

**SDSU Senate**  
**May 9, 2006**  
**Hepner Hall, Room 221, 2:00pm-5:30pm**

1. **Agenda** (Cademy)
2. **Minutes** (Cademy)
3. **Announcements** (Hornbeck)
  
4. **University Administration** (Marlin)
  - 2:10pm 4.1 President Weber
  - 2:05pm 4.2 Admissions and Records (Steadman)
  
5. **Auxiliaries and Affiliates Reports**
  - 5.1 Associated Students (Kramer/Lee)
  - 5.2 Academic Senate (Perkins)
  - 5.3 California Faculty Association (Wheeler)
  - 5.4 WASC Update (Chase)
  
6. **Senate Committee Reports**
  - 6.1 Officers' Report (Ely)
 

<i>2006-2007 Senate Calendar</i> _____	* [1]
<i>Referral Chart</i> _____	[2]
  - 6.2 Academic Policy and Planning (Ornatowski)\_\_\_\_\_ [3-19]
  - 6.3 Academic Resources and Planning (Thayer)\_\_\_\_\_ [20]
  - 6.4 Curriculum (Baber)
  - 6.5 Committees and Elections (Wilson)\_\_\_\_\_ [handout]
  - Elections of Senate Officers, Senator-at-Large, Foundation Rep*
  - 6.6 Constitution & Bylaws (Park)
  - 6.7 Diversity, Equity & Outreach (Donadey)
  - 3:30pm 6.8 Faculty Affairs (Zimmerman for Benkov)\_\_\_\_\_ \* [21]
  
7. **Senate-Appointed University Committee Reports**
  - 3:00pm 7.1 Environment & Safety (Quintana)\_\_\_\_\_ \* [22]
  - 7.2 Faculty Honors & Awards (Little)\_\_\_\_\_ \* [23, 24]
  - 7.3 General Education (Scott)
  - 7.4 Graduate Council (Andersen)
  - 7.5 Instructional and Information Technology (Stewart)\_\_\_\_\_ [25, 26]
  - 4:00pm 7.6 Intercollegiate Athletics Authority (King)
  - 7.7 Research Council (Scott/Nebeker)\_\_\_\_\_ \* [27-35]
  - 7.8 Staff Affairs (Nichols)\_\_\_\_\_ \* [36]
  - 7.9 Undergraduate Council (Chase)
  - 7.10 Other Committees
  
8. **Old Business**
  
9. **New Business**
  
10. **Other Information Items**
  - 10.1 Committee Annual Reports\_\_\_\_\_ [37-42]
  
11. **Adjournment**
  
- \* **Senate Action Items**

## 2006-2007 Senate Calendar

- = Senate Executive Committee Meeting
- = Senate Meeting
- = SDSU Holiday, Campus Closed

**2006**

### AUGUST

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

### SEPTEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

### OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

### NOVEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

### DECEMBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

**2007**

### JANUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

### FEBRUARY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27			

### MARCH

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	<i>Spring Break</i>					31

### APRIL

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

### MAY

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

**Senate**  
HH-221

2:00 - 5:30

September 5, 2006  
October 10, 2006  
November 7, 2006  
December 5, 2006  
February 6, 2007  
March 6, 2007  
April 10, 2007  
May 8, 2007

**Senate Executive Committee**

Faculty Staff Club      2:00-5:30

August 22, 2006  
September 19, 2006  
October 24, 2006  
November 21, 2006  
January 16, 2007  
February 20, 2007  
March 20, 2007  
April 24, 2007

Date: May 9, 2006  
 To: The Senate  
 From: David Ely, Vice Chair, SDSU Senate  
 Subject: **Referral Chart (Information)**

---

New items in *bold italic*

Committee	Date	Item	Referred by
AP&P	Apr 25, 2006	Policy on Academic Freedom	SEC
AR&P	Nov 8, 2005	Investigate funding to probationary faculty pending information from FA on analysis of Tenure/Tenure-track faculty	Senate
CCE	Nov 29 2005	Review procedures for selection of faculty to serve on search committees for administrators	Officers
CBL	Mar 20, 2006	EO 970 – Student Conduct Procedures	Officers
CBL	Mar 28, 2006	Participation by non-members during Executive Session	SEC
CBL	Mar 28, 2006	Policy on naming academic entities	Officers
Faculty Affairs	Mar 28, 2006	Graduate Council Proposal: Matriculation of Faculty Members	SEC
Faculty Honors & Awards	Aug 23, 2005	Strategies for simplification of Excellence in Teaching Award criteria and guidelines	SEC
Graduation and Retention Subcommittee	Sep 12, 2005	Campus Plan for Facilitating Graduation (CO coded memo AA-2005-21 and addendum	Officers
Instructional & Information Technology	Feb 13, 2006	CSU Code of Conduct, Computer Use Section – check to see if PF needs to be updated to reflect new code	Officers
Student Affairs	Aug 29, 2005	Review purpose and function of the Student Affairs Committee	Officers
Student Affairs	Mar 20, 2006	Review CSU Student Code of Conduct for needed changes to campus policies	Officers

Date: May 9, 2006  
To: The Senate  
From: Cezar Ornatowski, Chair, Academic Policy and Planning Committee  
Subject: Action and Information

---

**Action**

The Academic Policy and Planning Committee moves Senate approval to separate the School of Communication into two Academic Units.

**Information**

Approved the School of Communication restructuring proposal.

Reviewed and approved the AP&P report concerning annual review of enrollment management results. A copy of the report follows.

Date: May 9, 2006  
To: The Senate  
From: Cezar Ornatowski, Chair, Academic Policy and Planning Committee  
Subject: Annual review of enrollment management results

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In Spring 2005, the Senate Executive Committee authorized AP&P to rethink its approach to the annual review of enrollment management results. In May 2005, the Senate approved a new framework for the review that proposed to approach it as part of a more comprehensive, strategic approach emphasizing the entire complex of policies related to admission, enrollment, retention, and graduation. This report represents the first step toward such an approach to enrollment management. It consists of a review of current enrollment data, discussion of areas of emerging concern, discussion of potential concerns for the future, and conclusions and recommendations.

Review of current data indicates that the balance between actual and budgeted FTES has largely been achieved. The University has also enrolled more freshmen and transfer students from its service area than last year. The Dual Admission program was discontinued and students are enrolled in on-campus developmental mathematics and writing classes. The ethnic diversity of the undergraduate students has remained relatively constant. However, the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students continues to decline. Combined with the recently enacted “graduate differential,” this makes it even more urgent that the University increase its graduate enrollment.

Areas of emerging concern include the relatively large number of students not making adequate progress to degree, the adjustment of transfer students to SDSU, the specific effects of impaction on departments and programs, and the declining ratio of graduate to undergraduate students. For strategic enrollment planning, we also need to examine the profile of our graduating student body, consider information on the socio-economic background of applicants, and perhaps reexamine the appropriateness of the 80/20 formula for admission.

We conclude that the University needs to develop a comprehensive, proactive, and strategic approach to enrollment management. For this, we need substantial institutional data gathering and analysis capacity; regular gathering and analysis of data needs to be conducted by diverse bodies, with AP&P acting as a policy-recommending body to the Senate.

We therefore recommend that AP&P work with appropriate committees and bodies to become the nexus of policy-level discussion and decision-making regarding not only enrollment management but also the entire complex of strategies for proactive, on-going shaping of the University as a step toward developing, in the spirit of shared governance, what the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review pointed out that SDSU lacks: a “controlling philosophy, plan, and leadership authority that govern the way it

admits, retains, and graduates students.” We also recommend that the University ensure Institutional Research’s capacity to provide, gather and analyze data related to student body demographics, admission, and enrollment management. Finally, we recommend that the Senate reconsider the “Principles to guide impaction” in light of the information that will emerge from the kind of on-going analysis and discussion whose groundwork in laid out in the present report. AP&P will take the leadership role in this reconsideration and make appropriate recommendations to the Senate at some point in the future.

## **BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

In the mid-1990s, with the exception of admission limits to a few impacted majors, all qualified applicants were accepted into SDSU. Budget support for students beyond initial enrollment targets was lacking; in 1996, SDSU admitted about 1000 more FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students) than expected, which caused a loss of about \$7 million to the campus budget. Faced with increasing numbers of applicants seeking admission and in response to the financial challenges open admission presented to the University, the Academic Policy and Planning Committee (AP&P) recommended to the University Senate that SDSU seek impacted campus status (see Glossary).

Following ample campus-wide discussions, the proposal was accepted by the SDSU Senate and approved by the President, and, subsequently, by the CSU. Within a year, however, SDSU was directed to impact individual programs (see Glossary) rather than the entire campus. At the same time, AP&P recommended and the Senate approved the “80/20” model to guide the University’s selection of students (see Glossary). In Spring 1997, the Senate further adopted the eight “Principles to Guide Impaction,” which expressed the major assumptions that were to guide the University’s enrollment management practices, that is, the complex of strategies and policies that governed admission and enrollment of students under conditions of impaction. At the same time, the Senate also charged AP&P with annually reviewing the results of enrollment management in terms of the “Principles,” in effect with ensuring that the results of enrollment management practices are congruent with the assumptions spelled out in the “Principles.” For the past eight years, the Committee has complied with this charge, each Fall reviewing the prior year’s enrollment data and reporting the findings to the Senate in the Spring in the its “Annual Review of Enrollment Management Results.”

Over time, the report evolved from a general discussion of enrollment management data into a point-by-point discussion of the data and its implications in terms of each specific principle of impaction. Senate discussions of the AP&P report have tended to focus on specific issues, such as ethnic diversity or enrollment of local area students, and in response to these concerns AP&P has progressively refined its report to address these issues in more detail. As the report became more focused on specific issues and more detailed, however, the Committee felt that both the report and the review of which it was the result were becoming less useful as instruments of on-going assessment of the direction in which the University was moving, of long-range planning, and of policy making, while taking us into areas in which the Committee was

not particularly competent and over which it had ultimately little control. We were becoming reactive and defensive rather than proactive and strategic; we began to lose sight of the proverbial forest for the trees. Analysis of campus diversity, for instance, became increasingly number-driven in the absence of discussion of the potential meanings of diversity (ethnic, cultural, gender, geographic, national/international, financial background, and so on) or of desirable benchmarks for diversity on campus. At the same time, AP&P was not responsible for instituting policies that would affect diversity, nor was appropriate data concerning different kinds of diversity readily available. Perhaps more importantly, with the passing of time the “snapshot” benchmark period of Fall 1996 became increasingly unrealistic as a standard for on-going assessment of the direction in which the campus was moving and increasingly less productive as a guideline for policy making and assessment. The “Principles” in effect expressed the anxieties and concerns of a specific the time, while on-going assessment and policy-making require us to deal with issues and challenges that arise and to engage in strategic conversations that help shape the University’s future.

For all those reasons, in Spring 2005, at AP&P’s request, the Senate Executive Committee authorized the Committee to rethink its approach to the annual review of enrollment management results and to suggest a framework for an alternative approach. After considering the advice of the AP&P Sub-Committee on Enrollment Management, AP&P presented such a framework to the Senate at its May 3, 2005 meeting. The framework, accepted by the Senate in principle, posited four major assumptions.

First, enrollment management creates an opportunity for strategic admission decisions that in effect select the student body and to a significant extent shape the character of the university. The annual enrollment management review is an opportunity to track data that allows us to see what kind of university we are becoming and where we are going, to reflect on the changes the university is undergoing and to make strategic decisions about its future. It is also an opportunity for broad consultation with faculty, administration, staff, and students, and with appropriate committees and groups, and thus an opportunity to reinforce the Shared Governance Process.

Second, to respond to these opportunities, the review needs to take the next step beyond the exclusive focus on impaction and impaction principles and to make the enrollment management review and report an instrument of strategic decision making. The review and report should be a flexible instrument of policy making that is not merely reactive but responsive to developing issues and changing policies and practices.

Third, the review, and the process accompanying it, should serve to emphasize the importance to the University of the whole complex of policies related to admission and facilitating graduation, as well as to bring these policies to the attention of the University community. In this way, the review and report should take a broader perspective on the way enrollment management, together with other policies related to student progress and graduation, shapes the University.

Finally, the review and report should also become an instrument of on-going consultation between AP&P and the administration, and thus, indirectly, between the Senate and the administration, concerning these critical issues.

The present report is the first step toward such a strategic approach to enrollment management. It represents not a product of an established “new” process but only a step in a continuing effort to work out a process that would serve the goals spelled out in the framework above. It consists of both discussion of specific issues revealed by current data as well as of further process-oriented suggestions and even suggestions for appropriate institutional changes that would make the achievement of these goals possible. At the same time, the report continues to respond to the “Principles of Impaction,” while also raising issues that AP&P believes should be of concern, both immediate and long-term, to the larger campus community. The report is divided into four sections: Review of Current Enrollment Management Data, Emerging Concerns, Potential Concerns for the Future, and Conclusions and Recommendations.

## **REVIEW OF CURRENT ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT DATA**

Fall 2005 enrollment data (specific data consulted is listed in Appendix A) suggest the following observations:

1. Generally speaking, the number of FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students, undergraduates taking 15.0 units of coursework and, according to a recent announcement, graduate students taking 12.0 units) determines the annual University funding from the state and the CSU. University-wide, following several years of lag between budgeted and actual FTES, we have brought the two together. In fact, the University is currently only 12 FTES over its budgeted enrollment target. We note that substantial effort and insight were involved in moving us toward this goal.
2. Among the data we track is the show rate (the ratio of the number of students actually enrolling at SDSU in relation to the number that have applied). This year, the show rate for first-time freshmen is down compared to prior years. This is likely due to the fact that students apply to many CSU and UC schools; currently, it is inexpensive and easy for students to apply to multiple schools. The University has used a Spring 2006 admission cycle to offset FTES shortfalls from summer 2005. Next year’s review should examine the potential consequences of this action. Future enrollment may also be influenced by an expected dip in the number of high school graduates.
3. SDSU must accept CSU qualified students from its service area. Therefore, data about their characteristics are of interest even though we have little control over the characteristics. Between 2004 and 2005, the numbers of both enrolled first-time freshmen and transfer students from SDSU’s service area have increased (from 1141 to 1723 for first-time freshmen and from 1816 to 2239 for transfer

students). Preparation of students for academic work, as measured by high school GPA, SAT, cut score, and transfer GPA, has been consistent over the last three Fall semesters.

4. As an experiment starting in Fall 2002, the Dual Admission program sought to phase in enrollment of service area students needing remediation by dually admitting them to SDSU and a community college. The plan was for them to complete their remediation while also acquiring community college credit prior to entering SDSU. The dual admission program did not deliver the hoped for results in terms of improving continuation rates for these students and was discontinued (as announced by Associate Vice President Singer on January 6, 2006). The Department of Rhetoric and Writing Studies is working with Academic Affairs to open summer on-campus courses in writing and math for students who wish to begin fulfilling their requirements in those areas early. All students who have remedial requirements in these subjects will have multiple chances to complete these requirements: in the Summer of 2006, continuing in Fall 2006 and in Spring 2007, and even into the Summer of 2007. We hope that this improves the continuation rates for this population of local-area students. We will monitor the results of this action.
5. Of general interest to the university community is the ethnic diversity of our undergraduate students, and we have tracked related data for many years. Ethnic diversity among undergraduate students has stayed relatively constant over the last two years. The relatively low proportion of African-American students remains a concern, to which a diversity of potential approaches should be explored.
6. We would hope that enrolled students would continue to enroll and move toward graduation, and do so expediently. The continuation rate for first-time freshman has improved dramatically from Fall 1998 (71.6%) to Fall 2004 (82.1%). The average undergraduate unit load has leveled at about 13 units. This increase in student load over the last few years has partially offset the decreases in the numbers of graduate students. For 2001 to 2005, for Upper Division Transfers (except Education's Vocational Education program, an anomaly), all colleges have seen the average number of units at graduation reduced. For the university in general, the reduction was from 143.0 units to 139.3 units. (A lower number of units at graduation, coupled with reduced time-to-degree, is desirable since it opens access to more students, saves students time and money, and gets students into the workforce more quickly.) The trend is similar for first-time freshmen (except that Vocational Education ceased admitting entering Freshmen in 2002). Engineering students have the highest unit loads, with a 4-year average of 153.9 units at graduation.
7. SDSU values not only its undergraduate mission, but also its focus upon graduate education. Graduate enrollment continues to decline although many constituencies are trying to change this trend. Among these efforts was a

\$200,000 grant from the Provost's Office to help departments improve their graduate recruitment. The University is currently not able to achieve its goal of 20 percent graduate students in the student body. For Fall 2005, there were 3514.5 FTES post-baccalaureate and graduate students in the total student body of 26,294.8 FTES (13.6%). Decreases in graduate enrollment are offset by admitting more undergraduate students so the University can achieve its enrollment targets.

The recently announced "graduate differential" (the assumption that full time enrollment for graduate students is 12 units instead of 15, as it is for undergraduate students and used to be for graduate students until this year) for the first time pays the university more for enrolled graduate students than it does for undergraduate students, which means that SDSU now, even more ever, must achieve its targets for graduate enrollment. To achieve the same funding amount, we now have to enroll 1.25 undergraduates to equal a non-enrolling graduate student.

## **EMERGING CONCERNS**

This section of the report is intended to alert the Senate and the University community to areas of concern that may need to be addressed in the near future.

It is by no means to be read as either exhaustive of emerging issues or as definitive in their treatment. Rather, the issues mentioned here are selected for attention, and merely signaled, as examples of the kinds of issues that emerge when one takes a comprehensive, policy-level view of enrollment management within the context of the entire complex of policies and strategies that govern admission, retention, and graduation of students and that shape SDSU's student body. These issues go beyond AP&P's ability to "resolve" them unilaterally; they are thus signaled in the spirit of beginning the conversations across concerned constituencies that we feel needs to occur to begin to address them in a strategic and comprehensive way.

The four areas we selected as examples of foci of concern to the University this year are

- large numbers of students not making progress to degree,
- connecting transfer students to the University, and
- the need to know more about the specific effects of impaction on majors, departments, student populations, and student paths through the university,
- the decline in the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students.

### **1. Students not making progress to degree**

There is a large population of students with large numbers of units who have not yet been (and may never be) admitted into a major: 2200 juniors with 70 or more units and 380 seniors who were not yet in a major. Of those, 1100 were first semester transfers. We also have 1600 students with over 130 units and 111 of them are still pre-majors.

The issue was raised in the recent WASC *Educational Effectiveness Review* and intersects with enrollment management, since large numbers of students accruing units but not making progress to degree take up space in classes that could be used by new enrollees. Data-collecting and policy-level questions to be addressed in this connection include: What are the reasons these students are not in a major? (Are they changing majors? Are they not able to meet the standards for the selected major?) Is there an acceptable rate (raw number or percentage of the population) of students not progressing to degree? Should there be a limit on the number of units a student may accrue before declaring a major? Should there be a limit to how many times a student can take a course?

At this point, AP&P is not suggesting any specific policy changes to address this issue. Such changes should emerge from broader consultations with and between relevant constituencies and be data-driven. The policy-making process will be most coherent and effective if specific capacities for on-going inquiry, monitoring, and recommendation are vested in the most appropriate bodies, for instance, in the Graduation and Retention Subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council. Such recommendations may then be forwarded to AP&P, which would then serve as the nexus of policy-making with a broad purview over relevant areas and which would in turn make recommendations to the Senate.

## **2. Connecting transfer students to the University**

Transfer students are another population mentioned in the WASC *Educational Effectiveness Review* as deserving attention. They account for about 50 percent of SDSU's undergraduate population and for much of undergraduate ethnic diversity. A recent study of transfer students by students in the Sociology 408 class under the direction of Professor Sally Davies Netzley ("Transfer Student Qualitative Research Study," Spring 2005) identified many problems that transfer students face, both at SDSU as well as at community colleges before they transfer to SDSU. The study, preliminary as it is, points the way to the kind of data gathering and consultation effort that is needed to address the needs of transfer students more adequately and thus to improve graduation rates of SDSU students. Besides information on transfer students' profiles and needs, we need more longitudinal data on the patterns of their progress through SDSU. Such on-going data monitoring may perhaps be performed by the Graduation and Retention Subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council (in consultation with Enrollment Services), which would then make appropriate recommendations to AP&P.

## **3. Need to know more about the specific effects of impaction**

Impaction has been the subject of intense debate on campus since its adoption in 1997. Yet little concrete information is known, beyond anecdotal evidence, about its effects on specific departments, programs, majors, student populations, selection of majors, and retention and graduation patterns. For instance, does impaction really improve the quality of a program? Is impaction being used as a tool to "design" the university, or are we just

allowing accepted students to determine our direction? That is, for example, are we strategically enrolling students in the majors we want to grow, or, conversely, limiting enrollment in selected majors to enhance the majors' prestige? (Such actions affect the direction of the university.) Does impaction hurt some students by holding them back, thus contributing to the problem of students not making progress to degree? Is it still appropriate for all majors that are currently impacted to continue their impacted status? Is it appropriate in situations of limited resources?

We also need to know the effect of impaction on the economic diversity of our undergraduate student body. Average income is going up each year and the percent of students with low incomes is dropping. If, because of impaction and greater numbers of applications, will the cutoff score continue to rise, and if so, will it diminish the numbers or percentages of low incomes students.

We suggest that such questions need to be addressed if impaction is to be better understood and used as one of the elements of strategic planning and decision-making in shaping the University. The campus at large should seek answers to such questions. With better understanding of the effects, implications, and mechanisms of impaction we can make decisions regarding policies that should govern the impaction of specific departments and programs and their place in the entire complex of strategies for aligning enrollment demand with available resources in light of the University's goals, priorities, and visions for the future.

#### **4. Decline in the Ratio of Graduate to Undergraduate Students**

SDSU prides itself on its Carnegie Foundation classification among Research Universities/High Research Activity, as well as on its leadership role in offering 12 out of 14 joint Ph. D. programs in the CSU. The recent CSU decision to fund the university at a higher rate for graduate students than for undergraduate students (the "graduate differential") adds a financial incentive to the University's goal of maintaining a sizeable, quality graduate program.

### **CONCERNS FOR THE FUTURE**

Our deliberations over current data, over the issues discussed above, and over the best ways to move into the future according to the assumptions spelled out in the Introduction to this report suggest to us three topics that may deserve the Committee's, and the Senate's, attention in the future:

- the profile of the graduating student body
- the need for examination of information on the socio-economic background and status of applicants and enrollees
- the appropriateness of the 80/20 formula for admission.

#### **1. "Profile" of the graduating student body**

This may be the time to gather more data about, and for the University community to enter into discussions of, the profile of the SDSU graduate. We need data on time to degree, units taken, age, involvement data on international and study abroad activity, leadership, research/scholarship/creative activity, socio-economic status, percentage of graduates, and so on. Specific questions to be addressed may include: What is a good retention target (85%?)? What should be the graduation target? What about students at risk? What about students on financial aid or working? How do entering students compare to graduating students? What is the desirable ratio of graduate to undergraduate students?

Comparisons with selected institutions that provide viable models for SDSU may be helpful here (a preliminary list of such institutions is currently under consideration by the Undergraduate Council). Data on SDSU students and appropriate instruments may be provided by electronic resources such as the Degree Audit Reporting System and the Roadmaps to graduation. Perhaps the most important question for the University community to consider should be: "What should be the profile of a graduating student?"

## **2. Information on socio-economic background of applicants and enrollees**

We need more information about the socio-economic background and financial status of our applicants and enrollees. Perhaps we could do a better job of enrollment management if we knew about their outside work loads, living locations (proximity, with parents vs. dorm, and so on) and income (their income, parents' income, etc., and about comparisons between out-of-service-area and in-service area constituencies). As noted elsewhere, incomes of average undergraduate students are increasing. We already have a significant financial need that we are not meeting; data may guide us to seek more need-based grants. Funding more need-based grants may add to the economic diversity of our campus, which should be one of our goals.

## **3. Appropriateness of the 80/20 formula for admission**

About 10 years ago, when the 80/20 formula was developed as a way of admitting highly qualified applicants (the 80 percent) while also protecting through special admission some applicants who had desired merit but did not meet the academic cut score (the 20 percent), other models, such as 70/30 and 90/10, were explored. The selection of the 80/20 formula arose from careful planning and estimates, but it was a product of prior performance, and was thus an experiment.

In the past decade, a variety of student body demographics have changed, such as entering SAT scores, in-service versus out-of-service admits, and the ratio of applicants to admits. These changing demographics may have influenced both in-service area and out-of-service area students in the 80% category, as well as students in the 20% category. If we determine that in-service area students are improving more quickly than out-of-service area students on SAT scores and GPAs, for example, that means the eligibility index will rise, thus affecting other applicants. Because of the age of the formula and

changes in the makeup of the student body, we should ask, “Is the 80/20 formula still appropriate?”

## CONCLUSIONS

As we embark on a thorough reconsideration of our approach to our annual review of enrollment management results, we pose several preliminary conclusions that are intended to guide our continuing deliberations on enrollment management:

- Enrollment management has to be viewed, and reviewed, within the entire complex of issues and policies related to admission, enrollment, retention, graduation, and, perhaps most importantly, educational quality, at both undergraduate and graduate levels. The connections between these issues and policies need to be explored further in discussions between appropriate constituencies in order for the University to develop a comprehensive, proactive, and strategic approach to enrollment management. AP&P is the appropriate body for initiating such discussions and for gathering and adjudicating appropriate recommendations on policy from diverse concerned constituencies. Only in this way will our review of enrollment management results and associated issues occur at policy-making levels and have policy-making implications. Only in this way can we make substantive policy recommendations to the Senate.
- The University needs more institutional data gathering and analysis capacity. Although the data the Committee regularly examines in response to the eight “Principles to guide impaction” has been provided routinely, the kind of policy-level questions and connections suggested in a preliminary way in this report will need substantial, additional data gathering and analysis. This gathering and analysis needs to be conducted through many venues and bodies; only on the bases of informed discussion and recommendations can strategic planning be conducted (see also Recommendations).
- The “Principles to guide impaction” represent the anxieties and assumptions of a specific era in the University’s history. A decade later, the University is experiencing different pressures and problems that need to be dealt with in a coherent, strategic manner. The “Principles” do not help us deal with these problems as we continue to move away from 1996. We find that some of the “Principles” may actually be contradictory when applied in the context of such issues as the growth in use of very large classrooms or falling FTES. Enrollment pressures push us to hire more lecturers, who teach more students than tenure/tenure track faculty, to meet FTES targets. For example, does increasing the ratio of tenure/tenure track to lecturing faculty decrease the University’s instructional capacity, in effect increasing pressures toward larger and larger classrooms to increase FTES? (In this connection, see the “Report on Tenure Track Faculty” prepared by Senate’s Faculty Affairs Committee.) Better understanding of such connections at the college and department level may allow

us to make more considered policy decisions and to prioritize in response to changing demographic and fiscal pressures, rather than holding on to fixed and potentially outdated benchmarks. The problem is to make certain that enrollment management practices, in the context of all the policies governing admission, enrollment, retention, and graduation, continues to contribute to educational quality in both undergraduate and graduate programs.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the foregoing conclusions, AP&P recommends the following:

- Increase efficiency and effectiveness by coordinating data used by various committees and offices related to the broad issue of enrollment management. Make AP&P the nexus of policy-level discussion and decision-making regarding not only enrollment management but also the entire complex of strategies for proactive, on-going shaping of the University of which enrollment management is a part. This is the step toward developing what the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review pointed out that SDSU lacks: a “controlling philosophy, plan, and leadership authority that govern the way it admits, retains, and graduates students.” It is also a step toward developing such a capacity in the spirit of shared governance and collaboration that are characteristic of SDSU.
- Ensure Institutional Research’s capacity to provide, gather and analyze data related to student body demographics, admission, and enrollment management. This recommendation benefits the university at large. These data support understanding of who we are, who we want to be, and strategic planning to bring the two together. The data, of course, also support a multitude of internal and external processes and enhance student and faculty research regarding the institution.
- Reconsider the “Principles to guide impaction” in light of the information that will emerge from the on-going analysis and discussion whose groundwork in laid out in the present report. AP&P will take the leadership role in this reconsideration and make appropriate recommendations to the Senate at some point in the future.

## GLOSSARY

**80/20 Selection Process:** In Spring 1997, the University Senate approved “Principles to Guide Impaction.” The 80/20 model was developed as a means to implement those principles. Eighty percent of SDSU admits are to be based solely on academic performance, twenty percent of SDSU admits can be based on special talents, socio-economic status, local residence, etc.

**Admission:** An offer of admission is extended to those applicants who have met the admission criteria for a specific term as determined by the size and quality of the applicant pool. The admitted student must file an “intent to enroll”, \$100 deposit, and submit transcripts by an established deadline to confirm this offer of admission.

**Application:** To be considered for admission to SDSU, an applicant must submit a CSU admissions application during the application filing period (October 1-November 30).

**Campus impaction:** A campus that has more CSU-eligible applications than it can accommodate, is eligible for impacted status. This status allows campuses to use supplemental admission criteria; for example, higher grade point averages. SDSU was granted impacted status in Spring 1997. Campus impaction was first implemented in Spring 1999 at SDSU.

**Enrollment:** Enrollment is the number of students (headcount or FTE) enrolled in classes in a particular term. An admitted student who has confirmed his admission through the “intent to enroll” process, adheres to testing requirements, and pays his fees is eligible to register for classes. Once registered in classes, the student has moved from being an applicant to being an enrolled student.

**Enrollment management:** The process and art of admitting, enrolling, retaining, and graduating the students. Enrollment management seeks to assure that enrollment goals are aligned with funding/resources and shapes the character of the University.

**Program impaction:** A campus program (major) that has more students applying to it than the program can accommodate, is eligible for impacted status. This status allows programs to establish supplemental criteria to enter the major/program.

**Special admission:** The CSU allots a percentage of “special” admission slots to each campus. “Special” admission is defined as admission of a CSU-ineligible student.

## **APPENDIX A: Review Process**

### **The enrollment management review process**

- Data was distributed to members of the AP&P Subcommittee on Enrollment Management on November 5, 2004.
- The AP&P Enrollment Management Subcommittee met to analyze and discuss the data on November 11 and on December 14, 2005.
- Selected members of the subcommittee met with WASC Review Team November 9, 2005.
- The Chair of the Subcommittee, in consultation with AP&P chair, prepared the initial draft report in January 2006.
- President's Enrollment Management Advisory Committee met November 1, 2005
- AP&P discussed the draft report and the data at its December 20, 2005 and February 14, 2006 meetings.
- AP&P chair and Subcommittee chair made changes to the report based on AP&P's input.
- Revised report was distributed to the Subcommittee on March 15, 2006.
- Revised report was distributed to AP&P on March 21, 2006 for final feedback.

## **APPENDIX B: Data Points**

### Data points examined by AP&P

- Enrollment Management Update to all faculty and staff from Associate Vice President Ethan Singer (Summer 2005).
- Enrollment Management Update to all faculty and staff from Associate Vice President Ethan Singer, November 1, 2005.
- Enrollment Management Update to all faculty and staff from Associate Vice President Ethan Singer, January 6, 2006.
- Report to WASC team, including "Reflective Essay 1: The Balance Among Access, Retention, and Graduation.
- First-time freshmen graduation rates by ethnicity, Fall 1995 to Fall 2001
- One-year continuation rates by ethnicity, Fall 2000 to Fall 2004, and first-time freshmen, Fall 1998 – Fall 2004.
- Enrollment by ethnicity, Fall 2005
- First-time freshmen and transfers applicants, enrollees, and admits, by ethnicity and geographical area, 1999-2005.
- SDSU First-time Freshmen Profile: Sweetwater Union High School District Students (April 2005)

- San Diego County HS graduates by ethnicity completing all courses required for UC/CSU entrance, 2002/03 and 2003/04.
- California HS graduates by ethnicity completing all courses required for UC/CSU entrance, 2002/03 and 2003/04.
- Undergraduate first-time freshmen and transfers: applicants, admits, and enrollees by ethnicity and geographical area, 2004-2005
- Undergraduate enrollee and first-time freshmen characteristics, Fall 1998 to Fall 2005
- Undergraduate diversity, Fall 2003 to Fall 2005
- Average undergraduate student load, Fall 1999 to Fall 2005
- Undergraduate and freshmen average student load, Fall 1998 to Fall 2005
- First-time freshmen enrollees requiring remediation by ethnicity, Fall 2004 and 2005
- Dual admit data, 2000 to 2005.
- Time to degree, first-time freshmen and transfers, by major, 2001 to 2005
- Graduation rates for first-time freshmen, by major, Fall 1998 – Fall 2001.
- Graduation rates for transfers, by major, 2001-2005.

#### Selected electronic files

[http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/gradrate/sd\\_ftfgradrateseth\\_054.pdf?CFID=2344460&CFTOKEN=38105286](http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/gradrate/sd_ftfgradrateseth_054.pdf?CFID=2344460&CFTOKEN=38105286)

[http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/gradrate/sd\\_ftfgradrateseth\\_054.pdf?CFID=2344460&CFTOKEN=38105286](http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/gradrate/sd_ftfgradrateseth_054.pdf?CFID=2344460&CFTOKEN=38105286)

[http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/contrate/sd\\_contrates\\_0004.pdf?CFID=2344513&CFTOKEN=29835386](http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/contrate/sd_contrates_0004.pdf?CFID=2344513&CFTOKEN=29835386)

[http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/contrate/sd\\_contrates\\_0004.pdf?CFID=2344513&CFTOKEN=29835386](http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/contrate/sd_contrates_0004.pdf?CFID=2344513&CFTOKEN=29835386)

[http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/ethnic/all\\_ethnic\\_054.pdf?CFID=2344595&CFTOKEN=44701823](http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/ethnic/all_ethnic_054.pdf?CFID=2344595&CFTOKEN=44701823)

[http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/ethnic/all\\_ethnic\\_054.pdf?CFID=2344595&CFTOKEN=44701823](http://asir.sdsu.edu/app/reports/ethnic/all_ethnic_054.pdf?CFID=2344595&CFTOKEN=44701823)

Essay 1 in <http://wasc.sdsu.edu/edeffectiveness/htm>

<http://wasc.sdsu.edu/edeffectiveness.htm>

## APPENDIX C

### Enrollment Management Subcommittee of AP&P for 2005-2006

John Penrose (chair)

Cezar Ornatowski (AP&P chair) (Dan Finnegan, acting chair, Fall 2005)

Isidro Ortiz (SDSU Senate)

Sally Farris (Director, Institutional Research)

Sandra Cook (Director, Enrollment Services)

Chrys Dutton (Director, Financial Aid)

Dennis Kramer II (VP University Affairs, Associated Students)

Gene Lamke (SDSU Senate, Academic Resources and Planning Committee representative)

## APPENDIX D

### **President's Enrollment Management Advisory Committee** Community Members

Mr. Ramon Leyba  
Area Superintendent  
Sweetwater Union High School District

Mr. Daniel L. Guevara  
Attorney at Law  
Guevara, Phippard & James

Ms. Lynn Neault  
Assistant Chancellor of Student Services  
San Diego Community College District

Mr. César Padilla  
President  
Los Aztecas

Ms. Margaret Iwanaga-Penrose  
President and Chief Executive Officer  
Union of Pan Asian Communities

Mr. Cecil Steppe  
President  
San Diego Urban League, Inc.

Mr. Doug Williams  
Principal  
Hoover High School

Ms. Bertha Lopez  
Reading-Language Arts Specialist  
National School District

### Campus Members

Dr. Sandra Cook

Executive Director  
Enrollment Services

Ms. Chrys Dutton  
Director  
Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships

Professor Gene Lamke  
Department of Recreation Parks and  
Tourism

Professor Cezar Ornatowski  
Department of Rhetoric and Writing Studies

Professor Isidro D. Ortiz  
Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies

Mr. Chris Manigault  
President  
Associated Students

Professor John M. Penrose  
Department of Information and  
Decision Systems

Professor Douglas Stow  
Department of Geography

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** May 9, 2006  
**TO:** San Diego State University Senate  
**FROM:** Mark Thayer, Chair, Committee on Academic Resources and Planning  
**RE:** Information Items for Senate Meeting, May 9, 2006

---

The AR&P committee has the following information items for the Senate meeting of May 9, 2006.

1. Approved the proposal to separate the School of Communication into Two Academic Units with the understanding that all funding required to complete the proposed separation (approximately \$25,000 for remodeling space and \$30,000 for increased administration cost) would be the responsibility of the college of Professional Studies and Fine Arts.
2. Approved the proposal to delete the emphasis in Recreation Therapy in the department of Recreation, Parks, and Tourism.
3. Tabled curriculum proposal 06-43, Masters of Science Degree in Homeland Security, until additional information regarding the funding source for the program and potential duplication of courses was available.
4. Approved the AR&P Meeting Schedule for Academic Year 2006 – 2007 presented in the Table below.

**AR&P Schedule for Academic Year 2006 - 2007**

<b>Senate Executive Meeting</b>	<b>Senate Meeting</b>	<b>AR&amp;P Meeting</b>
August 22, 2006	September 5, 2006	August 29, 2006
September 19, 2006	October 10, 2006	September 12, 2006
October 24, 2006	November 7, 2006	September 26, 2006
November 21, 2006	December 5, 2006	October 17, 2006
January 16, 2007	February 6, 2007	October 31, 2006
February 20, 2007	March 6, 2007	November 14, 2006
March 20, 2007	April 10, 2007	December 12, 2006
April 24, 2007	May 8, 2007	January 30, 2007
		February 13, 2007
		February 27, 2007
		March 13, 2007
		April 3, 2007
		April 17, 2007
		May 1, 2007

To: The Senate  
From: Edith Benkov, Chair, Faculty Affairs  
Date: May 9, 2006  
Re: Action

## Change in Policy File

### Matriculation by Faculty Members

1.0 Members of the faculty of San Diego State University ~~holding appointments at or above the rank of lecturer shall not~~ may be candidates for degrees on this campus.

2.0 Faculty ~~shall~~ may not seek degrees or register for courses within their own departments, programs, or schools and retain faculty status in that unit. ~~Registration shall be by concurrent enrollment through the College of Extended Studies at a reduced fee.~~

### Rationale:

Graduate Council determined that there is no reason to prevent faculty members from enrolling in degree-granting programs as long as there is no conflict of interest between their roles as instructor and student. This requires that the policy be further revised to bring SDSU into compliance with PERB ruling on composition of bargaining units 3 (faculty) and 11 (academic student employees). Instructors who teach in units in which they are enrolled as students must do so as Teaching Associates, not Lecturers.

Date: May 9, 2006  
To: The Senate  
From: Quintana, Chair, Environment & Safety  
Subject Smoking Policy

---

### **Action**

The Committee moves that the Senate amend the current smoking policy found on the University Senate web site in the 2005 University Policy file pg. # 63 and as follows:

#### Smoking

1.0 Smoking shall be prohibited by San Diego State University as follows:

- a. In its buildings or leased spaces and motor pool vehicles,
- b. In outdoor areas connected to or within ~~20~~ 25 feet of university buildings or leased space including exits, entrances, operable windows, are intake vents, stairwells, balconies, breezeways, and under overhangs and awnings.
- c. In outdoor areas within ~~20~~ 25 feet of university-owned or -leased food establishments unless designated as smoking areas consistent with the goals of this policy and in outdoor university-owned or -leased constructed seating areas where people are likely to congregate, unless designated as smoking areas.
- d. Appropriately worded “no smoking” signs shall be placed in locations where the ~~20~~ 25 foot rule is consistently violated and all public ash receptacles shall be placed in compliance with this policy.

2.0 – 5.0 unchanged

### **Rationale**

This amendment would change the current ‘20 foot’ rule in the campus smoking policy to 25 feet. This change is motivated by the process currently under way of having certain campus buildings certified under the LEED EB designation (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-Existing Building category) by the United States Green Building Council ([www.usgbc.org](http://www.usgbc.org)). Certification is currently being sought for Manchester Hall (formerly Centennial Hall), and is planned for other buildings in the future. The only barrier to the LEED certification process is currently that, to meet requirements, the campus policy for smoking must state no smoking within 25 feet from entrances etc., not 20 feet as currently exists in our policy. LEED certifications are a priority for our campus (Vice President's office (Business and Financial Affairs), the CSU system (Revised Policy on Energy Conservation, Sustainable Building Practices, and Physical Plant Management (RCPBG 05-04-11), <http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/peu/sustainability.shtml>) and the State of California (Executive Order S-20-04).

## MEMORANDUM

TO: The Senate

FROM: Professor Sherry Little  
Faculty Honors & Awards

DATE: May 9, 2006

RE: **Emeritus Faculty**

---

### **Action Item:**

The Faculty Honors & Awards committee moves that the Senate approve emeritus status upon retirement to the following faculty:

Patricia Wahl, Professor of Nursing, May 23, 2006, 16 years  
Carlos Guillermo Wilson, Professor of Spanish, May 25, 2006, 14 years

## MEMORANDUM

TO: The Senate

FROM: Professor Sherry Little  
Faculty Honors & Awards

DATE: May 9, 2006

RE: **Emeritus Faculty for 2005-2006**

---

### Information:

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Years</u>
Zev	bar-Lev	Professor	Linguistics and Oriental Languages	27
Patricia	Dintrone	Lecturer	Management	27
Clive	Dorman	Associate Professor	Geological Sciences	32
Evangelina Bustamante	Jones	Associate Professor	Policy Studies in Lang. & C-C Educ.	16
Gene G.	Lamke	Professor	Recreation, Parks, and Tourism	33
David	Lesley	Professor	Mathematics and Statistics	36
Myron	Lustig	Professor	Communication	28
Leonard	Marino	Professor	Electrical and Computer Engineering	33
Edward	Omberg	Professor	Finance	17
Ida K.	Rigby	Professor	Art, Design and Art History	30
Donald	Sciglimpaglia	Professor	Marketing	29
Joseph E.	Spevak	Assistant Professor	Communication	37
Donna	Thal	Professor	Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences	16
Patricia	Wahl *	Professor	Nursing	16
Carlos Guillermo	Wilson *	Professor	Spanish and Portuguese Lang. & Lit.	14

\* Pending Senate approval May 9, 2006

## MEMORANDUM

May 9, 2006

TO: The Senate  
FROM: Kris Stewart, Chair, Instructional and Information Technology Committee  
RE: Information

### 1. Information

Response to recent referral from Officers.

*CSU Code of Conduct, Computer Use Section* –. The IIT Committee has reviewed the section: Misuse of Computer Facilities or Resources, in the Student Code of Conduct approved in November 2005, by the CSU Board of Trustees. The committee feels that the provisions found in this section of the Code are already covered by the Computing Acceptable Use Policy adopted by the Senate 03Apr2001: <http://security.sdsu.edu/policy/aup.html> as well as the SDSU Policy File: FACILITIES / Computer Use (p. 60).

To: The Senate  
From: Kris Stewart, Chair, IIT Committee  
Date: 9 May 2006  
Re: IIT subcommittee to address academic freedom and border firewall (Information)

**Information Item:**

The University Senate IIT (Instructional & Information Technology) Committee wishes to present to the Senate the following information item.

The IIT Committee will form a subcommittee of 5 representative members (Kris Stewart, IIT Committee Chair and Computer Science Professor; John Ross, Academic Affairs IT Coordinator; Jim Julius, Instructional Technology Services Asst. Director; Tom Impelluso, Engineering Professor; and Member to be named by the University Senate Chair to make recommendations that establish the proper relationship between academic freedom and IT security.

**Charge to Subcommittee:**

Classification of campus users:

- Inside firewall (restricted access to/from off-campus network services)
- Outside firewall (no restrictions to/from off-campus network services)

How should this classification be determined? What type of information is needed for the request? What approval is needed? Is this different for faculty / staff / student / administrator?

**Rationale:**

Need to balance the computer network security and related fiduciary issues with the core mission (to provide well-balanced, high quality education for undergraduate and graduate students and to contribute to knowledge and the solution of problems through excellence and distinction in teaching, research, and service) of SDSU.

A few years ago a state law was approved and it requires notification of people who have their social security numbers on compromised computers. An example of real dollar costs to SDSU is that shortly after that the campus had a computer hacked (although no evidence the social security numbers were violated) the campus still had to notify all the individuals, which did cost the campus real dollars. It is risks like this, and others that having computer systems “inside the firewall” can help to minimize.

The IIT committee is not asking for any Senate action at this time, we just felt it was important to keep the Senate informed, as I will continue to do through next year. For more details on this issue (or our other items) see our annual report or the committee web page at: <http://www.stewart.cs.sdsu.edu/USenate/>.

**To: Senate Executive Committee**  
**From: Research Council**  
**Date: April 25, 2006**  
**Re: RSCA Guidelines**

---

## RSCA GUIDELINES

Campus plan developed and adopted by the Senate in 1988 to implement Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity funding.

August 2005

Academic Budgeting and Planning Committee, The Senate

General Guidelines:

1. That the funds are to be allocated in three categories:
  - a. Mini-grants for scholarly research up to \$5000
  - b. Summer fellowships for one or two months
  - c. Semester leaves with pay
2. That the proportion of funds in the three categories may be determined by each campus.
3. That faculty recipients must be chosen by competitive review of proposals.
4. That committee(s) reviewing proposals shall be comprised of a majority of faculty who are elected by tenured and probationary faculty, and that inclusion of student(s) selected by normal campus procedures is highly desirable.
5. That criteria for evaluating proposals must address the educational impact of the proposal on students and the nature of student involvement.
6. That all faculty in Unit 3 are eligible for funding.
7. That summer fellowships be funded at the rank and step of recipients.
8. That semester leaves be funded at replacement level and that benefits not be charged to this source.
9. That any equipment purchased through state funds will remain state property.

During The Senate's discussion of what plan would best serve our campus, a number of themes emerged. The Committee felt strongly that the name "research, scholarship, and creative activity" implied that a broad range of professional activities should be eligible for funding. Since any reasonably-sized screening committee would be likely to lack sensitivity

to the quality and importance of proposals over the whole range, committees at the college level seemed most appropriate. Centering evaluation of proposals at this level also addresses two other concerns: allocation of funding into the three categories can more closely reflect the needs of the applicants in the various disciplines if done at the college level, and resources requested in applications can be more easily integrated with other resources available to Departments and Colleges, reducing both overlapping allocations and inadvertent omissions. ~~Therefore, The Senate recommends the following:~~

In 2005-2006, the Division of Research Administration and the Office of Faculty Affairs initiated a phased integration of all University grants (RSCA, Faculty Development Program, and Grants-in-Aid) in order to coordinate and simplify the application and review process. All colleges provided input into the revised procedures. This integration necessitates some changes in the original 1988 RSCA allocation plan.

~~The Provost shall allocate directly to each college its portion of the funds from this program. Allocations shall be determined principally and primarily on a prorated FTEF basis.~~

2. Each college shall form ~~an~~ a University Grants Program (UGP) RSCA research committee consisting of, nominated by, and elected by faculty (including administrator other than the dean) plus a graduate student in good standing. The faculty on this committee should be broadly representative of the variety of research, scholarship, and creative activity characteristic of the college. Committee members shall not have proposals before the committee during their period of service.
3. These college RSCA research committees shall evaluate proposals submitted by individual faculty members in their colleges, rank the proposals, and ~~where necessary, recommend proposal funding levels~~ provide explanations for the significance of the proposal and the committees' recommendations. College research committees may develop funding recommendations that include sequestering of research funds for new faculty. There shall be no fixed amount of funds that need be allocated to a particular research category, i.e., mini-grants, summer fellowships, or semester leaves with pay. In order to avoid unintended redundancies, the committees shall interact with their deans and department chairs to become aware of what other resources have been, or plan to be allocated to faculty submitting proposals.
4. The college research committees shall also formulate and disseminate the criteria for evaluation of proposals in their colleges. One criterion must be the educational impact of the proposal on students and the nature of student involvement. Other options for college committee criteria might include:
  - a. The faculty member's research agenda
  - b. New and emerging areas of research
  - c. Impact on faculty member's scholarship
    1. Supports faculty member's competence in area.
    2. Improves teaching effectiveness in an area of expertise.

3. Leads to a refereed publication, exhibition, or performance.
  - d. Impact on future extramural funding.
  - e. Limitations on availability of alternative funding opportunities.
  - f. Recognition of affirmative action goals and of the needs of untenured faculty.
  - g. Reasonable budget.
  - h. What can be accomplished within the period of funding.
5. ~~The college RSCA research committees shall evaluate proposals submitted by individual faculty members in their colleges, rank the proposals, and where necessary, recommend proposal funding levels. All proposals shall then be forwarded to the dean.~~The Division of Research Administration shall form a UGP committee consisting of one representative from each college (including Library and IVC) and at least one graduate student in good standing. The faculty members of the committee shall be nominated and elected by the Senate. The Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Director of Research Affairs will sit as ex officio, non-voting members of the committee. The UGP committee shall evaluate only those proposals deemed worthy of funding by the college committees and deans and recommend funding levels.
  6. ~~If a dean disagrees with the recommended division of funds among the research categories or with rankings within the categories, the committee's and dean's recommendations shall go to the Provost for final resolution.~~
  7. ~~On a college by college basis, deans~~The University shall notify the individual faculty of the allocation decisions for that year after allocation decisions have been completed and disagreements resolved. The ~~deans~~Office of Faculty Affairs shall ~~also~~ be responsible for ensuring the completion of required reports. Each college research committee shall ~~prepare for~~be available to advise the faculty of their college ~~a summary of on~~ the preparation of applications, the evaluation process, and the results for that college.
  8. The Office of ~~the Provost~~Faculty Affairs and Division of Research Administration shall prepare a calendar of deadlines for each year for the administration of the research funds to be included with the Provost's announcement of the distribution of funds.

Date: April 28, 2006  
To: The Senate  
From: Thomas R. Scott, Chair, University Research Council  
Subject: Policy File Change

---

**Action:**

Changes in the Integrity in Research and Scholarship policy

Rationale:

The Code of Federal Regulations 42 CFR Part 50 was replaced in June 2005 with 42 CFR Part 93 which prompts a change to our policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship. The policy with the changes tracked follows. These changes were accepted by the University Research Council in November 2005.

The required changes focus on the definition of scientific misconduct. The final rule defines misconduct as Fabrication, Falsification, and Plagiarism (FFP) and expands the scope of plagiarism to include material obtained peer review process and used without attribution. The clause, “and other practices” was deemed vague and deleted from the definition. The term "performing" replaces “conducting" in section 2.0 and two definitions of misconduct were deleted from the existing policy because they either fell under Fabrication, Falsification or Plagiarism (FFP) or referred to deliberate violations of regulations for research subject protections which are covered under separate regulations. In addition, spacing corrections were made in one section.

Action:

Section 2.0: Definition of Scientific Misconduct  
Section 3.2: Elaborate on limits to confidentiality  
Section 3.5: Spacing added in two places

## Research and Scholarship, Integrity in

1.0 Members of the academic community involved in the conduct of research and scholarship shall adhere to the highest standards of ethical behavior. This policy applies to all individuals at San Diego State University including those engaged in research that is supported by the Public Health Service (PHS) or for which an application has been submitted. The procedures herein shall protect the rights and reputations of parties involved in alleged misconduct and shall cover allegations involving students employed on research grants or contracts. Allegations of academic dishonesty by students engaged in research, as part of their academic program shall be dealt with according to University academic policies, student disciplinary procedures, and regulations of Graduate and Research Affairs.

2.0 Guidelines for Identifying Misconduct: Consistent with the Public Health Service (PHS) definition<sup>[cn1]</sup> (42 CFR 93.103), ~~research misconduct in research shall be means~~“ fabrication, falsification, ~~or~~ plagiarism ~~for , or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for~~ proposing, ~~performing~~~~conducting~~,<sup>[cn2]</sup> or reporting research ~~results”~~ and shall not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data.<sup>22</sup> The same shall apply to scholarship. ~~The types of fraud or deviance in academic research and scholarship shall include:~~

The definitions of misconduct in academic research and scholarship are as follows:

- a) Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- b) Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- c) Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.

[cn3]

~~a. Falsification of data, which shall range from sheer fabrication to selective reporting, including the omission of conflicting data~~

~~b. Plagiarism, which shall include inadequate citation of references, parsimony in referencing, submission of the same data in more than one publication by the same author, and similar abuses~~

~~c. Abuse of confidentiality not only by the primary reviewers but also by those with whom the reviewers have shared the privileged information.~~

~~d. Seemingly deliberate violations of regulations adopted by appropriate mechanisms to protect patients, research subjects, and other persons and animals.~~

3.0 Procedures for Handling Allegations of Misconduct

**3.1 Inquiry Process.** Initial reports or charges of misconduct in research or scholarship shall be directed first to the dean of the college in which the alleged misconduct has occurred. The dean shall inform the department or program chair and the research or scholarship supervisor(s) of the allegations. The dean shall also inform the involved faculty member(s) or nonfaculty employee(s) of the nature of the allegations, the nature of the inquiry, and the rights of the parties involved. Diligent efforts will be made to protect the positions and reputations of those who, in good faith, make allegations of scientific misconduct.

3.2 The college dean, after consultation with the department or program chair and appropriate research or scholarship supervisor(s) with appropriate expertise for inquiries, shall conduct promptly a preliminary inquiry to determine whether there is sufficient prima facie evidence to merit a formal investigation of the charges and shall inform the Vice President for Research or designee that a preliminary inquiry is under way. Precautions shall be taken to prevent real or apparent conflicts of interest on the part of those involved in the inquiry. Confidentiality shall be strictly maintained throughout the inquiry to the extent allowed by law. If an inquiry is terminated for any reason without completing all relevant requirements, a report summarizing the termination shall be sent to the appropriate official (ORI for PHS funded research). For PHS funded research, the Vice President for Research or designee shall notify the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) of the Public Health Service within 24 hours of obtaining reasonable indication of an immediate health hazard, need to protect Federal funds or equipment and individuals affected by the inquiry, and that the alleged incident may be publicly reported.

3.3 The college dean shall forward without delay a written report to the Vice President for Research or designee. An inquiry must be completed within 60 calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. Any extension of this period shall be based on good cause and recorded in the inquiry file. The written report shall (a) state the evidence reviewed, (b) summarize relevant interviews, and (c) include the conclusions of the inquiry. A copy of the report of the inquiry shall be given to the person(s) against whom the allegation has been made, and their comments on that report may become part of the record. Detailed documentation of the inquiry shall be maintained by the Vice President for Research or designee for at least three years and, in federally funded research, shall be provided upon request to authorized personnel. Appropriate interim administrative action shall be taken to protect Federal funds and ensure that the purposes of the Federal financial assistance are being carried out.

3.4 If, after consideration of the report of the inquiry, the Vice President for Research or designee determines that there is not sufficient prima facie evidence to support the charges, no further action need be taken, and the Provost and the parties involved shall be so informed. Efforts shall be taken, as appropriate, to restore the reputations of persons alleged to have engaged in misconduct when allegations are not confirmed.

**3.5 Investigation Process.** If, after consideration of the report of the inquiry, the Vice President for Research or designee determines that sufficient prima facie evidence

supports the charges, the Vice President for Research or designee shall appoint within 30 days of the completion of the inquiry an ad hoc committee with appropriate expertise to conduct a formal investigation, and the Provost shall be so notified. The membership of the committee shall consist of at least four knowledgeable and impartial persons including one representative from the department, program, or auxiliary unit of the involved faculty member(s) or nonfaculty employee(s) and three faculty members from related departments, programs, or areas. For externally funded research, the Vice President for Research or designee may also appoint a member of the San Diego State University Research Foundation as an ex officio member to represent the interests and legal obligations of the Research Foundation. In addition, the Vice President for Research or designee may appoint members from outside the institution in order to broaden the expertise of the committee. Precautions shall be taken against the investigators' real or apparent conflicts of interest.

3.6 As soon as the committee has been requested to conduct a formal investigation, the Vice President for Research or designee shall notify the accused faculty member(s) or nonfaculty employee(s) of the charges and the function of the committee. In consultation with the Provost and the college dean, the Vice President for Research or designee may determine that the research activities of the involved researcher(s) may be restricted or monitored during the course of the investigation. The Vice President for Research or designee shall also notify the President, the Provost, the school director or the department or program chair, and for funded research the Chief Executive Officer of the San Diego State University Research Foundation and the project officer(s) of the funding agencies that a formal investigation involving charges of misconduct in research or scholarship has been initiated. For PHS funded research, the Director of the Office of Research Integrity shall be notified in writing on or before the date the investigation begins, and such notification shall include (a) the name of the person(s) against whom the allegations have been made, (b) the general nature of the allegations, and (c) the application or grants involved. If an investigation is terminated for any reason without completing all relevant requirements, a report summarizing the termination shall be sent to the appropriate official (ORI for PHS funded research). Confidentiality of the affected individual(s) shall be strictly maintained throughout the investigation to the extent possible.

3.7 The Vice President for Research or designee shall convene the committee, appoint one of the faculty on the committee to serve as chair, present the charges and allegations, and discuss University and Research Foundation policies and procedures pertinent to the investigation. The committee shall investigate all charges and facts and may interview parties appropriate to reaching a decision regarding the merit or lack of merit to the charges. The chair of the committee shall meet with the appropriate personnel officers (viz., Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, Director of the Center for Human Resources, and Research Foundation Director of Human Resources) regarding existing procedures and safeguards to protect all parties' rights and reputations before carrying out the investigation. Diligent efforts shall be made to protect the positions and reputations of those who, in good faith, made allegations of scientific misconduct. The committee shall begin its investigation promptly and shall provide a written report of its findings and recommendations to the Vice President for Research or designee no later

than 60 days after beginning the formal investigation. The Vice President for Research or designee may either accept the report or return it to the committee for further information or clarification. The committee shall also forward the final copy of this report to the accused parties, who shall have an opportunity to comment on the findings. The investigation shall be completed within 120 calendar days. For PHS funded research, the Vice President for Research or designee shall notify the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) of the Public Health Service within 24 hours of a reasonable indication of possible criminal violations are found or about an immediate health hazard, need to protect Federal funds or equipment and individuals affected by the investigation and that the alleged incident may be publicly reported. Appropriate interim administrative action shall be taken to protect Federal funds and ensure that the purposes of the Federal financial assistance are being carried out. ORI shall be promptly advised of any developments during the course of the investigation which disclose facts that may affect current or potential DHHS funding for individual(s) under investigation or that the PHS needs to know to ensure appropriate use of Federal funds and otherwise protect the public interest. If the investigation cannot be completed within 120 days, a request for extension shall be made to the ORI with an explanation for the delay, an interim report on progress to date, an outline of what remains and an estimated date of completion.

3.8 If from the findings and recommendations of the committee the Vice President for Research or designee determines that no unethical or fraudulent acts have been committed, all parties shall be notified accordingly. The Vice President for Research or designee and the college dean shall undertake all necessary efforts to restore fully and promptly the reputation and credibility of the researcher(s) under investigation when allegations are not confirmed. All interim restrictions on research activity shall be promptly removed.

3.9 If from the findings and recommendations of the committee, the Vice President for Research or designee determines that there is evidence of misconduct, he or she shall report to the Provost this conclusion and recommendations regarding the imposition of sanctions or disciplinary action. The President shall make the final determination regarding the appropriateness of the recommendations. Sanctions may include (a) termination of current research or scholarly activity, (b) public disassociation of the University from future unauthorized research or scholarly activity, (c) restriction from future research or scholarly activity for some period of time, (d) special prior review and approval requirements in future research or scholarly activities, and (e) debarment from intramurally funded research or scholarly programs. The President may also determine whether the matter warrants a reprimand or disciplinary action pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding or sec. 89535–89539 of the Education Code or should be referred to the cognizant auxiliary organization for appropriate action.

3.10 The President shall determine whether information about the charges, the investigation, or their disposition shall be released to the public, the press, or specific parties (e.g., editors of journals in which papers or reports of the research in question may have appeared). For externally funded research, the sponsoring agency shall be notified

of the findings of the investigation and the final disposition of any sanctions, disciplinary action, or restitution to be made. For PHS funded research, a written report documenting the investigative process, summary of information obtained relevant to the investigation, findings to include the actual text or summary of the views of individual(s) found to have engaged in misconduct, and sanctions taken by the institution shall be made available to the Director of the ORI, who shall decide whether that office shall proceed with its own investigation. The University shall maintain such documentation for at least three years after PHS acceptance of the final report.

TO: Senate Executive Committee and the University Senate  
FROM: Sue Nichols, Chair, Staff Affairs Committee  
DATE: April 25, 2006  
REF: Staff Retirements for July 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005

---

**Action:**

The Staff Affairs Committee and the Senate Executive Committee move that the Senate recognize the following staff upon their retirement, and thank them for their contribution to the mission of San Diego State University.

Massoud Ajami, Equipment Technician III, Physical Plant, 24 years  
Edwena R. Ayers, Confidential Admin. Support, Records, 17 years  
Diana L. Bischof, Admin. Support Coordinator I, Records, 16 years  
Lois J. Boyd, Admin Analyst/Specialist, Academic Affairs, 18 years  
Donna J. Collins, Admin. Support Assistant, Social Work, 12 years  
Lynda J. Conley, Custodian, Physical Plant, 16.5 years  
Wendy L. Esterly, Admin. Support Coordinator II, SLHS, 26 years  
Leon Geis, Analyst/Programmer, Library, 13 years  
Alice E. Janmohamed, Student Services Professional II, Records, 32 years  
Linda M. Jimenez, Admin. Support Coordinator I, Imperial Valley Campus, 25 years  
Trunk K. Lai, Custodian, Physical Plant, 21.5 years  
Freddie D. Minjares, Lead Locksmith, Physical Plant, 34 years  
Carlos Saiz, Custodian, Physical Plant, 32 years  
Charles F. Sneider, Instructional Support Tech II, ITS, 28 years  
Bobbie J. Shaw, Admin. Support Assistant, EOP, 35 years  
Susan K. Taylor, Student Services Professional III, Records, 25 years  
Theresa L. Thomas, Information Technology Consultant, Extended Studies, 20 years  
Jane A. Vidal, Student Services Professional IV, Records, 25 years  
Troy Walker, Custodian, Physical Plant, 32 years

## Committee 2005-2006 Annual Reports

Reports were received from the following committees: Bookstore Advisory; Diversity, Equity, and Outreach; Environment & Safety; Faculty Affairs; General Education; Instructional & Information Technology; Liberal Studies; Library; and Staff Affairs. Additional reports will be included in the Fall, 2006 Agenda.

### Bookstore Advisory (Gretchen Vik, Chair)

The SDSU Bookstore Advisory Committee met twice each semester this year to discuss issues facing the Bookstore. Our faculty and staff members attended regularly and ably represented their areas. This year we also had a student on the committee who could attend some of the meetings. We look forward to another productive year next year.

#### Increasing the Number of Used Books Available to Students

Twice this year, a Used Book Initiative has increased the number of used books available to our students. This helps reduce student spending on required text books. The national average of used books is 25%; we have gotten up to 50%. During the week of December 5 we teamed with Associated Students to have students remind professors to get book orders in early enough to help students at Buy Back time. The campaign will be repeated this spring with mailers to faculty more publicity about goals to meet or exceed.

To lower prices for our students, we continue to try to make faculty aware of

- the importance of ordering course materials early (so that more used books can be obtained on the national market),
- adopting materials for multiple semesters (which lowers prices from publishers), and
- avoiding bundled materials unless they plan to use them (as texts cannot be sold on the used market without the bundle, and reducing the number of re-sale opportunities for students and the possibility of buying used books).

#### Course Materials Subcommittee

The Course Materials Subcommittee will meet again in the fall. It may someday be possible to get student feedback on course materials as part of the evaluation process. We hope to encourage course-wide adoption of course materials both to make changing sections easier for students and to help instructors hired to teach added classes at the beginning of the semester. Another option is a book rental program for a large adoption course, with a department guarantee to use the book for an extended period of time to justify the cost of buying all the initial books.

#### Book Availability to Students

Making books available to students the first day of class remains a very high priority. Not all faculty members make their book orders available to the SDSU Bookstore, which makes it very difficult for some students on scholarships and other reimbursement programs to get their books. We continue to discuss making faculty more aware of the effect of book prices on students and how to get book orders early enough to have required texts made available to students on the first day of class, which helps reduce prices.

Multi-section courses for which part-timers are hired late cause problems because books ordered by other instructors may sell out due to the added enrollment in the new courses using the same books. We encourage departments to order books for sections that will be staffed later. The online ordering system that began in Fall 04 made it easier for people to place orders (but harder for them to remember to do so).

AB2477 aims to reduce text prices to students, and we are monitoring how it could be implemented to help students in a cost-effective way.

#### Costas Lyrantzis Library Book Award

We continued the annual (since 1997) \$1000 award to the library for purchase of books primarily used by undergraduate students (or in the case of Education, by graduate students). We used to request titles from faculty members each semester when sending out the book order packets; with online ordering, we will ask for suggestions in the fall. Mary Beth Link and library acquisitions staff then go over the suggestions, removing duplications and titles already in the library. Books are then ordered after consultation with the committee chair. Professor Lyrantzis was a former chair of the Bookstore Advisory Committee. The library staff also makes suggestions of appropriate books requested by library patrons.

### Diversity, Equity, and Outreach (Anne Donadey, Chair)

The committee met four times during the fall semester 2005 and four times during the spring semester 2006. Activities undertaken by the DEO in 2005-2006 include:

- Working on a referral to modify the Policy File to match the language of EO 883 (section on Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity); changes were approved at the November 08 Senate meeting
- Meeting with Deans in all Colleges to investigate which recommendations from the May 2005 DEO report on African American faculty diversity are being implemented and gathering Deans' recommendations on the subject
- Participating in the WASC visit
- Meeting with American Indian Studies faculty and students to discuss American Indian issues at SDSU
- Meeting with Vice President for Research and Interim Dean of the Graduate Division to discuss graduate student diversity
- Seeking out faculty members in all colleges to urge them to consider serving on the Senate
- Working with the Faculty Affairs committee on its first annual report on the faculty body
- Working on various other small ad-hoc projects as they arose (see minutes for more detailed information)

The DEO wishes to thank Senate Chair Hornbeck for facilitating the work of the committee in general and reinstating assigned time for the DEO committee chair in particular. The committee's ability to do its work effectively is directly dependent on the availability of assigned time for the position of chair. The committee hopes that it can continue to count on the presence of assigned time.

Future planning:

- Discuss the development of a long-range strategy for diversity at SDSU
- Work to have a diversity section on SDSU's website
- Find ways to improve community relations between SDSU and underrepresented groups
- Focus on the retention of African American faculty
- Work on graduate student diversity
- Work on African-American student diversity

#### **Environment and Safety (PJE Quintana, Chair)**

The committee met monthly throughout the year. Representation from students and staff was excellent, though we lacked adequate representation from faculty (recently rectified). Priority topics were: to eliminate sale of tobacco products and to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke, to promote energy efficiency, to encourage recycling and waste reduction, and to promote safety of students, faculty and staff.

The major accomplishments were to

- propose a ban on the sale of tobacco products on campus (approved by the Senate).
- propose an amendment to the SDSU smoking policy to change the rule prohibiting smoking within 20 feet of an entrance, etc., to 25 feet. This amendment would make it possible for current efforts to certify campus buildings under the LEED EB designation (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-Existing Building category by the United States Green Building Council) to move forward (pending Senate meeting May 9).

Ongoing projects are to:

- bring the University into compliance with the state mandated requirement for 50% of paper used by campus entities to be recycled paper with at least 30% post-consumer content.
- increase student, faculty and staff awareness of campus resources to enhance personal safety and to encourage safe behaviors.
- increase use of products with recycled content on campus and to encourage recycling.
- encourage use of low-toxicity products, for example for building maintenance/ cleaning.

#### **Faculty Affairs (Edith Benkov, Chair)**

##### September 2005

Announced at Senate that newly revised edition of the "Faculty Handbook" was now available on-line: [http://www-ohan.sdsu.edu/%7Efacaff/documents/SDSU\\_FACULTY\\_HANDBOOK\\_082005.pdf](http://www-ohan.sdsu.edu/%7Efacaff/documents/SDSU_FACULTY_HANDBOOK_082005.pdf) .

Discussed changes in policy file language concerning external professional activities; presented policy change at Senate Executive – referred back to Committee.

Discussed enlargement of committee by one member.

##### October 2005

Established subcommittee to review currency of academic unit RTP procedures and compliance with University Policies on RTP.

Presented policy change concerning external professional activities to Senate Executive – referred back to Committee.

Proposed policy change concerning participation of FERP faculty in personnel decisions (passed 10/11/05).

First reading of enlargement of Faculty Affairs Committee at Senate.

##### November 2005

Began analysis of final data from '90-'05 for report tenure-track faculty.

Action: Second Reading of enlargement of Faculty Affairs Committee at Senate (passed 11/8/05).

Evaluated concerns on changes in policy file language concerning faculty overload, based on discussion at Senate Executive : changes in policy withdrawn.

Presented preliminary data for tenure-track report to Senate Executive.

##### December 2005

Continued work on report on tenure-track faculty, with additional data as requested by Senate Executive.

Continued discussion on RTP policies.

Information item to Senate: Clarification of term "full-time" in relation to academic unit employees (12/13/05).

##### February 2006

Additional data received for report on tenure-track faculty in response to questions raised in preliminary analysis.

##### March 2006

Completed report tenure-track faculty & presented to Senate Executive.

Completed reviewed of RTP policies and procedures; finalized letter for distribution to academic units.

Developed language re: referral on Professorial Chairs.

##### April 2006

Reviewed draft of Academic Freedom policy; submitted suggestion to Senate Executive.

Reviewed policy (jointly with Graduate Division) on graduate students as lecturers; revised version to be proposed at May Senate Meeting.

Presented change to Policy file on Professorial (Endowed) Chairs to Senate (passed 4/11/06).

Distributed memo with recommendations on RTP procedures to all departments, programs and schools. Available on Senate web).

Report on Tenure-Track faculty presented to Senate (4/11/06).

##### May 2006

Cleared all referrals.

Discussed possible agenda items for academic year 06-07.

Will present revision of policy on matriculation of faculty to Senate (5/9/06).

### **General Education (Bonnie Kime Scott, Nick Reid, Co-Chairs)**

Nick Reid and Bonnie Kime Scott agreed to serve as co-chairs of the General Education Committee, with Nick serving as liaison between the committee and departments and Bonnie presenting items for passage to the Senate. At the start of the year, the Committee shared its concerns over the recent functioning of the GE committee with Senate President Fred Hornbeck. Several experienced members felt that the Committee has been reduced to the role of approving most proposals that come their way, whether on the first or the second pass through the committee. Last year the Committee had offered a requested revision of "Goals for General Education as a Whole," which had been referred back to committee by the Executive Committee. Since the University anticipates a thorough review of General Education in the near future, the Senate consented to have this item removed from the referral chart.

The Committee began working to gain greater control of General Education. A survey of frequency of teaching GE courses revealed that only 6 courses were on the list of ones not taught for 2 years; 12 were not taught for 3 or more—thus there is not a large pattern of GE courses not being taught. The ideas of declaring a moratorium on new approvals, or limiting the number of GE courses to be offered within a discipline were rejected as unfair to some departments. Instead the Committee concentrated on passing only course proposals that stood up to strict scrutiny. We looked for proposals that carefully addressed appropriately-selected GE goals, and offered a thorough description of the course itself. We proposed and the senate passed a resolution that called for a complete course syllabus that addressed learning outcomes.

In Senate meetings, concern was expressed over the necessity for departments with new course proposals to communicate with departments with similar content courses. It was clarified in the Senate that departments do not control areas of general education, e.g. quantitative reasoning.

Dennis Kramer II, Vice President of University Affairs for Associated Students kept us informed about progress on their General Education Survey, which surveyed the three main goals of GE among students.

During the coming year, we will continue to review course proposals to ensure they are meeting the goals and objectives of the GE program. We will continue working with departments to strength and focus their proposals to fulfill the mission of GE to serve the broader SDSU population. We will continue to clarify the criteria for reviewing courses and will develop a mechanism to notify departments of upcoming agenda items.

### **Instructional & Information Technology Committee (Kris Stewart, Chair)**

We must begin with a tale of two committees. Many details are available from the Committee's home page, with monthly agendas of each meeting. <http://www.stewart.cs.sdsu.edu/USenate/>

In the Fall 2005 semester, the Instructional Technology (IT) Committee continued its efforts to consider topics referred to us by the Senate as well as topics consistent with our charge.

Our membership was composed of Senate appointed members and advisors/consultants:

Members: (all members shall have one vote):

- 9 faculty representative
  - 1 from each of 7 colleges, the Library and Imperial Valley Campus
- 1 staff representative
- 1 student representative (appointed by Associated Students)

Advisors/Consultants:

- Director of Instructional Technology Services
- Library IT Director
- Academic Affairs IT Director
- Information Technology Security Officer
- Technology Security Officer Student Affairs
- IT representative Business and Financial Affairs

We continued to discuss formalizing our membership to ensure that the voluntary efforts of experts who participated with the committee as Advisors/Consultants in the past years is acknowledged and credited by the Senate and by their supervisors.

In our October meeting, the committee identified an issue with the SPAM filtering policy on the computer system mail.sdsu.edu. We were informed that with no consultation with users, the administrators of this system chose to filter and not deliver all SPAM with no notification to the sender or receiver that this filtering is occurring. Since some users of this system are required to receive official email, they felt it was necessary to at least receive a notification that this filtering was being done. We submitted an official inquiry to Sally Rouch, V.P. Business and Financial Affairs, and suggested alternative techniques to handle this. At our November meeting, Riny Ledgerwood, Telecommunications and Network Services (TNS), presented their rationale for choosing the Mirapoint software to handle email and the SPAM policy. We had a discussion and reached an understanding. We are happy to report that now all mail passing through mail.sdsu.edu is delivered and those messages that are identified as SPAM have an appropriate tag added to the Subject field.

By December 13, 2005, we formulated the recommendation to present to the Senate that changed the name of the committee to Instructional & Information Technology (IIT) Committee, expanded the membership to include several new members and correspondingly charged the Committee's charge. We were pleased that the Senate voted to adopt this change to their policy, which we present below.

Instructional and Information Technology Committee

1.0 Membership (15): nine faculty, one from each college, the Imperial Valley Campus and the Library; one staff member; one student; Director of Instructional Technology Services or Designee; Academic Affairs Information Technology Coordinator or Designee; Information Technology Security Office Designee appointed by the Associate Vice President of Financial Operations; Member of the Information Technology Managers Committee selected by the Information Technology Managers Committee.

## 2.0 Functions

2.1 The Committee shall advise the administration and the Senate on instructional and information technologies.

2.2 The Committee shall assist the Directors of Instructional Technology Services, the Library, the Academic Affairs Information Technology Coordinator, and other campus Instructional / Information Technology offices, with developing long-range master plans and shall review and make recommendations on the mission and services of ITS, the Library and Academic Affairs on instructional and information technologies.

2.3 The Committee shall consider any matter referred by the Senate or by the administration of the University (and may consider, at its own discretion, other matters relating to instructional and information technologies at the campus and CSU system-wide levels.) The committee shall review and provide feedback on campus information technology initiatives as related to instruction, research and operational needs.

### Rationale:

Since 1993, the beginning of Mosaic web browser, there has been a dramatic expansion of the use of the Internet. This has led to wide-spread use of networked technologies, even to having the San Diego City Bus System display a URL on their buses. With this widespread usage over the past decade, has come increased performance and capability. Also, increased responsibility for each network user.

The University has recognized this responsibility with the creation of the Information Technology Security Office (ITSO), a campus-wide responsibility. Additionally, Academic Affairs has hired an Information Technology Officer.

The University Senate has no standing committee to look into issues of Information Technology and with the growing dependence of the university on computer-assisted/enhanced mechanisms for communication, collaboration, research and instruction. We feel the current committee [Instructional Technology (IT)] is best suited to expand its responsibility to the Senate to examine these issues. Please note that in recent years, the Senate has asked the Instructional Technology committee to look into the appropriate student email policy – [http://senate.sdsu.edu/agendas/committees/it/it\\_email\\_febsec2004.htm](http://senate.sdsu.edu/agendas/committees/it/it_email_febsec2004.htm), the computer security document – <http://security.sdsu.edu/policy/security-policy.html> as well as the Technology infrastructure upgrade.

“

Starting with Spring 2006, the new committee has been meeting to discuss Instructional & Information Technology Issues.

Our committee members are:

Kris Stewart, Sciences, Chair  
Bob Hoffman, Education  
Bongsik Shin, Business Administration  
Tom Impelluso, Engineering  
Jong Won Min, Health & Human Service  
Richard Burkett, Professional Studies & Fine Arts  
Cyndi Chie, Staff  
Ellie Dworak, Library  
Mary Ann Lyman-Hager, Arts & Letters  
James Frazee, Director of Instructional Technology Services  
John Ross, Academic Affairs Information Technology Coordinator  
John Denune/Felecia Vlahos - Information Technology Security Officer (ITSO)  
Kevin Carter, appointed member of campus Information Tech Managers Group  
Vacancy, Imperial Valley Campus  
Vacancy, Student from Associated Students

Our January meeting, had the committee discussing goals. It was brought to our attention that planning was underway to strengthen the Campus Border Firewall for large parts of the computer network. We discussed potential impacts of this measure on faculty and the teaching role.

In February, the IIT committee received a referral from David Ely concerning the recent CSU Senate statement on Misuse of Computer Facilities. We were asked to look into whether SDSU had a policy already that covered these issues. This was placed on the agenda for the next meeting and, in time, we discovered that the University Senate Policy file contained a similar specification in the Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) on p. 60 covering Facilities/Computer Use/ Acceptable Use. This was reported to David Ely in time to be included in the 09May06 meeting agenda.

Felecia Vlahos, a committee member, announced that SANS would be offering a Computer Security Course on the SDSU campus and that IT Managers should consider having appropriate staff attend. August 11 - 16, 2006.

At the March IIT Committee meeting we celebrated the apprehension of the juvenile who pleaded guilty to hacking the SDSU Financial Affairs computer 2 years ago. This apprehension was a collaboration between the SDSU ITSO, the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. The Daily Aztec featured an article on the front page (22 March 2006) and it is suggested that this be brought to the attention of students widely on campus.

Also at the March meeting, Victor Hazlewood from the San Diego Supercomputer Center, on the campus of UCSD, was invited to speak to the IIT committee about the issues of computer security they see and how they respond. Victor has a paper, “Defense in Depth”, that we found useful. Victor also made a copy of his Powerpoint slides (with references) available to share with all interested parties – at <http://security.sdsc.edu/SDSCsec.ppt>

Mary Thomas, a faculty member from Computer Science, presented to the committee her goals for a Data Grid/Research Network on the SDSU campus. Grid Technologies and Computer Network Security would be key issues to be dealt with.

Also in March, Stewart shared the email that the College of Sciences IT Support Staff, Jim Varnell, Sciences Help Desk, distributed to all faculty and staff in the college to begin the inventory of computer systems, network connections and software needs to contribute to the university-wide inventory being gathered by ITSO to assist in redesigning the Border Firewall. Members of the IIT were asked to take this information back to their own colleges and their college IT support staff to provide a possible model to use more widely.

We also received a live demonstration of the upgraded resources in AH1120 Smart Classroom, from James Frazee.

Our April meeting was also packed with activity. We met in the Art North 215 and received an update on progress with Smart Classrooms. The committee had just received a memo from Associate Dean Gordon Lee, College of Engineering. In this memo, Dr. Lee specified his concerns with the manner in which the campus Border Firewall implementation was being handled. Since this was a topic the IIT committee had been discussing at each of its meetings the entire semester, we spent time discussing a possible course. A motion was made to form a small sub-committee that would volunteer to work during the summer month to collaborate with the ITSO as it solicits an inventory of firewall exemption needs from the colleges and begins its implementation of stricter Border Firewall Software Rules. The meeting had to break up before we concluded the discussion and an electronic vote was held by the committee chair seeking opinions from each committee member on their support (or lack of support) for this issue. There was a quorum of positive votes from the committee members.

The information item presented to the University Senate on 09May06 is a slightly expanded version of this committee motion, subsequently fashioned into the standard template for communication with the Senate.

Stewart will present the Information Item to the Senate 09May06. Stewart has also been invited by Vice President Ellene Gibbs to attend the IT Managers meeting on 15 May 06, as this group discusses further details of the plans for the design of the campus Border Firewall.

The IIT committee will have their final meeting of the year on 18 May 06. Wednesday, May 03, 2006

#### **Liberal Studies (Phoebe Roeder, Chair)**

Monitored effects of impact on enrollment and course demand, retention, and graduation.  
Approved a new portfolio assessment that responds to changes in major.  
Made final curriculum recommendations for CSU mandated 135 unit integrated major.  
Worked with faculty in Linguistics and History to link summative assessment to student learning outcomes in the respective areas.

#### **Library Committee (Gordon Lee, Chair)**

The University Senate Library Committee met four times during the academic year to discuss issues associated with the Library as well as to provide information for distribution to our constituencies across the campus. Following are some of the committee's activities:

1. Information on the web-based LibQUAL+ Survey was provided to the committee members. The response to the LibQUAL+ survey was outstanding. The library received 4,736 responses (the most responses received out of the 700 institutions that have used the survey). Preliminary results indicate that our faculty would like more journals and electronic resources, whereas students are concerned about the building and study space. Final evaluation of the survey results will be available at a later time.
2. Recent additions to the library databases include Web of Science back files, Early English Books Online (84,000 items), Humanities and Social Sciences Index Retrospective and the BIOSIS back files. Recent improvements in the library include wireless access throughout the building and external areas, addition of 44 new chairs and ottomans/48 new Index Table chairs, 685 public access computers (an increase of 50).
3. A few of the library's recent donations were shown to the committee members, including:
  - (i) [Recueil d'Observations faites en plusieurs Voyages par Ordre de sa Majesté. Pour Perfectionner l'Astronomie et la Géographie. Avec divers Traitez Astronomiques](#) was published in 1693 and the Aristarchi De Magnitudinibus, et distantis solis, et lunae, liber / cum Pappi Alexandrini explicationibus quibusdam, published in 1572, are the library's most recent additions to the astronomy collection.
  - (ii) Three Allen Ginsberg items donated by Andreas Brown; his own Ginsberg-inscribed copy (no. 1) of *Bixby Canyon Ocean Path Breeze*, published by the Gotham Book Mart in 1972, along with two prepublication mock-ups of the same title, which show the editorial hand of Andreas Brown, owner of the Gotham Book Mart.
  - (iii) Two signed and inscribed Henry Miller monographs: *The Smile at the Foot of the Ladder* (San Francisco: The Greenwood Press, 1955), and *The Waters Reglitterized* (San Jose: John Kidis, 1950) donated by Nancy Reed Gibson, Professor Emeritus.
  - (iv) Paper engineering books (pop-ups) representing donation of 250 of them by Horace Dodd. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland: A Pop-up Adaptation of Lewis Carroll's Original Tale*, by Robert Sabuda, master paper engineer (New York: Little Simon, 2003).
  - (v) A large, original, pen and ink drawing done by Mr. Luscomb and Mr. George Sorenson (both deceased) for publication in the San Diego State College yearbook, *Del Sudoeste*, 1936. It featured the faculty of the college at that time.
4. Several changes in personnel occurred during this year. The former Head of the Reference Services Department, Charles Dintrone served as Acting Head of Special Collections and University Archives until his recent retirement. Cristina Favretto, former Head of Special Collections and University Archives, has taken the position of Curator of Rare Books at the Young Research Library at the University of California, Los Angeles. Melissa Lamont, who is currently the Visual Resources Manager at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, has accepted the position of Digital Collections Librarian at SDSU and will begin on June 1. Searches for an Engineering Librarian, a Cataloging Librarian, a Fine Arts Librarian and the Head of Special Collections and University Archives are continuing.
5. Over 80 guests attended the Friends of the Library dinner on March 24. Art Linkletter was the keynote speaker who announced the donation of part of his archives to the library.

6. Dr. Mallios presented a summary of the 2004 discovery of WPA murals, from the 1930's, in the basement of Hardy Tower (originally the library) to the committee.
7. Vice-President Thomas Scott met with the committee to discuss continued collaboration between the Research Administration and the Library towards enhancing the academic environment at SDSU.
8. The committee suggested that we include undergraduate and graduate student representation at the meetings. Dr. Lee was given the action item to see how this can be accomplished in compliance with University Senate policies.

#### **Staff Affairs (Sue Nichols, Chair)**

The Staff Affairs Committee had a very productive year with thanks to the committee members, the staff senators, and staff representatives to 05-06 Senate and Senate Appointed committees. We had a large and dedicated group that was successful in advancing the shared governance process at San Diego State University.

1. The Staff Affairs Committee met every month including the summer months. At the beginning of the summer, we set the Goals for the Staff Affairs Committee for 05-06. We are pleased to say we met all our goals.
2. We worked with Senate and Senate Officers on staff issues. The SAC Chair was a member of Senate Exec. SAC worked on filling staff vacancies on committees throughout the year. (Goal #1)

The Staff Affairs Committee is proud to have participated in the selection process for the first ever staff members to serve on administrative review panels. The committee facilitated the nomination process, and then held elections per the *SDSU Policy File*, for staff representation on the review panels of the Provost, and the Dean of the College of Extended Studies.

3. Goal #2 was to establish annual meetings with SDSU's President and with SDSU's Provost to further Staff affairs. SAC met with President Weber on October 18, 2005, and Provost Marlin on March 21, 2006. These meetings started dialogues on a variety of projects that SAC is now pursuing.
4. SAC wanted to continue open dialogue with division leaders on issues of relevance to Staff (Goal #3). On July 12, 2005, we met with Sue Blair, Associate VP for the Center for Human Resources and her staff. This information meeting also resulted in several ideas that are being considered, including SAC representation in the planning of the Staff Awards Day.

On January 17, 2006, SAC met with Vice President for University Advancement, Tere Mendoza. Ms. Mendoza gave us an update on the University's Comprehensive Campaign.

5. In the spirit of shared governance, we continued to advocate for Staff as full members of the University, working towards recognition of Staff value on campus (Goal #4). One way is the first ever recognition by the Senate of staff who retired from SDSU. In addition, ways to update the Staff Awards Day, including awards that recognize Staff contributions have been initiated.
6. Working to increase visibility of the Staff Affairs Committee among the Staff, SAC utilized the *SDSU Universe* to advertise for staff committee opening, and staff members became part of the Campaign Communication committee. SAC's membership increased this year to include representation not previously on SAC: Mathematics and Statistics, Graduate and Research Affairs, the Diving Safety Officer, the College of Science, Career Services, and Physical Plant. We also were joined by a non-Senator faculty member, Dr. Joseph Lewis, from Computer Sciences. (Goal #5)
7. The Staff Affairs Committee advocated for direct Staff representation on the President's Budget Advisory Committee (Goal #6). SAC wrote a letter to President Weber concerning this request. While his reply was not what we had hoped for, we are proud to have taken this initiative, and continue dialogue with the President on how staff can participate in the budgeting process.
8. Beyond our goals for the year, SAC continues to struggle with the way staff data is reported in campus reports. The idea of a Campus Census day was initiated, and will be worked on this next year.
9. Aside from the SAC goals, Staff participated in their assigned committee work, giving valuable input in the goals and mission of SDSU. Also Staff proudly played a part in the WASC process, and was mentioned numerous times in the current *Shared Vision* report.

This report was revised and adopted by the Staff Affairs Committee on April 18, 2006.