Rights for All Individuals Regardless of Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Other Dimensions of Diversity
Affirms ASCSU opposition to Proposition 8 (gay marriage).

AS-2885-09/AA Resolution in Support of CSU Authority to Offer the doctorate in Nursing Practice (first reading was waived)
Reaffirms ASCSU support for State Assembly Bill AB 867 authorizing the CSU to offer the doctorate in Nursing Practice.

AS-2889-09/APEP Support for the Continued Alignment of the “a-g” Course Pattern and for CSU-UC Collaboration Related to Career Technical Education (CTE) (first reading was waived)
Supports collaboration between the CSU and UC in refining CTE course evaluation guidelines to make these courses potentially acceptable for inclusion in the “a-g” course pattern.

One resolution was withdrawn:

AS-2879-08/AA Keeping Recognition for Faculty Creators and/or Founders for Centers and Institutes Developed Within the CSU System
Urges recognition of faculty creators of centers or institutes within the CSU and provision of credit similar to intellectual property.

Six resolutions received their first reading:

AS-2884-09/EX Academic Senate CSU Calendar of 2009-2010 Meetings

AS-2886-09/FA Concerns Related to the migration of State-Supported Courses to Self-Supporting Special Sessions During Times of Budget Constraints
Affirms ASCSU support for Executive Order 802 that self-supporting special sessions not supplant regular course offerings during the college year.

AS-2887-09/FA CSU Faculty Professional Development Strategic Planning
Gives ASCSU support to the Institute for Teaching and Learning and the Faculty Development Council’s concept paper on “CSU Faculty Professional Development Strategic Planning.”

AS-2888-09/AA/FGA Support for Honorary Degrees for Alumni Interned by Federal Executive Order 9066
Urges CSU universities to seek out and appropriately honor potential alumni whose academic careers were interrupted by internment under FEO 9066 and expresses concern with the language of AB 37, which “requires” that the CSU award honorary degrees to potential alumni while only “requesting” that the UC do so.

AS-2890/AA Support for International Baccalaureate (IB) Courses for GE and Transfer Credit
Supports the use of IB courses in high schools as appropriate preparation for university work and urges the CSU to establish minimum standards for system-wide acceptance of these courses for potential GE and transfer credit.

AS-2891-09/AA Support for Campus Guidelines and Policies on Consultation and Shared Governance
Urges individual university senates to develop guidelines, policies, and/or procedures for creation, reorganization, consolidation, or elimination of academic programs, departments, or schools to ensure that consultation and shared governance are followed.

**Discussion:**

**Senator Moore:** In regards to the IB baccalaureate, we just went through specific General Education criteria. I would be hesitant to give a blanket approval to all of these courses.

**Senator Ornatowski:** It is more to ensure that there are minimum standards, not necessarily a blanket. **Senator Moore:** System-wide acceptance is a concern to me. The articulation agreements SDSU has with community colleges differ from the articulation agreements other CSU’s have with community colleges. **Chair Benkov:** This seems to be paralleling the Lower Division Transfer Program. I can find out more information. **Senator Ornatowski:** The resolution does indeed state that it is system-wide. **Chair Benkov:** But, they differ by university. **Senator Ornatowski:** I will make copies of the complete version of the resolution. I will appreciate your feedback. **Senator Donadey:** What are self-supporting special sessions? **Chair Benkov:** Extended studies. There was an issue brought up at the Campus Chairs meeting where faculty are asked to teach a class in special session which is above their usual level. This was the only way to pay them. **Chair Park:** I am glad to see the special session resolutions. We need to examine the definition of the special session as well as a regularly offered class. **Senator Ornatowski:** I have a document with more information that I encourage you to read. **Chair Benkov:** Senator Park is correct. Some courses are indeed pushed into special session.

5.3 California Faculty Association (Kennedy)

No report.

5.4 Undergraduate Studies (Chase)

Two students just won Research Internship Science and Engineering scholarships from the German government. They will complete internships over the summer in a hi-tech lab or research facility. Both students are in the honors program at SDSU.

**Discussion:**

**Senator Ornatowski:** How do students find out about these scholarships? Shouldn’t we have a mechanism where faculty members distribute announcements of scholarships? **Dean Chase:** Patti Scott, Director of Academic Scholarships keeps a large list of scholarships. There is a protocol associated with applying for some of these scholarships, and those protocols are very necessary to follow.

6. Senate Committee Reports

6.1 Officers’ Report (Renegar)

**Information:**

**Referral Chart:**
Discussion:
Senator Flahan: We should examine the rules that govern skateboarders. Chair Benkov: We will look into this matter and make a referral.

6.2 Academic Policy and Planning (Finnegan)

Information:
1. Committee discussed implications of E.O. 1037 stipulation that a course with a grade of C or above cannot be repeated.

Action:
1. The Academic Policy and Planning Committee moves that the Senate approve the substitution of the following language for the section of the policy file regarding Honor Societies for students.

Honors Societies, Student

1.0 Honors at Entrance: Those receiving awards or honorable mention for the Merit Scholarship shall be automatically admitted to the Honors at Entrance program, and this information shall be inserted at the proper place in the General Catalog and in advising materials.

2.0 Academic Honor Societies: An academic honor society shall be a campus organization that values and reinforces the high academic standards of the university and selects its members, at least in part, based on superior academic performance.

2.04 Honor societies shall receive academic sanction by the university through the appointment of a faculty adviser subject to approval by the Provost.

3.0 Honor societies shall be required to obtain on-campus status through the Office of Vice President for Student Affairs Campus wide multidisciplinary honor societies shall be required to obtain approval from the Provost.

4.0 Honor societies with on-campus status shall be represented by the Honors Council.

Rationale: Bring policy in line with practice since Honors at Entrance are not awarded.
2. The Academic Policy and Planning Committee moves that the Senate approve the substitution of the following language for the section of the policy file regarding Distance Education and Hybrid Courses.

**Classes and Courses, Hybrid, and Distance Education**

1.0 Distance education shall be defined as a formal educational process in which the primary instructional interaction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same physical location. Such instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may include audio, video, or computer technologies. A hybrid class shall be defined as any class in which 20% to 50% of scheduled class sessions are conducted by means in which student and instructor are not in the same physical location. Classes that exceed this 50% limit shall be considered distance education (DE) classes.

2.0 The following guidelines shall apply to new hybrid education and distance education courses.

2.1 Hybrid and distance education classes shall be offered following consultation with the department chair and relevant departmental bodies.

2.2 Hybrid and distance education classes shall be so identified in the official schedule of classes, which shall notify students of any requirements for participation in synchronous class activities outside class session times indicated in the schedule.

2.3 The class schedule shall notify students of any software and hardware required for participation in class meetings taking place when the student and instructor will not be in the same physical location.

2.4 Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of hybrid and distance education course, including software, or other media products shall be in accordance with the policy on Intellectual Property.

2.5 Regardless of how they are offered, classes should be consistent in terms of purpose, scope, quality, assessment and expected learning outcomes with other classes bearing the same department code, number, and course title. Courses offered via Distance Education shall meet all the standards set forth in the Curriculum Guide.

2.6 Students enrolled in distance education courses shall not be denied access to advisement, grievances, or other key academic rights and services, nor shall they be excused from the academic responsibilities expected of all students.

3.0 New Distance Education Programs

Programs in which fifty percent or more of the course work is delivered online shall meet the substantive change requirements related to distance education programs as established by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

**Courses, Hybrid (05/06/08)**

1.0 A hybrid class shall be defined as any class in which 20% to 50% of scheduled class sessions are conducted by means in which student and instructor are not in the same physical location (e.g., online communication). Classes that exceed the 50% limit are considered distance education classes (see Distance Education).

2.0 The following guidelines shall apply to new hybrid education courses and to existing courses in which the method of delivery has changed significantly from that approved in the original curriculum proposal.
2.1 Hybrid classes shall only be offered following consultation with the department chair and relevant departmental bodies.

2.2 Hybrid classes shall be so identified in the official schedule of classes which shall notify students of any requirements for participation in synchronous class activities outside class session times indicated in the schedule.

2.3 The class schedule shall notify students of any software and hardware required for participation in class meetings taking place when the student and instructor will not be in the same physical location, except when such hardware and software are accessible in the library or in open computer labs on campus.

2.4 Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, or other media products shall be in accordance with the policy on Intellectual Property.

**Distance Education (5/06/08)**

1.0 Distance education shall be defined as a formal educational process in which most of the instructional interaction occurs when student and instructor are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Distance education may include correspondence, audio, video, or computer technologies. This policy shall apply to all credit-bearing courses and programs offered through distance education by San Diego State University, including those offered through the College of Extended Studies.

2.0 The following guidelines shall apply to new distance education courses and programs and to existing courses and programs in which the method of delivery has changed significantly from that approved in the original curriculum proposal leading to that course, certificate, or degree. A department, school, or faculty group offering distance education programs (i.e., in which more than half of the courses are offered through distance education) shall meet Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) requirements and shall be guided by university policy. In its selfstudies or proposals for institutional change, an academic unit or faculty group shall address the following expectations, which shall be reviewed by the university and perhaps by the regional accrediting commission. (Cf. WASC guidelines [March 8, 2000].)

3.0 Principles

3.1 The faculty also shall ensure the academic quality and integrity of courses, programs, and degrees, including those offered through distance education.

3.2 Faculty and students shall be informed of the modes of delivery and technological requirements of each course, program, and degree offered by the university. Students shall have access to this information before enrolling in a course or program.

3.3 Distance education programs and courses shall be consistent with the educational mission of the college and the university.

3.4 Web-based programs and courses shall be consistent with university policy on Universal Access to Information Technology.

3.5 Each program shall provide the opportunity for substantial, personal, and timely interactions between faculty and students and among students.

3.6 The proportion of tenured and probationary faculty teaching in a distance education program shall approximate that of the campus-based program.
3.7 Admissions criteria shall be comparable for students on and off campus.

3.8 Financial plans for program delivery and student participation shall be preapproved.

3.9 Students shall have adequate access to library and student services.

3.10 The university shall offer training and support services to faculty who teach distance education courses and programs.

3.11 Distance education shall be an optional but not a preferred or required mode of instruction.

4.0 Implementation

4.1 Curriculum and Instruction

4.11 In the curricular review process, distance education programs shall demonstrate that they provide the opportunity for substantial, personal, and timely interactions between faculty and students and among students.

4.12 Individual mentoring with a tenured or probationary faculty member associated with the program shall be required for a graduate culminating experience.

4.13 The faculty of a department, school, or program shall oversee the distance education program, ensuring both the rigor of the courses and program and the quality of instruction. The responsibility and oversight shall include the following:

   a. The selection and evaluation of formally approved adjunct or part-time faculty,
   b. Maintaining approximately the same ratio of tenured or probationary faculty to adjunct or part-time faculty as in the campus-based program,
   c. Ensuring that technology suits the nature and objectives of the courses and program,
   d. Ensuring that technology is accessible to students with a variety of visual, hearing, motor and learning impairments,
   e. Ensuring the integrity of student work and the credibility of the degrees and credits that the university awards, and ensuring reasonable safeguards of academic honesty.

4.14 Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products shall be agreed upon by the faculty and the university (in accordance with the Intellectual Property Policy) before the initial offering of a course or program.

4.15 No faculty member, program, department, or school shall agree in a contract with a private or public entity to deliver distance education courses or programs on behalf of the university without prior approval from the Office of Graduate and Research Affairs.

4.16 The university shall not agree in a contract with a private or public entity to deliver distance education courses or programs without the prior approval of the relevant department, school, or program.

4.17 Agencies providing funding for special certificates or degree programs or courses shall not acquire privileges regarding the admission standards, academic continuation standards or degree requirements for students or faculty attached to a university-approved academic program.

5.1 Evaluation and Assessment

5.11 The Graduate Council Curriculum Committee or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall review all distance education courses and programs, even if the
The curriculum is largely derived from existing campus-based courses or programs. When distance education proposals are to be considered by either committee, it shall be expanded to include three nonvoting, ex officio experts in distance education selected by the Committee on Committees: one from the faculty, one from the instructional technology staff, and one from the administration. Distance education programs shall also be reviewed by the committees charged by policy with curricular program review.

5.12 The method of delivery for new courses and programs shall become part of each curriculum proposal, to be reviewed under the normal curricular process.

5.13 A significant change in the method of delivery for existing courses or programs shall be submitted as a course change proposal, to be reviewed by the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. When such a proposal is to be considered by either committee, the committee shall be expanded as in sec. 5.11.

5.14 The Academic Review process shall be used to evaluate the educational effectiveness of distance education courses and programs (including assessments of student-based learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction), and when appropriate, determine comparability to campus-based programs. This shall assure the conformity of distance education courses and programs to prevailing quality standards in distance education.

5.15 A review and approval of distance education courses and programs, including those initially approved by their colleges, shall begin immediately and conclude within two years of the implementation of this policy.

5.2 Library and Learning Resources: The program administrators shall provide evidence in the curricular proposal that

a. Students have adequate access to and support in the use of appropriate library resources and
b. Students have access to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs.

5.3 Student Services and Admissions: The program administrators shall provide evidence in the curricular proposal that

a. Students are provided adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support the program, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, delivery of accessible course materials, assistive technology, and placement and counseling,
b. Students are provided with an adequate means for resolving student complaints,
c. Students are provided advertising, recruiting, and admissions information that adequately and accurately represents the program’s requirements and services,
d. Students who are admitted possess the knowledge and equipment necessary to use the technology employed by the program, and
e. Technical advice is available to students to resolve hardware and software problems.

5.4 Facilities and Finances: The program administrators shall provide evidence in the curricular proposal that

a. University standards are followed in setting course loads per instructor or academic unit,
b. The program, department, or school possesses or has access to the equipment and technical expertise required to deliver distance education courses and programs,
The long-range planning, budgeting, and policy development reflect the facilities, staffing, equipment, and other resources essential to the viability and effectiveness of the distance education course or program, and

d. The distance education program has received resource approval before operation.

Rationale:

The changes proposed bring policy in line with current WASC requirements regarding degree programs utilizing distance education. The change also aligns the expectations of courses using distance education methods with courses using other modes of instruction while assuring that students are adequately informed of any special requirements for participation in a course relying extensively on distance education.

We also discussed the issue of priority registration for escorts; individuals who volunteer their time to walk or drive students to their cars, especially at night. We decided that this was not the necessary or appropriate tool to add more bodies for Public Safety.

6.3 Academic Resources and Planning (LaMaster)

No report.

6.4 Undergraduate Curriculum (Baber)

No report.

6.5 Committee on Committees and Elections (Atkins)

Action:

The Committee on Committees moves approval of the following appointments, reappointments and replacements to committees with terms to end as noted.

Student Grievance Committee
Kim Archuletta, College of Health and Human Services (term ends May 2011)

General Education Curriculum Sub-Committee
Laurel Bliss, Library (term ends May 2011)

The idea of hosting Senate elections online next year was discussed. Every effort is being made to not have paper elections next year.

6.6 Constitution and Bylaws (Park)

We would like to email and discuss issues to changes in the bylaws and constitution in pieces to give sufficient time and discussion per issue.

Please take a look at the document emailed to you by Allison and send your feedback to me.

Discussion:

Senator Moore: I think it is great you are looking at apportionment. We do need a definition of what a unit is though. I understand your effort to extend democracy to underrepresented units but smaller units may then actually have a greater voice than larger units. Chair Benkov: One other thing to remember is coaches are faculty but are not included in any faculty definitions. We have had a request from coaches to be included in the Senate as a voting member. Staff also does not include MPP staff. The question is how we are finding places where we can place these units. All the larger units lose senators with the new plan.
that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee are reviewing. Smaller units either stay the same or do not pick up anything.

**Senator Donadey:** We work better as a smaller Senate. I believe this plan is reasonable. I would have to be convinced that our MPP’s should have a Senator. It seems that there is plenty of representation of higher administration. **Provost Marlin:** You do not have to have a high salary to be classified as an MPP. They are classified as MPP I suppose because they have supervisory roles. I have had a great deal of MPP staff come to me that have questions regarding representation. These people are sometimes considered as staff. **Chair Benkov:** I am hesitant to cut the faculty to add MPP but I like Senator Moore’s idea of extending democracy instead of cutting anyone out. **Chair Park:** I would like to revise the proposed floor that our committee has been discussing. **Senator Ornatowski:** Are there MPP that are faculty? **Dean Chase:** Yes. **Senator Ornatowski:** Who are these people? **Chair Park:** Deans, the President and the Provost to name a few. **Senator Ornatowski:** So as of right now and after the revision non-faculty MPP would have representation? **Chair Park:** Yes. **Senator Ornatowski:** Does the same apportionment apply to staff and MPP? **Chair Benkov:** No. These numbers are apportioned differently. **Chair Park:** We will bring this issue to SEC again in April.

6.7 Diversity, Equity and Outreach (Donadey)

No report.

6.8 Faculty Affairs (Moore)

**ACTION ITEM: Changes to the University Policy File regarding Academic Responsibilities for Accessibility**

**RATIONALE:** The Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) requires that SDSU endeavor by 2012 to make all instructional materials universally accessible. This revision to the Senate policy on Academic Responsibilities provides a statement of the university’s commitment to policies, laws, and best practices on accessibility, and provides guidance for faculty and departments or schools as they attempt to comply with the goals of the ATI.

**FACULTY/Academic Responsibilities**

1.0 Audiovisual Materials

1.2 Audiovisual materials, whatever their source (rental, purchase, private collection, guest lecture), shall be legally acquired and shall include captioning whenever possible.

2.0 Course Syllabi: The syllabus for each course shall describe the course’s purpose, scope and expected student learning outcomes. In addition, each syllabus shall describe the design, conduct, and grading policies, which may vary by section. A syllabus shall not bind the instructor to specific details, and the instructor shall retain the right to adjust the course design. Major departures from the syllabus, however, especially with regard to learning outcomes and grading policies, shall be made only for compelling reasons.

2.1 Instructors shall provide students with access to the syllabus at or before the first class meeting, except when circumstances beyond the control of the instructor prevent such distribution. Whenever possible, instructors shall post syllabi on individual web sites or learning management systems.

2.2 Instructors shall make available to their department the most recent version of each syllabus. Departments shall retain and make accessible the most
recent versions of syllabi. Whenever possible, departments shall post syllabi on department web sites.

3.0 In order to facilitate universal access to instructional materials:

3.1 Instructors shall endeavor to order textbooks, course readers, and other required instructional materials on or before the deadline established by the campus bookstore, and definitely no later than six weeks in advance of the beginning of the academic term.

3.2 Whenever possible, departments and schools shall endeavor to order textbooks for classes without assigned instructors on or before the deadline established by the campus bookstore, and at least six weeks in advance of the beginning of the academic term.

7. Senate-Appointed University Committee Reports

7.1 Environment and Safety Committee (Quintana)

AS brought forth a resolution to create designated smoking areas. The Environment and Safety Committee also met to answer the questions SEC had given Jenny Quintana, the committee chair. These answers were presented by Chair Quintana and discussed with SEC.

Discussion:
Senator Ornatowski: What does designated smoking area mean as opposed to banning smoking? VP Velasquez: We would like to work with the most appropriate people to figure out where these designated smoking areas would be. We wanted to get students’ opinions on this matter first. VP Scott: This is an important consideration. If these are indoor smoking areas maybe charcoal filters could be used but if they were just designated smoking areas outside I am not sure what purpose this serves. Provost Marlin: One of the problems is if a staff member wanted to leave campus to smoke it would take quite a while to leave and come back. Was there any discussion that there might be circles outside? VP Velasquez: Yes. This was an idea. We believe social enforcement would be the way to prevent individuals from breaking the rules. Police are called now if someone has a problem but nothing is done otherwise.

Chair Quintana: The resolution we submitted at the last SEC meeting was amended to move away from implementing a completely smoke free campus and to move to a designated smoke free campus. The other change is to phase in the smoke free campus gradually rather than suddenly. Our committee approved these amendments. We also considered how far our employees would have to go to smoke off campus. VP Scott: Concentrating all the smokers into an outdoor area does not change the prevalence of the smoke outside. An indoor area that regulates the smoke would be a much better idea. Chair Quintana: From the Environmental Health point of view the exposure to pollutants is greater when you are near the pollutant. If you had smoking areas someone like me could avoid those areas. VP Scott: The point source would be greater though because of the density. Chair Quintana: A designated group would decide the best places for these areas. VP Scott: There is an advantage that the harder and harder it is to get to a place then the more inconvenient it would be. VP Velasquez: Students would consider the designated smoking areas outside not inside. Senator Moore: I would like to ask that the committee look closely at the number of areas and locations. I would not want students and teachers coming to class crabby. We do not want to make it so inconvenient that students could not smoke in between classes. Chair Quintana: We hope to have feedback from all the unions on campus. This is also an issue for workers. Bob Shulz also cautioned us to the idea of a changed workplace. Senator Ornatowski: Maybe we can also think of other areas that we don’t normally think of. Roof
or terrace areas are a good idea. **Senator Finnegan:** Did you have any discussion of the minimum size of a designated area? **Chair Quintana:** The answer to this would be related to how many designated areas there are. We will be contacting other CSU’s to examine which steps were taken to address this issue. **Senator Flahan:** I am the president of units 2, 5, 7 and 9 and we have sent a letter to HR. We need to put a representative on your committee. According to the contract the union needs to agree with any changes. **Senator Donadey:** Is the sale of tobacco products already forbidden on this campus? **Chair Quintana:** Yes. **Senator Donadey:** The committee’s proposal is a little more lenient compared to the AS proposal. Why is this? **Chair Quintana:** We hoped to focus more on the positive side. IVC also has always felt slighted and not consulted. We had a conversation with their environment and safety representatives and they hoped they would go smoke free not just designated areas. In regards to penalties that staff would encounter, Human Resources said that this would be a working rule violation. No case came up regarding an individual smoking inside a building on campus. Also, the students inquired about how many signs would cost. Signs would cost about $1000. Bob Shulz stated that maybe new benches would be necessary and $10,000 was enough. In regards to enforcement, Amy Raymond called other campuses. Social enforcement was used instead of ticketing. Enforcement was not seen as a huge problem. We talked to smokers and they all said they would be ok with designated smoking areas. Our committee suggested that we phase the identification of designated smoking areas in during Fall 2009 and implement by spring 2010. There is also some language regarding theatre and how smoking would be permitted onstage as part of a performance. **Senator Flahan:** If there is a change in working conditions the union will request that SDSU confirms what we can with them before anything happens regardless of what the Environment and Safety Committee passes here. I do not deal with this necessarily but I will be the union rep for this. **Provost Marlin:** Great job Jenny! **Chair Quintana:** I would like to thank my committee. **Chair Benkov:** A lot of our questions were answered. Thank you.

### 7.2 General Education Curriculum Committee (Sasidharan)

**Action**

**IV. EXPLORATIONS OF HUMAN EXPERIENCE**

**C. Humanities**

*Latin American Studies 370. History of Mexico: From Independence to Early Twentieth Century (3) [GE]*

Prerequisite: Latin American Studies 101 or completion of the General Education requirement in Foundations of Learning II.C., Humanities for nonmajors. Cultural history of Mexico from Mexico’s independence from Spain in early nineteenth century to presidency of Lazaro Cardenas. History of legacy of Caudillos, evolution of PRI, and US/Mexico relations from a Mexican perspective.

* Cultural diversity course.

### 8. Old Business

### 9. New Business

**Faculty Forum (Moore)**

Given the important issues that currently face faculty, staff, students, and administrators on this campus (budget concerns, class size, pedagogy, effects of the shift toward research university status on graduate and undergraduate programs, athletics, promotion and tenure in the face of budget constraints, etc.), it seems that the Senate could be playing a significant role in facilitating campus-wide discussions. I ask that the Senate explore ways to implement and regularize formation of a Committee of the Whole to provide a forum for such discussions.
Discussion:
Senator Flahan: You are hoping to have some type of forum outside of the Senate? Senator Moore: No. Senator Finnegan: I am not against the ‘committee of a whole’ or a discussion with faculty but we need to be sensitive with the issues that are brought to something like a faculty forum. Senator Moore: It should be issues of substance and should be organized. This would not be a gripe session. Chair Benkov: If a faculty forum is held during regular senate time and we call it ‘committee of the whole’ senators would still give their opinion and voice. I would propose that a senator bring a new business item for a faculty forum to meet on another date. Senator Finnegan: An open forum should be held to discuss which issues need to be brought forth. Then the officers could pick a committee to vet the forum. Senator Flahan: How open do you want this forum to be? If you want shared governance an item should be able to be brought at any time by anyone including staff and not be discussed first. Senator Renegar: This could turn into a gripe session. Senator Ornatowski: It needs to be prepared and well vetted. Data should be available to support any topic. VP Velasquez: It seems a lot of the issues brought up this last year we were not prepared to discuss. On AS we have a public session where individuals are able to sign up before the meeting and if the chair allows they are able to speak for three minutes during this public session. Time is always a huge issue. Senator Moore: Vetting defeats the entire purpose. Senator Finnegan: I don’t want to have a two-hour ‘committee of the whole’. If the Senate is going to endorse a forum they need to have a reason for it. Chair Benkov: I understand that if there is a timely issue it is important to react quickly. Dean Chase: I am struck by how often reports are presented that represent a lot of work and how little discussion there is. Another idea is shuffling around the agenda so no one is ever in the same place. Senator Donadey: I ask most of my questions at SEC. Therefore, I am not going to ask them again in the Senate. Also, as a new senator you think that everything has been vetted by SEC first so you figure that everything has been thought through. Chair Benkov: Things can be brought to SEC but things also can be brought to the Senate assuming that the four-day rule is met. We try our best to make sure things are clear and concise before we bring them to the Senate. Senator Finnegan: My advice is to identify under what conditions a forum should be held. Senator Ornatowski: I do believe in general that group discussions help when people have prepared and read the material. Real issues sometimes actually do not hit the floor because they have been predigested. It may be good to bring issues to the Senate that have not been predigested.

Athletics Update (Caves and Schemmel)

Jeff Schemmel, Director of Athletics
The Academic Progress Rate (APR) is a rather new program that measures student athlete performance based on eligibility and retention. The NCAA passed this program about five years ago. A score of 925 is passing. The scores of athletes on the football and baseball teams have been low in the past. This year, football and basketball are well over 925. We submitted academic improvement plans to the NCAA to show how we will get our multi-year average up.
**Discussion:**

**Senator Finnegan:** How do the athletes’ graduation rates compare to non-athletes? **Director of Athletics Schemmel:** Athletes have a higher graduation rate. **Senator Finnegan:** What are the consequences for being on probation? **Director of Athletics Schemmel:** Being on probation is taken very seriously here at SDSU.

Brady Hoke was hired as the new football coach. Also, we hired a new volleyball coach from Cornell.

We are sharing in the general fund budget cut. Athletics took a 5% cut this year. We tried to cut in places that would not affect students. A 10% cut was made in all administrative positions as well as a mid-year cut. We are taking busses instead of flying to some places.

**Roger Caves, Faculty Athletics Representative**

COIA has asked if SDSU is able to host the COIA meeting next spring.

NCAA has asked us to look into the idea of clustering of majors and clustering athletes in classes.

We are in the process of developing exit interviews to evaluate the athletic experiences of students that are leaving SDSU. This would be mostly electronic but include a personal interview as well. These interviews would be separated into categories, which include students that have graduated, exhausted eligibility, transferred or quit.

Grade changes are consistently an issue. I am in charge of looking into athletes being ineligible and then receiving a grade change, which then makes them eligible.

I would like to suggest that COIA reports at the end of each academic year to the Senate. I would like to create a template so Senators can expect the same type of reports each year.

**Discussion:**

**Senator Ornatowski:** Please include the athletic budget in your report as well. **COIA Rep Caves:** Ok. **Senator Donadey:** It is important that the people that have been elected for the exit interviews reflect the diversity of the athlete student body. **COIA Rep Caves:** Yes. That will be done. **Chair Benkov:** I like the idea of a template so we can expect what is coming to the Senate. **Senator Moore:** The pep band has been playing a song and the students yell “You suck”. This is embarrassing especially when I bring big funders to games. **Director of Athletics Schemmel:** We have asked that the band stop playing the song but they keep chanting. **VP Velasquez:** The people that were heading this are called ‘The Show’ and are not current students so it is difficult to control them.

**10. Other Information Items**

**11. Adjournment**

The SEC adjourned at 4:26pm.

Respectfully submitted:

Allison Bobrow
Valerie Renegar
Administrative Coordinator
Vice Chair