

2018/2019 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
November 5, 2018**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CHHS Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Chin
Absent: Sen

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Day
Absent: Faas, Papazian, Ficke,
Wong(Lau)

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Bullen
Absent: Khavul

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Stacks, Olin, Ehrman, Elliott
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo, Gill
Pang, Rodriguez
Absent: Kethepalli

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Ramasubramanian, Kumar, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, Mok, Ormsbee
Absent: McKee

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Absent: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart
Absent: Trulio

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Trousdale
Absent: Hurtado, Higgins, Monday

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– The Senate minutes of October 1, 2018 and October 15, 2018 were approved as amended.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Frazier announced that last Friday (November 2, 2018) that he and several Senators attended a briefing at South Campus on concussion protocols by the Athletics Division. Chair Frazier thought the meeting was very educational and felt reassured that we were in good hands with people that know a lot about concussions in the pre-performance and education stages, as well as concussion protocols themselves. Chair Frazier had made a request during the meeting that the Athletics Board report on concussions every year in their annual report to the Senate.

There are ongoing discussions about a new faculty and staff dining facility between

members of the Senate, VP Faas, and others.

The university is holding a Celebration of Life for Amy Strage this Friday, 2 to 4 p.m. in Uchida Hall, Room 124. Please attend if you can.

Chair Frazier expressed his gratitude to committee members that continue to work so diligently on policy matters.

December 11, 2018 is the Senate Holiday Reception at the President's House. All Senators should have received an invitation for that. It is starting at a later time to accommodate spouses that work.

B. From the President of the University – The President was not present.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of October 8, 2018 – No Questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of October 22, 2018 – No Questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of November 5, 2018 was approved.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None.

V. Unfinished Business: None

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

Senator White presented *AS 1713, Policy Recommendation, University Writing: Requirements/Guidelines and Support by the University Writing Committee (First Reading)*.

[Senator Frazier vacated the Senate Chair's position for this presentation in order to sit down and address questions regarding the policy proposal. Senator Ravisha Mathur, the Vice Chair, assumed the Chair's position for this segment.]

Questions:

Q: About graduate writing, there doesn't seem to be much consistency across departments in terms of how graduate writing requirements are met. Maybe the committee can look into that? My second question is about line 89 where it says, "Demonstration of competence in written communication shall be a requirement for graduation with any bachelor's degree." This is vague and you need to be more specific. I teach 100W and one of the things I see is students from a variety of departments taking my 100W class, and when I ask them why they aren't in the 100W in their department they say that their adviser said to take any 100W. I think we need to change the "demonstrates competence in written communication" to say something

like, “demonstrates competence in writing in one’s major or discipline.” Is that something the committee would consider? My third question is that the writing skills test is a one shot, timed essay exam and is used as a basis for a waiver, but what the 100W courses teach is not tested on the writing skills test. My last question is that the last bullet (3b) states that there will be 2 students and one will have experience with ESL learning, but I’m not sure what that means? Maybe that could say, one student will be a multilingual writer?

A: These are great points and we will consider all of these.

Q: Would the committee consider adding to the charge some involvement with or link to assessment?

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Am I correct that the reporting line has changed and that the WRC will no longer report to BOGS, but will report to C&R? There are times when the WRC needs to coordinate with BOGS.

A: That is correct. The WRC is currently an administrative committee under BOGS, in the new role the WRC will be an operating committee reporting directly to a policy committee and that committee will be C&R.

Q: My question has to do with the appointment of members and the recruitment. In 3.b.ii. it states that, “attention should focus on the person’s experience and engagement in activities related to student writing.” This is very vague so would the committee consider rewording this? My fear is that course coordinators that don’t teach writing are going to want to be on the committee and so many of our course coordinators don’t teach the courses they coordinate. The people that do teach them are the lecturers. It makes more sense for the people that teach the courses to be on the committee.

A: The committee will take that under advisement.

Q: There is a ton of research to back up that writing in the discipline is far more valuable than just advanced writing. This is a great place to encourage that. The other thing I wanted to comment on is in 2.b.v. where it states, “Satisfactory completion of an upper-division writing course at another university judged by the Graduate Studies Office to be equivalent in content and writing requirements to SJSU’s 100W.” I can say from experience that determining this equivalency is a very difficult challenge. Unless the CSU declares what is equivalent, I urge the committee to consider refraining from using that. It poses a lot of difficulty and can cause delays in graduation.

Q: In 2.b.iii. I believe “a graduate course of at least three units in which a major report is required,” would be any thesis or project required for most graduate programs. Although this strikes me that unless the program does something very special this is going to be very backend-loaded, because you are going to have the GWAR when you pass the thesis as opposed to any time before that. This doesn’t strike me as good.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Does a student have to complete the GVAR before they take on a thesis proposal?

A: You have to have completed the GVAR before you apply for candidacy, so it depends on your department. You don't have to apply for candidacy until one semester before graduation, so you could backload everything into that semester depending on how the department has it structured.

Q: In number 2.b.iii it refers to 30 percent of the course grade. I wonder if the committee would consider adding a word count to the 30 percent?

A: The committee will definitely consider it.

C: Senator Frazier commented that the only substantive change made in this resolution to the WRC is a name change and change in the charge. This first resolution was basically focused on moving the committee from an administrative committee reporting to BOGS to an Operating Committee of the Senate.

Senator White presented *AS 1714, Policy Recommendation, University Grading System Policy (First Reading)*.

This policy resolution comes to you as a result of a referral to put us into alignment with Executive Order (EO) 1100 regarding our GE courses. After digging through our policies we saw that there were amendments to amendments to amendments. We found six different policies and this resolution is a result of combining these policies into one policy. The first section of the resolution establishes a grading system and nothing has really changed, but language in b and c bring us into alignment with EO 1100. Part 2 are the exceptions. The exceptions have been updated from our current policy. Sections 3 and 4 are basically old language that has not been updated.

Questions:

Q: If credit by examination is an exception, it might be worth calling it that in here. I thought you had up to six units if approved by the major that actually count. This just says 12 units credit/no credit outside the major. I thought that it was permissible inside the major with approval or something.

A: If that language exists, it is not in the policies we found. If you can find that language in a policy we missed, we would greatly appreciate it.

Q: I went back and looked through the old policies. University Policy F88-6 is that strange policy that talks about no more than 60 units and I noticed that part didn't get ported into the new policy. Have you ascertained why that policy permitted 60 units to be credit/no credit, and are satisfied that dispensing with that is appropriate?

A: In F88-6 there were two sections. The first section we kept, but the second section has this old language that said that up to 60 units could be credit/no credit and applied to the degree. C&R could not find anything anywhere that addressed this.

Q: Could this have applied to transfer programs?

A: It could be and at first we thought that might be a reason to put it in, but then we

put in section 5 and it says if there is something strange like that taking place then the Provost can make a decision to approve it.

Q: On line 45 onwards from the old policy, would the committee consider adding Written Communication 100W which has a minimum of a C to pass?

A: Yes.

Q: On the matter of the 60 units credit/no credit question, didn't C&R consider that that existed during a time when we allowed 150 unit majors?

A: Yes. We also discussed that historically UC Santa Cruz did not offer graded classes.

Q: Would the committee please check carefully when rescinding all six policies to ensure that something isn't missed and an amendment isn't needed right away? Second, am I correct that starting on line 54, exceptions to number 1 would be for courses that apply credit/no credit, and was that designed to allow for the fact that in some programs individual studies is credit/no credit?

A: Our thought process was to keep the language very simple to allow the departments to go either way, but yes you are correct. Department A may offer a workshop for credit/no credit, and Department B may offer a workshop with a letter grade.

Q: On line 68 it states that "a graduate student may accumulate a maximum of 30% of the total units to graduate as Credit/No Credit. The 30% is nine units, so does this amount to one class being credit/no credit?"

A: A typical master's degree is 30 units, so 30% is nine units, and if they did their master's for six units of credit/no credit they could still have one additional class.

Q: I have a question on line 79, who can initiate that exception to the policy?

A: The committee will consider that.

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): None

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented *AS 1715, Senate Management Resolution, Creating a Task Force for a Supportive Workplace and Calling Upon our Community to Preserve Civility and Combat Bullying at San José State University (First Reading)*.

The state legislature and the ASCSU have urged that we tackle the problem of bullying. Universities like UC Berkeley, the University of Wisconsin, and SFSU have already crafted policies on bullying. We also discovered that several members of the PS Committee had been victims of bullying. Complicating the problem of bullying is the issue of overlapping jurisdiction. A lot of inappropriate behavior falls into categories covered by Title IX or the CBA. Unfortunately, there are forms of behavior that is unacceptable that fall through the cracks. Another complication is the issue of Academic Freedom. Both the AAUP and others recommend a very careful approach so as not to confuse legitimate disagreements over ideas and policies with

bullying behavior. Clearly the definition must be precise. Another complication is that not all bullies and bullying behavior is alike. Many can be helped through education and a great deal of bullying behavior can be prevented if the workplace environment is appropriately cultivated with positive role models and collegial advice. However, other bullies are more deeply ensconced in their behavior and will require zero tolerance of certain behaviors. PS has learned a lot over this year, but we recognize that dealing with a problem of the complexity will require expertise and persistence. No Senate committee is equipped to take on this matter. PS recommends a task force. There are individuals on this campus that have expertise and should be recruited to serve on the task force. The task force should take a year to study the situation at SJSU and recommend measures. This was the approach taken by SFSU. PS requests your feedback. We want this resolution to open up a campus dialogue on this issue. PS is very flexible about the nature and membership of the task force. PS also highly desires feedback from the President and is willing to design the task force however the President would like it.

Questions:

Q: My research background is in bullying prevention in schools. Would the committee consider changing the definition of bullying to include a pattern of repeated offensive behavior with a power differential?

A: PS didn't define bullying. We looked at what other universities were using and this is exactly what the UC Berkeley has used as a starting point. However, PS will consider it.

Q: On line 199, I think that for faculty I would have a problem endorsing a program, such as the EAP, without actually knowing they would keep matters confidential. This sounds like there would be an online portal and I would suggest a more in person method for faculty.

A: This is the Employee Assistance Program for SJSU. It is off campus for a reason so matters can be dealt with in a confidential matter. However, PS will check with the EAP to be certain.

Q: I would just like for there to be an avenue that wasn't online for faculty.

A: PS will look into this.

Q: On line 50, under the examples, would the committee consider adding a category about RTP so that senior faculty that serve on RTP committees understand that they cannot threaten and make demands of junior faculty that might come before them? This is a very indirect and power abusive behavior.

A: PS will consider this. This is the kind of thing PS hopes the task force might come up with.

Q: There is a typo where there are two 9's and no 10 in the resolution. On the final line of the definition could the committee consider revisiting that language. Often times if someone has done this once and gotten away with it they think, well I've done this before and it wasn't a problem so why is it now. The first time something happens is a great time to educate before a precedent is set. I also find it very concerning and perplexing that a single physical act would not constitute bullying.

Would the committee consider revisiting this language?

A: Again, PS took this from the Berkeley definition, but PS will look at it.

Q: I'm thinking about civility, for instance if several people in a group of ten all agree but then a minority in the group can be targeted, and not feel they can express their ideas.

A: That goes right to the heart of the Academic Freedom issue. It is a critical matter and allowing a minority to express an unpopular view without being bullied is something a university should do, but at the same time we have to make sure we don't go so far in the other direction that we enable bullying. It is a hard line to draw.

Q: I have a question about the composition of the task force. I know you said the membership details would be worked out, but can you give us an idea what you are thinking about in terms of the number of administrators, faculty, staff, and students?

A: We were following the SFSU model. It isn't a majority faculty task force. I think there were three administrators, three deans, three faculty members, two staff, and two students. However, PS is open to suggestions. The SFSU task force were all selected and had a certain level of expertise. The task force can only be effective if it reflects all the constituents of the university and has the full backing of the administration.

Q: Do we have any data on previous bullying at SJSU? This could really help a future task force.

A: The committee considered doing a survey, but to do that you need people with a certain level of expertise. There have been campus climate surveys, but it is hard to say if it has specific data on bullying. There are several people on campus that have done research on bullying at several levels. There is a lot of research at other universities about this issue. We think there is enough information to establish a task force.

Q: I think this is really important and long overdue. I was wondering if "gaslighting" is something being considered, because that is a form of bullying and should be included in the examples? I'm also wondering if you considered linking any of this with the whistleblower policy? Also, have you looked into research on restorative justice and bullying and how and where bullying prevention has worked well?

A: If you can send the link to the information on restorative justice, we will look into it.

Q: I commend you for underspecifying membership provided that the task force will then produce recommendations that will be filtered, but if the task force is going to implement workshops and policies prior to a final report then we need to think more carefully on what the membership is.

A: Thank you.

Q: If there is a question about including a definition or not, then I'd like to encourage including one. Also, even though a pattern of bullying is not included in the

definition of bullying, it is really important to address. It would be helpful to provide a resource, or somehow state that an individual experience is also important and we are not dismissing that. The Behavioral Crisis Intervention Team is also another resource we should include. Would the committee please consider this?

A: The committee will consider it.

Senator Peter presented *AS 1716, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of S96-2, Direct Instruction Obligations (First Reading)*.

The PS Committee was asked to review S96-2 by the O&G Committee. The PS Committee has only changed two things. The language in a whereas clause that referred to 18 class hours has been supplanted by a more recent CBA, and then the title Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has been changed. The PS Committee did insert one phrase that it is the normal obligation of the faculty member to meet with his/her class at the appointed time, place, and manner. The next section talks about the penalties if you don't show up for your classes.

Questions:

Q: Does manner refer to modality in terms of the way the class is taught online or face-to-face?

A: Would modality be a better word?

Q: I think it is what we use on campus.

A: Modality may be a better word.

Q: Would makes the determination of the appropriateness of the material in line 68?

A: That is the old language we didn't change, but I think it refers to a faculty member covering all kinds of things that don't pertain to the class.

Q: Years ago there was a faculty strike on campus, and the President issued an order that if you didn't teach you were fired with no questions asked. I was appointed to chair a committee that represented faculty and in all instances we were able to clear the faculty members except one where we asked the faculty member what he/she did during the strike and he said he did nothing while on strike and we had to fire him. My question is using the language you have here if I am on strike and I say that I'm on strike will that prevent me from being fired?

A: I will have to consult our CFA people. I think that strike was before the CBA and the CBA protects faculty on strike now.

Q: If a faculty member has a previously approved travel request and the time comes for the travel to take place, can the chair deny it?

A: Yes, substitute arrangements are subject to approval of the chair. You have to arrange to replace yourself or to give your students a substitute assignment, but the chair has the right to determine if that is sufficient or not.

Q: What if the faculty member thinks the arrangements are sufficient, but the chair doesn't, isn't that a matter of personal choice? Would the committee consider looking at this in comparison to the Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility policy to ensure they are in alignment, especially in regards to professional choice?

A: You don't have the Academic Freedom not to teach your class.

Q: But, you made a statement that the chair could override based on his/her determination as to whether the arrangements are suitable.

A: Someone needs to make that determination, but PS would be happy to look at alternatives to the chair. Usually the way it works is if you aren't happy with the determination by the Chair, then you take it to the Dean. We could add an addendum here that it is subject to review of the Dean.

C: Historically, the first step of any review is the department chair, then the dean.

Q: I'm assuming this language has been compared to the CBA to make sure if there are comments that specify the CBA that we are in alignment with the CBA. If this is specified within the CBA, then is it necessary to have it specified in our policy here?

A: Most of the edits were done by the campus expert on the CBA, Senior Associate Vice President for Personnel Joanne Wright. The next question is what if it isn't in the CBA? The CBA is actually quite vague about this. We asked the administration if we should rescind the whole policy and let the CBA take care of it and the answer is no. The policy is still used.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1717, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of Bylaw 15a (First Reading)*.

This resolution comes to you as a result of a referral asking O&G to consider expanding the categories of changes that are permissible under bylaw 15. Presently there are three sections in bylaw 15. Section "a" allows changes to the title of a university official or unit. Section "b" allows changes to a law, Executive Order, etc. Section "c" pertains to policy recommendations and senate management resolutions that need correction that don't change the function or intent of the resolution, but correct an error. In all cases, the change needs to be reported in the Executive Committee minutes. We have recently encountered changes with the addition of courses numbered above 200 for doctoral programs, but our documents stop at the 200 level for course numbering. This resolution would allow the Senate Chair to make a change to any document where the course number needed to be modified without having to bring it back to the Senate.

Questions:

Q: Does "as recorded in the Executive Committee minutes" mean "policy F69-2 got changed," or would it say, "policy F69-2 got changed and the changes are attached"?

A: The changes would be specified.

Q: Can you please be clearer about that.

A: Yes.

E. University Library Board (ULB):

VII. Special Committee Reports:

VIII. New Business:

Senator Rodan presented a Sense of the Senate Resolution from the floor of the Senate , *Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting the Adoption of the Tenets of Shared Governance by the Academic Senate of the California State University (First Reading)*.

Senator Rodan commented, “In his email to you Sunday, Senator James Lee wrote you that shared governance is the real issue and faculty do not need to agree with the tenets for cordiality to reign and he is indeed quite right, but this is about trust.

I think everyone agrees that the way that Executive Orders 1100 and 1110 were issued was quite a blunder. Last fall the Chancellor’s Office agreed to what amounted to peace talks. The ASCSU was delegated the task of developing, with the Chancellor’s Office, a joint understanding of how shared governance at the system level should work in practice to the ASCSU Executive Committee. The result is the tenets document we are discussing here today.

The Chancellor was in agreement with the document. However, when it was brought to the floor of the Senate, the incoming ASCSU Chair, who was herself on the Executive Committee, unexpectedly admitted that she had reservations. This blindsided the Chancellor and the Senate Chair, and allowed a small but vocal minority to derail the Senate’s document. This called into question for the Chancellor, whether the ASCSU could be trusted. In the absence of trust, disagreements have to be metaphorically mitigated and that raises the cost and reduces the productiveness of collaboration.

The tenets document on its own is no guarantee of successful shared governance and it is by no means perfect. However, it is a reasonable first step and perhaps more importantly, it demonstrates a joint commitment to a collaborative process.

This fall the Chancellor’s Office shared the drafts of three Executive Order revisions (EO 1080, 1081, and 1082) with the ASCSU. We have shared those with you. This suggests change in the way the Chancellor’s Office is working with the ASCSU. A rejection of the tenets document, on the other hand, signals a repudiation of the process by which it was and indicates a preference for adversarial bargaining over collaboration. If the Chancellor’s Office concludes that intensive dialogue and consultation with the ASCSU is unproductive, any consultation is likely to be perfunctory in effect. That I’m sure you would agree is less than ideal.

In conclusion, I hope to convince you of two things. First, that this is an issue not of cordiality, but of trust. Second, that trust is essential for faculty to be able to work productively with the Chancellor’s Office to focus on what we can do together for our mission and our students.”

Questions:

Q: In essence the ASCSU has found itself in quite a pickle. The purpose of this Sense of the Senate Resolution, if I understand it, is to help the Executive Committee at the CSU get itself out of a bind that it put itself into, by having the Executive Committee work to build an agreement and then have the body as a whole pull back from them, so what is the role of the

individual campus in this process?

A: What prompted me to bring this to the Senate floor was a number of resolutions from other campuses where there is a much more adversarial relationship between faculty and their administration, which has carried over to their approach to the ASCSU. These resolutions potentially provide fodder for those who would like to undermine the adoption of the tenets. This could be problematic because it signals to the Chancellor's Office that faculty are not interested in a collaborative dialogue and they want to preserve a more conflictual approach to negotiating with the Chancellor's Office. The purpose of bringing this resolution is to give some counterweight and say some campuses actually support the document.

Q: The Executive Committee of the ASCSU put the ASCSU in a pickle because the Academic Senate did not ask the Executive Committee to draft a tenets document that would then be adopted by the ASCSU. Instead the Executive Committee drafted a document that was not asked for and then took it to the floor of the ASCSU and asked the Senate to vote it up or down, because they wanted to have that document in place to cover a problem they had had with the Executive Orders. The problem was that a few of them had conferred with the Chancellor's Office prior to the issuance of that Executive Order and then they were accused of being turncoats of the ASCSU because they gave a thumbs up when the ASCSU had not. Have you considered in drafting this document that there is a clause in the tenets that states that "time constraints that do not allow for normal systems to work effectively are occasions when the Chancellor's Office can act unilaterally" and this was exactly what occurred when those Executive Orders were approved. There is an old saying in Academic Affairs that there are no emergencies in higher education and yet the Chancellor's Office artificially created an emergency. Are you aware that Complete College America, which the Chancellor's Office has been working with to change the curriculum within the CSU, has a document that is entitled, "Time is the Enemy"? In that document they assert that faculty cannot be contributors because they take too long, and it was the Chancellor's Office that argued that these changes were good for our students. Therefore, we couldn't wait because we would put disadvantaged and underrepresented minorities in a pickle, because we weren't changing fast enough to graduate them faster. This was an artificial emergency created by the Chancellor's Office, and are you aware that this tenets document would not have prevented the Executive Orders from going through had it been in place and a working document of the CSU at the time?

A: I was not aware of the collaboration between the entity you mentioned and the Chancellor's Office. However, the tenets have specific time provisions written to avoid what happened with Executive Orders 1100 and 1110.

Q: My understanding is that the ASCSU asked members of the Executive Committee of the ASCSU to meet with CSU leadership to address the current state of faculty and administration relations and asked all of them to develop a mutually agreed upon definition of joint decision making and to recommend a process by which decisions are made, is this correct?

A: I was not a party to those initial discussions (Senator Rodan). Yes. (Senator Van Selst)

Q: Isn't the document that we are reviewing and endorsing the Executive Committee's final presentation of their efforts to actually do what the ASCSU asked them to do?

A: Yes. That is my understanding.

Q: I noted that almost all the presentation focused on the process and issues of trust, and I'm not comfortable in a body that is far away from Long Beach deciding those kind of issues. What I think we should be doing is reading the tenets and deciding if we agree with them or not. What specifically in the tenets did the outgoing chair back away from? What were her objections to in the content of the tenets that created this controversy?

A: My recollection is that it was in the way the move to second reading fell. The incoming chair, who expressed reservations at that point, said little specifically. My sense from the ensuing discussion was that there was opposition, because faculty did not feel they were given sufficient time to weigh in. Also, many faculty felt that the relationship with the Chancellor's Office was somewhat defined by HEERA so any additional language expected by aspects of the process would almost by definition cause a curtailing of their freedom of action. My reading of HEERA is that it doesn't speak to the process by which faculty interact at the system-level with the Chancellor's Office.

Q: Could you please clarify how the adoption of these tenets is different from every other document from the ASCSU that talks about shared governance with the CSU? For instance, AS 2960 that was done in 2010 is called "Objection to Unilateral Decision-Making in Pursuit of a Culture of Compliance in the CSU" that specifically references a document that is called "Collegiality in the CSU System" that talks about maintaining shared governance principles and standards, so how is this resolution different from all the previous iterations of the CSU and will that actually improve unilateral decision-making coming from the Chancellor's Office.

A: No, I can't answer that question. I've only been with the ASCSU for one year. What I can say is that the effort taken last year by the Executive Committee and Chancellor's Office to develop these tenets seems to be a good indication on both sides of willingness to work collaboratively. It is also my sense in my interactions with the Chancellor's Office, this semester in particular, that there seems to be a greater willingness to share draft Executive Orders with the ASCSU and to solicit feedback. This is a tangible change in pattern.

C: I think the thing that is different about the tenets is that they were actually written in collaboration with senior administrators in the CSU system. Previously it has been, this is what we as a Senate believe and then it gets passed up to the Chancellor. This year the Executive Committee and senior administrators talked about what it looks like, where the authority lays, what are the bounds, what implementation looks like, etc. That level of involvement is what is different. We have a representative of the CSU system office that is a Senator, but they are not as engaged as they are in this body and among others.

Q: Senator Buzanski commented, "My question is simply, are you not overlooking the fact that you are now dealing with a different Chancellor from the previous Chancellor that didn't give a damn about what the faculty believed and simply handed down orders, whereas the current Chancellor is very different and is now engaged in these mutual discussions." [Note: Senator Peter requested a point of personal privilege and asked that in light of Senator Buzanski's long service on the Senate his comments be recorded verbatim.]

A: That is not something I considered, particularly because EO 1100 and EO 1110 were issued by Chancellor White.

C: Senator Buzanski, “Yes, I’m aware of that.”

A: That wasn’t part of my thinking.

Q: The ASCSU has already given the Executive Committee laurels for drafting this document. It basically rubber stamped that the process was good and sound, so it is not that it isn’t appreciated. They have done enough. Pushing it forward is an attempt by some of the people involved to basically amend what HEERA says. Also, I’d like to point out a few of the things in the document that are problematic. The definition of shared governance as “partially a respect for evidence-based deliberation and then a recognition of established best practices and promising new data-driven practices in the evaluation of subjects under consideration.” That has Complete College America written all over it all over again, because that has been the push from that group to change how we do things. As an applied researcher what I have seen is that these are not best practices and they are not establishing that the things you are saying work actually work. They are argument. They are all data packages put forth by Complete College America and were not authenticated through research. One of the problems with this particular tenet is that it embeds the notion that if the Chancellor’s Office has data that says we ought to do it then that’s the way we should do it. We agree to it in essence instead of asking for peer reviewed literature from the field to make decisions when it comes to curriculum. This is a deeper layer that is not obvious at first objection to the document. I will reiterate the question, did you know that the Senate already said what you did was fine and that this continual assertion that the tenets need to be ratified by the ASCSU is kind of an unnecessary step and one that wasn’t asked for by the body?

A: The answer is that not only do I know that we ratified it in May, I drafted the initial language for that resolution. This is the reason for my shock at the way the tenets debate unfolded, so I thought it was important in May to bring forth something to the floor of the Senate that did not signal a complete rejection of a year’s worth of work by both the Executive Committee and the Chancellor’s Office. It has been brought back to the ASCSU, but I was not a party to the decision to bring this back to the floor. Nevertheless, it is here and is up for debate which is why I think it is important that we engage so that it doesn’t go down the same way.

Q: This is a challenging issue. I echo some of the concerns after seeing the K-12 system being potentially hijacked by efforts to try and privatize it. Also, seeing the same foundation, Complete College America, involved. It is not the hypothetical. They are promoting the Complete College America plan which is to reduce time to graduation, which on paper sounds good. However, in the K-12 system is called “Digital Diploma Mills” and it is reducing the quality. What they are recommending is not evidence-based, but they are calling it data-driven. Are you aware of these patterns and what is the opportunity for us right now? Is it going to the ASCSU?

A: It is a first reading for our Senate. Something else will be going to the ASCSU.

Q: If you look at the CSU website, they have completely bought into the hype and artificial intelligence and the way they are going to be using our students’ data is just another aspect of the mandates that appear to be placed without any faculty consultation involved. There are issues of ethics involved in terms of who is going to be engaged in some of the initiatives.

A: In response to am I aware of the ethics involved, absolutely. I’ve had discussions with Senator Lee on this. We have to be very careful about letting outside organizations in. That

being said, we need to take a step back and ask the question what happens if the Chancellor's Office decides it is not worth engaging with the ASCSU? This is a real possibility. At that point the likelihood of outside organizations being allowed to step in actually increases, so our best house for influencing policy is to remain engaged with the Chancellor's Office. If we reject it, then outside bodies will step in.

Q: Have you considered before bringing this back for a final reading, to offer a compromise resolution that endorses the efforts to collaborate and endorses the tenets broadly without committing the SJSU Academic Senate to endorsing every line of those tenets?

A: That is certainly an interesting suggestion. I would be happy to have you draft language.

IX. State of the University Announcements:

A. Chief Diversity Officer: Not present.

B. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation):

SJSU is very lucky to have three formidable CSU Statewide Senators. What you have just heard from those three covers the spectrum and I believe you have received a balanced representation. This is not the kind of representation that every campus received. Some campuses only have two Senators and they may be like-minded.

There has been only one ASCSU meeting since October when Trustee Sabalius last reported to the SJSU Academic Senate and there have been no Board of Trustees (BOT) meetings. Even without the standard meetings, it was a very busy month. Trustee Sabalius delivered a report to the campus Senate Chairs in Long Beach as well as to the Emeritus Retired Faculty and Staff Association (ERFSA). Also, he met with the staff in the Chancellor's Office in his role as the Vice Chair of the Campus Planning, Building and Grounds Committee. The following week was the annual Trustee Retreat and was it held in San Diego the day before the Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium. In total, Trustee Sabalius was in San Diego for the entire week, and he used the opportunity to visit San Diego State University.

Two interesting developments may happen at SDSU. If tomorrow's ballot initiative passes that supports the sale of the former Charger Stadium and the land around it, then this will be a historic acquisition for the CSU. This would increase the SDSU Master Plan by almost 50% and will initiate a massive expansion of the campus that costs several billion, which should be funded by bond obligations and public/private partnerships. This would probably be the biggest acquisition in recent CSU history aside from creating a whole new campus. The other significant plan is to establish legislation that would allow SDSU to offer independent Ph.D. degrees. So far Ph.D. degrees have been the purview of the UC, but Trustee Sabalius is hopeful we will get legislative support. If San Diego succeeds in their request, then SJSU might soon follow.

After SDSU, Trustee Sabalius went to visit Sonoma State University. Trustee Sabalius also met with former SJSU Dean, Lisa Vollendorf. Trustee Sabalius and his stepdaughter will both be voting for the first time tomorrow. The Senate gave Trustee Sabalius an ovation.

Trustee Sabalius will then fly back to Long Beach for a three-day ASCSU meeting. The following week is the November Board of Trustees' Meeting. After that Trustee Sabalius will visit Cal Poly Pomona. During the upcoming BOT meeting the BOT will decide on the budget request for this coming year. Trustee Sabalius has already scheduled meetings with our legislators. In Trustee Sabalius' last report to the SJSU Senate, he told the Senate that at the last BOT meeting he suggested the CSU should ask for \$1 billion in one-time funds instead of the \$150 million proposed by the Chancellor's Office. Last month Trustee Sabalius also met with the Executive Vice Chancellor for Finance and his staff in Long Beach. They all agree with Trustee Sabalius on the need, but they do not want to ask for such a high amount. However, the Chancellor's Office has agreed to ask for \$250 million.

Questions:

Q: In listening to the last BOT meeting, two terms stood out that I'd like clarification on. One was a repeated call for demonstrated efficiency before we go back to the legislature next year. How do we demonstrate efficiency? The second term is regionalization. What does that mean in practical terms?

A: The Chancellor's Office and the Trustees realize that before we ask for a lot of money, the legislators insist on knowing if we have looked internally at where we can save money or be more efficient. Our office of finance has engaged with the UC to create common purchases to get better prices and that is one example. Another example is establishing sustainable campuses and practices. There is a long list of things where we have saved a lot of money. Regionalization has to do with our new admission policy of giving preference to students in the local area I believe. The legislature compelled the BOT to create two admission standards and one is regionalization and the other is redirection.

Q: How would you size up efforts on the campuses to meet the graduation initiative?

A: Often the administration throws something at faculty that they find unfair and that process is not immediately followed, but when they are compelled to do then you they do a great job. This speaks to the dedication and excellence of the faculty.

Q: Just had a question about the doctorate at SDSU. Can you explain, because we already offer doctorates here.

A: There is a difference between the Ed.D's and the Ph.D.s. Currently we offer joint Ph.D. degrees, but we are moving away from that. However, we are still bound by the law. To fully develop new Ph.D. programs we need legislative change.

Q: I'm a little concerned about independent Ph.D.'s and modifying the act that setup the master plan because of the precedent it sets in the other direction. Every time we mess with Ph.D.'s the community colleges start saying okay then we are going to start offering bachelor's degrees. Not having this clean line of demarcation between the different systems and their mission aren't we really endangering our basic mission of undergraduate education by feeding it possibly to the community colleges?

A: Your point is well taken. I did bring that up with the President of San Diego State

and since that time I've talked to a lot of Academic Senators. I think that we cannot have it both ways if we want to march into the former territory of the UC. There are some good reasons to move into that territory, but at the same time we can't tell the community colleges they shouldn't. We either have to decide if we want to adhere to the old master plan, or that changes are in order and appropriate.

Q: Trustee Sabalius you were talking about increasing efficiency, so are you aware that today SJSU has eight deans and 12 AVPs. The males in the AVPs all make well over \$200,000 a year, but only one female earns in the over \$200,000 range. The rest of the women AVPs earn about \$170,000. The new President is also still looking for additional AVPs. Do you find that to be a matter of waste?

A: The BOT in closed session sets the salaries for 30 people in the CSU including the campus presidents, the Chancellor, and six Vice Chancellors. That is the only control the BOT has over salaries. At the BOT retreat we talked about efficiencies, but it was geared more to things like freeing up classroom spaces and cutting costs with utilities. I think your question would generate the interest of the CFA. They might be a more appropriate place to answer that question.

C. Statewide Academic Senators:

We will be having an ASCSU meeting this week. I am disturbed by the pay differential that Senator Buzanski mentioned, but will discuss the matter with him.

SJSU got a letter from the Chancellor's Office asking us to change our GE package to remove Area D sub-categories. There will probably be a lot on GE and GE pushback at this coming meeting.

D. Provost: Not present.

E. Associated Students President:

AS ranked in 5th place in the ballot bowl out of all the community colleges and CSU campuses.

The Marketing and Events and Human Resources Departments have moved to the Student Services Center since the AS House is going to be moving.

Carol Dowell has been appointed as our Interim Executive Director. There are also job opportunities available in AS.

F. Vice President for Administration and Finance: Not present.

G. Vice President for Student Affairs:

We are currently about 397 students below where we were last year at this time. We are not concerned at this point since it is still very early. We are at 35,344 students now. We are doing quite well.

We opened Spring applications August 1, 2018. Our Fall applications opened on

October 1, 2018. We are on track for Fall 2019 for first year freshmen students. We are also on track for our upper division and our graduate students.

There is a slight increase in our international students of about 72 students. Any increase in international students is worth noting. It is still early, but we will see how this goes.

With regard to spring, we are doing about the same as last year. This year we have 105 and last year we had 106. Our upper division transfers, however, are up about 700 students. It is a very good thing for our transfer numbers to increase. Our graduate students are lagging just a bit about 60 students, but again it is still early.

As for graduation, last year we graduated 3,200 and this year we will graduate 3,720. That is an increase of 500 students.

Questions:

Q: When students apply do they indicate when they need housing at the time of application and if so has that changed over the years?

A: I do not know. They do indicate if they are going to apply for housing at that time. I would imagine given the increase in upper division students it will reflect a considerable increase in demand. There is considerable demand for housing from students that aren't in that first year.

Q: I'm just wondering if the housing crisis is reflected in the number of students requesting housing?

A: It always a balance. Some of it is a direct reflection of need and some of it is creating a culture of having housing on a campus like this and getting people used to that. I'd be happy to take a look at that and see if there is a trend in terms of housing.

Q: I was reading a report out of one of the CSU admissions committees and the message was that we are going to be told to accept more transfer students and that we should make transfer students a priority in admissions. I'm wondering if this will impact the campus in a way that reduces our freshmen admits and whether our destination campus theme is going to be hindered by that?

A: I appreciate the question. I don't know if we've decided where we are going as a campus. Part of my tasks is to develop an enrollment plan so we understand our priorities over time. What I will say, having spent time in an urban university where there were more transfer students than first-time freshmen, is that it still became a destination campus, but a destination for a more robust population. I think we need to determine the percentage of a transfer population we should have on a regular basis, and also where those transfers come from. We want to make sure we getting a certain population from the two-year institutions around us and if not why not. We need to determine our goals and go from there.

Q: In terms of international students, are you seeing a decline in the numbers of students applying?

A: We are early, but at this stage we are holding steady. That could change. We

have to be increasingly thoughtful on how we are serving those students.

VP Day has asked his staff to go back to a more robust 2-day orientation process. They had transitioned down to a one-day process this past summer. The reasons include having an opportunity to let students learn who we are and what we value. That will show up in a number of ways, but takes time to do. That is early in the process.

We are spending increasing amounts of time looking at the allocation of resources for student behavioral health. This is an increasing challenge. We are looking at this in terms of how we have allocated our existing resources, and what additional resources we need. We are looking at what is going to be our strategy to sustain and improve the health of our students. We are also preparing for tomorrow and are thoughtful in how we help our students.

Questions:

Q: So to recap quickly, headcount is down 300+ and average unit load is up, so what happened to FTEF?

A: I don't have the answer today, but I will include that part in the analysis I bring to these conversations.

Q: What is the timeline for implementing the 2-day orientation, and what are the alternatives for students that miss that including administrative errors in scheduling?

A: We are looking at this summer for the 2-day orientation. Part of the design of the orientation process is to provide enough opportunity for students to make a selection that works with their schedule. Typically, there is a catch kind of orientation that occurs at the end of the summer for students that have difficulty getting to the campus, etc. that gives students that opportunity to experience orientation. If there are a large number of administrative errors occurring that is a much bigger problem and we simply can't have that.

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.