2019-2020 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 10, 2020

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

Ex Officio:
Present: Van Selst, Frazier
Parent, Mathur, Rodan
Absent: Curry

CHHS Representatives:
Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Chin, Sen
Absent: None

COB Representatives:
Present: He, Khavul
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Marachi
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:
Present: Sullivan-Green, Kumar, Okamoto
Absent: Ramasubramanian

H&A Representatives:
Present: Riley, Kitajima, McKee, Coelho, Khan
Absent: None

SCI Representatives:
Present: Cargill, French, White
Absent: None

General Senate Representatives:
Presents: Masegian, Monday, Higgins
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– The Senate minutes of December 16, 2019 were approved as written with 3 abstentions.

III. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate –
Chair Mathur announced the President, Provost, and CDO are unable to attend the meeting today. The President is in Washington D.C. The Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) is at the CSU System CDO’s meeting, and the Provost is in Sacramento, CA.

There were two GE Summits that were very well attended. There were 70 to 80 faculty in attendance at each summit. In the January GE Summit there were some
administrators as well as students. The summit attendees gave a lot of feedback to the Curriculum and Research Committee to help them move forward with their review of the GE guidelines and also to the Undergraduate Education Office so they can begin to think about updates and revisions to how GE assessment is done. The Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee is here today and would be happy to take any additional feedback you might have.

The Senate Retreat was held on January 31, 2020. Chair Mathur thanked Vice Chair McKee and Senate Administrator Joice for their hard work. There were a lot of rich discussions throughout the day and a fun activity in the afternoon. Chair Mathur posted some pictures to the senate Twitter.

Chair Mathur reminded Senators that we are beginning our Senate Elections and that there are a number of seats open. Senators were notified if their seat was expiring and nominating petitions are due in the Senate Office by February 21, 2020. Please also encourage your colleagues to join the Senate. Chair Mathur will be hosting some open house meetings to go over the activities and responsibilities of the Senate next week for anyone interested in joining.

You were messaged about giving feedback for the Chancellor’s search. Chair Mathur also provided the link to the Chancellor’s search website.

Please also provide feedback for President Papazian’s three-year review. Back in November the Chancellor sent an email extending the deadline to March 27, 2020.

The Campus Climate Survey is going to be launched on February 25, 2020. There are five Senators involved in the Campus Climate and Belonging committee who participated in survey development and outreach. This is your chance to provide feedback about campus culture and climate. It is being run by an independent consulting firm, Rankin and Associates. There is a launch event on that day so please come. Chair Mathur distributed a flyer with details. The committee is aiming for a 30% participation rate to get wide feedback. The survey will be open until March 20th. Chair Mathur encouraged senators to complete the survey and to encourage others to do so as well.

At the last ASCSU meeting, a resolution was passed AS 3403-20, called “The Recommended Implementation of a CSU Ethnic Studies Requirement.” With the passage of that resolution, a memo came from Executive Vice Chancellor Loren Blanchard asking for feedback. Blanchard suggested ways to collect information on this requirement. Some of those ways included individual feedback, campus Senates’ feedback, and feedback from the whole campus. The Provost, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Senior Deputy Provost, and Senate Chair met to discuss how to implement a coordinated method of data collection to allow the whole campus to give feedback. The deadline for feedback is February 21, 2020.

Chair Mathur invited CSU Statewide Senator Mark Van Selst to provide further
information to the Senate. Senator Van Selst explained actions taken by the committee in creating AB 3403-20. The first thing the committee did was come up with a definition of ethnic studies. The committee next discussed what the standard learning outcomes should be. AB 3403-20 is a proposal for a 3 unit GE course or overlay within GE, if it is not done within GE that is okay, but typically it would be.

A campus is free to define other ethnic studies outcomes. A campus may choose to have a cultural diversity requirement in addition to the ethnic studies requirement. A campus may choose to implement these requirements prior to the implementation date. If a campus has an existing campus requirement, they could update it into a system requirement. The difficulty with a campus requirement is that transfer students are not required to do any campus specific requirements. By defining this as part of lower division GE it ensures that transfer students have to take it.

Questions:
Q: You mentioned that transfer students have to have a uniform requirement across the CSU system, so how is this possible if transfer students don’t have to meet campus specific requirements?
A: This is defined by ASCSU recommendation as part of lower division GE so it has to be done as part of lower division GE transfer courses. All transfer students will have to meet these requirements.
Q: For those Senators who don’t understand how the CSU Statewide Senate works, which is different from how our Senate works, would you describe what this actually means and how would this become reality? What has to happen for this to go into effect? How does this interface with the board, the legislature, and the Chancellor?
A: There are two ways in which it could become a requirement for the system. One way is by board (Board of Trustees) action and the other way is by state legislative action. The intent is that this will become a board action item since that is the appropriate home for curricular change. In the CSU, the Chancellor can interpret policy, but board action would generate new curriculum. The process we are going through now is advisory to future board action.
Q: Is there a time frame for that?
A: The other shoe is AS 1460 from Assemblywoman Weber. AB 1460 is a very narrow definition of ethnic studies with a 3-unit course that would become a system requirement for the CSU with a prohibition on exceeding 120 units attached to it. The intention is that it is way better off as a normal curricular process. What we did as a Senate was recommend a longer implementation timeframe of 2023/24.
Q: It is the hope that the board will implement it before AB 1460 is voted on?
A: Move towards, yes. I can’t imagine this going before the board at its next meeting. It will probably occur sometime in the summer.
Q: Is the ASCSU continuing to push against AB 1460 in the meantime?
A: Yes, there is a letter being put together right now by Chair Nelson.
Q: Are there any negative impacts to graduation rates?
A: Any time you introduce a change to graduation standards you will impact somebody’s time to graduation, but by overlaying it with GE and by giving flexibility, the ASCSU recommendation is far less impactful than the Weber bill would be.
C: Some people are very concerned about what is going to happen at the community college level to address this. That is where another potential slow down can occur and we can’t control this.

Q: For upper division requirements, is it envisioned that potentially we would reduce some of the learning outcomes in one of the existing areas in order to add in this additional responsibility?
A: Yes, this would be up to a campus. In the ASCSU recommendation, we left it up to campuses.

Chair Mathur commented that we need to protest AB1460 as far as we can. All of us do support ethnic studies, but the minute you open the door and allow the legislature to determine your curriculum, you open the door for future legislative curriculum control over what we should and shouldn’t be teaching.

C: Caution should be used in how we frame that pushback. There are some powerful political forces pushing this forward. Senator Weber has taught in ethnic studies and worked for many years to promote ethnic studies. We need to be clear that we, as faculty, promote ethnic studies, but want to preserve the right for faculty to determine the curriculum.

Q: You reminded us to get feedback on President Papazian to the Chancellor. Could you resend that email to faculty with the link to the Chancellor’s website and the deadline?
A: There is no actual link. The interesting thing is that there is just a button that you push that says submit your comments and then that actually takes you to an email address or a mailing address.
Q: Could you resend that to all faculty?
A: All faculty on campus?
Q: Yes.

Q: Can you just share with us what you are thinking as far as ethnic studies feedback from the campus?
A: The ASCSU Chair forwarded us a survey we could potentially use. The team looked at it last Friday and think the survey idea is the best thing to use, but this survey has some bias in it (we felt) so we are going through and editing it and then will be sending it out to get campus feedback.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. Executive Committee Report:
   A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
      Executive Committee Minutes of December 9, 2019- No Questions.
      Executive Committee Minutes of January 27, 2020- No Questions.

   B. Consent Calendar:
Consent Calendar of February 20, 2020. There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi. AVC Marachi welcomed Senator Karthika Sasikumar from the College of Social Sciences.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. **Special Order of Business:** Vote on One-Year Extension for the Senate Chair. A motion was made to suspend the rules and vote by acclamation. The motion was seconded. There was no objection to suspending the rules and voting by acclamation. The Senate voted and approved the extension by acclamation.

VI. **Unfinished Business:** None

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

A. **University Library Board (ULB):**

*University Library Board report on funding, acquisitions, services and staffing by Maureen Smith and Dean Elliott.*

We looked at research intensive peer organizations in the system and those aspiring to be research intensive and we compared SJSU in terms of our student undergraduate headcount and graduate headcount, our budget, and those sorts of things. In terms of number of students, we are right up there with the large universities. We are above San Francisco State and below San Diego State in terms of undergraduate student headcount, however, we are above both in terms of graduate student headcount. The Senate was given a presentation in 2003 and this presentation is a comparison between 2003 and 2018 data, which is the latest data we have for the large institutions.

You can see we are even with the other large CSU campuses, but we are significantly behind our research peers in terms of expenditures per student FTE. Our aspirational research peers have increased 22.3% between 2000 and 2018 in terms of expenditures per student FTE, whereas the large CSU campuses have decreased by 2%, and SJSU has decreased by about 8%.

Questions:

Q: Is that stateside FTES or total FTES?
A: This is everything, but doesn’t include the lights and electricity. VP Faas pays for that. That’s the FTES that we reported in IPED.

Q: We have about 8,100 graduate students on this campus, that is probably the stateside FTES?
A: We used the same number those other campuses reported in IPED for 2018 per headcount per graduate student. The numbers might not be exactly accurate, but that’s the comparison based on what we are reporting out to the federal government. I agree with you. When I saw that number, I thought it was extremely low, because we work really hard to support our graduate students in the library. We know there are a
lot more than 5,000 of them.

Q: Who are the aspirational research peers?
A: We have to go back a few screens. The first group is what we used in 2003, and we changed that when I (Dean Elliott) had a conversation with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics and he gave me these institutions as our research peers (San Diego State University, Portland State University, Indiana University – Purdue University and Indianapolis, University of Memphis, University of North Carolina, University of Toledo).

C: The yellow is FY 2000 and the blue is FY 2018, and this is looking at how much money we spend per student on library materials. Again, you can see SJSU and the large CSU campuses funding went down by about 18%.
Q: Is that adjusted for inflation?
A: It is the amount of money we spend to the amount of full-time equivalent students we have.
Q: So if it is not adjusted for inflation, it has actually gone up a lot more than that?
A: Yes. They actually put that in the original report, but we just didn’t have the time to put it in our report. Twenty years ago they said it represented about a 25% loss. It has got to be somewhere around 50% now. We see about a 10% increase in the cost of publications annually, particularly books.
C: I also think it is important to note that with our aspirational research peers expenditures per student have gone up by 27%. That is also not adjusted for inflation.

Next, we look at how we have been spending money by funding source. This is FY 1998 to FY 2002. The blue is our general fund, the orange is the lottery fund, and the grey is our foundation funds. This was recorded in 2003.

The next slide is sources of funding for library materials for FY 2011-FY 2014, and you can see there has been a shift in our funding.

Questions:
Q: Does the ULB have an opinion about the ethics of using lottery funds which are supposed to be supplemental under the Lottery Act for the acquisition of annual library material?
A: The ULB has not taken a formal vote on this, but the ULB had a very long conversation about this. One thing we have noticed is that as the library loses funds, in order to maintain the research expectations and the collection necessary for students. We are accepting money from whomever will give it to us. It is our understanding this wasn’t a decision that was made at the library level.

The next slide shows staffing compared between 2000 and 2018. Again you can see that our large CSU campuses and SJSU have had a higher loss in staffing.

Moving on, the next slide shows the number of library employees per 10,000 student FTE between 2000 and 2018. SJSU had a 33% decrease, the large CSUs had a 44% decrease, and our aspirational peers had a 28% decrease.
SJSU had 7 librarians per 10,000 student FTE in 2018, whereas the large CSUs had 8, and our aspirational research peers had 14.

The last slides show services. The diminished or discontinued services include circulation of instructional videos, print course reserves and circulating textbooks. We have discontinued the combined reference and periodicals desks shared with SJPL. We have added on-demand streaming videos, a Unified Service Point on the first floor, an SJSU reference desk on the 4th floor, digital course reserves in Canvas, (Leganto reading lists)/Open Educational Resources/eBooks as textbooks, and faculty support for low-cost textbook materials/copyright clearance.

Other services diminished or discontinued include discontinuing managing the meeting rooms and audiovisual services for SJPL, moving the bound periodicals collections on the 4th floor to the lower level, and discontinuing managing the interlibrary loan requests for the entire SJPL system (all 24 branches).

We have added or enhanced services by upgrading technology in meeting rooms and library classrooms, increasing subscriptions to 371,335 journals in electronic format and collaborative student learning spaces on the 4th floor, and increased resource sharing throughout the CSU and with a shared CSU catalog.

New and enhanced services also include SJSU Scholarworks Repository, Student Computing Services (laptops and equipment lending), Student Technology training, Online Chat Reference Services, Grad Lab, extended study hours, mobile phone checkout for materials, self-service equipment checkout, prototyping lab, late-night tutoring, KLEVR Lab and Sound Studio, Presentation Practice Room, Materials Library, SJSU-Only Reference Services (4th floor) and Proactive Chat Reference Services, and Writing Center collaboration.

Questions:
Q: The lottery dollars are meant to supplement not supplant. My recollection the last time we got a budget report was that something along the lines of $8 million out of $9 million of Instructionally Related Activity (IRA) dollars went to Athletics. Wouldn’t you love to have those dollars since they are called IRA dollars. It is time for students, faculty, deans, and the Provost to have a discussion about IRA dollars and where they are going. (applause)
Q: Congratulations to Dean Elliott on her new job. We will miss her. Can you elaborate a little more on the drop in staffing over the years, because I’m assuming that means actual librarians as well as other support staff? What can you attribute that to?
A: Two things happened. First, the numbers we reported are based on student FTE. Our student FTE numbers have grown significantly while our librarian staffing has decreased. Dean Elliott wasn’t here during the furlough years, but she hears about it at least once every week even 3 ½ years later. The university as a whole had a drop in faculty and staff and we have just never recovered. Also, there have been lines
removed from the library during Dean Elliott’s time here.

Q: The lottery money was repurposed right after the recession during the Kassing/Selter administration. That money used to be available to faculty for professional development, but there was some kind of flap about how the faculty were misusing their $250 allotments never mind that we live in a world where people misuse billions of dollars everyday. Then the money was kind of worked into .20 release time for faculty who were supporting student success. That was a very successful program. In my time as senate chair, I was given an assurance from the administration that that money would go to release time grants forever except for an act of God, but I guess the recession was an act of God. At that point the Provost very graciously took the lottery money and put it towards the library acquisitions budget because things were really in a bad way, but that somehow got institutionalized and now I guess that is how that works. It is illegal and unethical. My question is about the friends of the library. There was wasn’t much publicity about the Friends of the Library being removed from the building and that space being repurposed. That building is a public building.

A: A member of the Friends of the Library sent out that email before checking with us. We are relocating them and repurposing that space. The space is being used as a polling place for the students to vote. The Friends of the Library book donations have gotten so large they don’t work in that space any longer. We were receiving about 300 books a day in donations. We started talking about the huge piles of books that weren’t getting moved and they were becoming a fire hazard. We are working with the Friends of the Library to possibly open a gift shop that could be seen as you come in from the front. Dean Elliott met with the ULB and the Friends of the Library and they all agreed this was the way they wanted to go. At no point was the Library going to kick them out. That was crazy.

Q: There is a rumor running around the neighborhood. I heard about it on Nextdoor, because this is the branch library for people downtown. You may want to get the word out.

A: Yes, we will do that. Thank you.

Q: For the last six years, I’ve chaired the Program Planning and Curriculum and Research Committees. In both those committees, one of the criteria is to look at the library resources for new degree programs. In the entire time I’ve been doing this, I have never had a librarian that has said they had inadequate resources for a program, so I’m trying to resolve the conundrum in my head. Looking at your budget and the loss in staffing does the library have adequate resources to support new Master’s and Doctoral programs? I’d like to hear your thoughts on this.

A: My parting thoughts for the university are that we are going to need more resources and those resources will go up in price as our research level changes such as with the doctoral programs. The good news is that they have commissioned a consulting group of former library deans that will be looking at the funding, the staffing, the way the library is organized, etc. They will give us a recommendation of what we need to complete the vision for 2030.
Q: Although moving to all electronic materials is good in some ways, some research has shown a diminishment in learning if the materials aren’t printed out for some faculty and students. There is also some value of going into the stacks and looking for your book and finding something next to it you didn’t expect. This is a philosophical question, but do those type of questions come up?
A: All the time. I just had lunch with the librarians and we talked about this for about an hour. We probably should have these conversations on a more regular basis. The ULB is sponsoring a forum on section 7 of the library policy. That is about evaluating the collection, especially the print collection. The forum is on February 18, 2020 from noon to 1:30 p.m., come and give us your opinion. We have some interesting data that shows students in some months using way more e-books. More e-books were checked out than print books were ever checked out. We never had access to 371,000 titles in print copy. This is phenomenal that we can do this now. My recommendation is that if you do need to read it, then print it out. There is no way we could have ever housed that many titles. The number one checked out titles are U.S. History and Government and then Math.

Q: Could you talk a little about the negotiations with Elsevier?
A: Those are supposed to be confidential, but I can tell you they are going very well. We have been working with the UC. We have a deal we think we can accept.

B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
Senator White presented AS 1760, Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Students Earning Graduate Credit (First Reading).
C&R is bringing AS 1760 back as a first reading because of all the questions received after the last meeting. Most of the wordsmithing we did was to the whereas clauses. The big problem is that when an undergraduate student takes a class for graduate credit, there is no way of knowing that class was taken for graduate credit on the transcript. The registrar has to manually go in and make reference to how that class is used, but they would only do that through a petitioning process. The whole purpose of this policy is to bring clarity to this process.

We clarified the title and made it clearer. The only big change is in 2E under existing units and that is in alignment with our current policy. No other changes were made to the policy.

Questions:
Q: It looks like the only time you would take a graduate level course is in your major or minor, except it can’t be a required course. Could it be used for your major or minor if it isn’t a required course?
A: The policy doesn’t really address that. However, the question is ‘can a student use a graduate level course for their degree program’, and again that would be up to the degree program adviser whether they would allow that in.
Q: Would C&R consider saying “except as an elective in the major or minor or something like that?”
A: That isn’t the purpose of this policy. I think we have another policy that talks
about this.
Q:  I think, "petition through their major adviser," needs to be looked at, because I’m trying to figure out how a major adviser would sign off on a minor graduate course?
A:  The whole reason for using the major adviser is that the major adviser interacts the most with the undergraduate student. We did discuss this with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and there are other mechanisms besides what is outlined in this policy that would have to go through her office.

Q:  With just using the language, “of a graduate course,” many of our programs allow for undergraduate upper division electives to be used in both the undergraduate and graduate programs, not at the same time, and many students want to take those 100 level courses with this intent, but you say graduate course. If you said specifically that it was 200 level courses, or that it could be either, that would be useful to have it spelled out explicitly.
A: I would have to pull the policy and look at this, but we already have procedures in place for graduate students that take 100 level courses.
Q: You are correct, but for this policy it would probably be better to say it was 200 level courses so there is no question.
A: If we say 200 level that could potentially hurt students who were applying for some of the doctoral programs.
Q: Then say, “200 level or higher,” something that explicitly says that the 100 level courses used in a graduate program are not permitted under this policy? From my students’ perspective, they are going to argue that those courses can be graduate level, because they are allowed to be used towards their graduate program.
A: C&R will discuss.

Q: In the second whereas it says that, “any undergraduate student may take a graduate level course provided they meet the course prerequisites,” does that mean that all our graduate courses are supposed to include everything that is listed in number 2 on the second page, because they don’t?
A: That’s correct. That is a tricky one. Some graduate courses don’t have any prerequisites. If the student identified a graduate-level course, the student would have to figure out if they could take the course at the undergraduate level. The course prerequisite could be set by the department.
Q: They don’t have to have any of the information in number 2?
A: They would have to first meet the prerequisites, then number 2 would kick in.

Q: In number 5, it talks about 30% of the program must be taken in residence, does that 30% apply to students from another institute, or open university students?
A: The 30% applies to everyone.

Senator d’Alarcao made a motion to move AS 1760 to a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the d’Alarcao motion passed with 4 Nays and 1 Abstention.

Senator White presented an amendment to sections 2B and 2E that was friendly to the
body to insert at the beginning, “Normally,”.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment in number 5 to remove the language starting on line 58 that reads, “through the process described herein.” The Sullivan-Green amendment was seconded. Senator Sullivan-Green withdrew her amendment. Senator d’Alarcao presented a substitute amendment to the Sullivan-Green amendment to leave line 58 as is and add “including” before “through the process described herein.” The d’Alarcao amendment was seconded. Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment to the d’Alarcao amendment to add a comma after “herein.” Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the d’Alarcao amendment as reads, “herein” to read, “within this policy.” The Senate voted and the d’Alarcao amendment passed with 2 Abstentions.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to line 35 after “graduate course” to add “[200 plus level]”. Senator Schultz-Krohn suggested an amendment to the Van Selst Amendment to change “[200 plus level]” to “[200 level or higher]” to allow for accessibility for doctoral courses. The Senate voted on replacing the Van Selst amendment with the Schultz-Krohn amendment. The Schultz-Krohn amendment passed with 1 Abstention.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to the second whereas clause to add, “(if not for graduate credit)” after “course prerequisites.”. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Frazier amendment failed with 2 Abstentions.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to strike the third whereas clause. Senator Frazier withdrew the amendment.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to 2d. to change, “better on all work…” to read, “better averaged across all work.” The amendment was not seconded.

The Senate voted and AS 1760 passed as amended with 2 abstentions.

C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1741, Policy Recommendation, English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU Applicants (Final Reading). Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “EO 975” to “EO 1082: International Students https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6591473/latest/)” in the 7th whereas clause.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 92 to read, “Post-baccalaureate or graduate applicants who meet both of the following criteria are required…”.

The Senate voted and AS 1741 passed with 1 Abstention.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1759, Policy Recommendation, Student’s
Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (Final Reading).

Senator Shifflett presented a motion to extend the meeting by 5 minutes (5:05 p.m. to 5:10 p.m.). The Senate voted and the Shifflett motion passed.

Senator Parent presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “Tran” on line 32 to read, “Trang.”

Senator Shifflett called the question. The Senate voted and the question was called with 2 Nays, and 6 Abstentions.

The Senate voted and AS 1759 passed with 4 Nays and 6 Abstentions.

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
Senator Peter presented AS 1756, Amendment B to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (Final Reading).

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add to the Resolved clause, “, effective beginning with the 2020-2021 Academic Year.”

The Senate voted and AS 1756 passed with 1 Abstention.

AS 1761, Amendment I to University Policy S15-7, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees, Procedures Concerning Small Colleges (First Reading). [AS 1761 was moved to the next meeting due to a lack of time.]

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
Senator Shifflett presented AS 1762, Policy Recommendation, Modifying Seats on the Program Planning Committee and the Accreditation Review Committee, Amendment B to University Policy S17-11; and Amendment B to University Policy S16-5 (Final Reading).

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 57 to read, “Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education or designee (EXO)” and on line 88 change, “AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (EXO)” to read, “WSCUC Accreditation Liaison Officer (EXO)”.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change lines 59 and 90 to read, “Director of Institutional Research or designee (EXO).”

The Senate voted and AS 1762 was approved as amended.

AS 1763, Senate Management Resolution, Updates to the Senate Standing Rules (First Reading) [Note: AS 1763 was moved to the next meeting due to a lack of
VII.

One of the things I want to do today is give you an idea where we stand as far as faculty diversity. I caution you that there is a little bit of an art in understanding racial identification and it is challenging to get accurate reports of what we feel racial identification is and what we actually are constrained with as well as how we collect data. Those issues may come up today.

We have 396 Full Professors, 159 Associate Professors, and 263 Assistant Professors. There are 948 Temporary, 504 3-year Temporary, and 49 Retired Annuitants. We look a lot like the CSU in terms of our tenure density. Tenure density is essentially ratio of lecturer faculty to tenure/tenure-track faculty. Tenure density in the CSU and SJSU has been declining. You can see the effect this is having on Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR). We have the SFR as we have had for a very long time, so we have had to hire more lecturers to meet the demand.

If you compare our student demographics with our faculty demographics, you can see we have 16.1% White students, but have 53.5 percent White faculty. We have 41.9% Asian students with 24.4% Asian faculty, etc. What we are seeing is some demographic mismatching between our faculty and students. That doesn’t mean our students aren’t going to get a good education obviously. However, that has an impact on student success. What this data is showing us is that racial diversity varies from unit to unit. As someone who studied why students go into Science, Math, and Engineering for his dissertation, I can tell you that students want to study where there are more faculty of their own race and ethnicity. The proportions of faculty in races between T/TT and lecturers is very similar.

We are seeing a slow decline of White faculty with a steady increase of non-White faculty. The proportions of faculty in races between T/TT and lecturers is very similar. This is interesting because our lecturer faculty are usually homegrown and we live in a very diverse area.

We have switched now so that we have slightly higher rates of female faculty than male faculty. In addition, more faculty who are retiring are white males. When it comes to resignations, we don’t have more of a problem with faculty of color as compared to white faculty.

We provided 20 two-hour sessions of faculty diversity training in October and November. We had 246 faculty participate. Also, online training was available.

There are structural issues when you try to diversity faculty. There is an interesting trend among non-White faculty in that non-White hiring has outpaced White hiring over the last three years. However, our applicant groups are constrained by our applicant pools. How do we get applicants to apply and how do we make the university attractive to faculty? We are very popular among men. Our male applicants way outnumber our female applicants.
terms of how we hire, there is more of a balance. When we look at how we’ve changed our applicant pools over time, in 2016 a large majority of our applicants were White, but by fall 2019 less than half of the applicants were White. We must be doing something right in terms of how we write our job ads and how we attract the people that are coming to the university. If we look at how we’ve changed our applicant pools in 2019, we don’t have a problem getting more men to apply, but how do we get more women to apply? However, this is not all our fault. When we look at other institutions across the U.S., the proportion of faculty who is White is 70. We must be doing something different if our rates are better than across the U.S. We might be doing a better job than we give ourselves credit for. We are getting there in terms of hiring a diverse workforce.

**Questions:**
Q: Are we starting to trend towards our T/TT faculty representing our student population more? Does this apply to a specific college?
A: Yes, if Engineering Departments are trending towards more non-White faculty than other disciplines will follow.

Q: What improvements are being made to fix the diversity gap?
A: There is a lot. However, in Faculty Affairs, we are focusing on recruitment training programs for faculty.

Q: I was surprised to hear that two-thirds of the candidates going through the RTP process were female over the last five years which suggests these ratios are going to change a lot in the future, but I was just as surprised to find that two-thirds of the applicants were male. How do we get from an overwhelmingly male pool to what is becoming a predominantly female probationary faculty?
A: That is a great question. One of the things we can do is to message out to our applicants and include more gender inclusive language. There are lots of people who have a stake in what you just asked.

Q: In a best case scenario, how quickly could we get to a situation in which the ratios are different and where the faculty are more matched to our student population?
A: Unfortunately, no, but if you have anyone who can do that for us it would be great.
Q: I’d be happy to work on it if you give me the data.

Q: Thank you for the presentation and the training you have been doing. Do we have any data on the reasons faculty are resigning, because I was thinking that might be something to look into to see if there is a difference between Whites and non-Whites?
A: I know that the Provost Office has permission to begin studying this. The Faculty Affairs Office is working on the exit process, because we need more detailed data.

Q: Looking at these things in isolation doesn’t take into account multiple factors? Without knowing the proportions coming in from the field it’s really difficult. The second point on our hiring is that I would be interested in seeing our offers rather than our hiring, because our salaries are below market and more women tend to accept those. That could skew that data significantly. It works in our favor in terms of diversifying the campus, but without that
middle gap of what the offers look like, it is hard to know why this is happening. There is also a dynamic that is happening in rural campus communities vs. high-cost areas and no campus hires.

A: I can say that there is activity on campus, especially in the Provost Office moving forward.

Q: Thank you Director Lee, I noticed you did not mention ethnicity or national origin and I wanted to know how that is represented in the diversity on the campus, because it is linked to but not exactly the same, as racial diversity? I think it is important to remember that those who are applying to SJSU who are not U.S. citizens have many more barriers in front of them to even accept an offer from SJSU. I’m wondering what your office knows about those conditions that are offered?

A: I (Lee) know nothing personally, but we have an Analyst in UP that handles all the Visa cases. We have to be very careful about those because of what you can say and can’t say. An international university needs an international faculty. What I see coming in is that there is a large proportion of our faculty coming in from other places.

Q: There may be a discrepancy between applicants that get offers, those who accept the offers, and those who do not accept the offers, because getting legal status can be more important than salary for a non-citizen.

A: As a former department chair, I think more than half the faculty I hired came from other countries.

Q: One thing I noticed is that over 60% of the faculty are lecturers, but only 30% of the faculty are tenured, yet it seems like the only way you are looking at diversity is through the tenure/tenure-track faculty and this doesn’t seem like a fast way to get hiring done if you want to diversify. Why are the hiring seminars about diversity focused on tenured hiring instead of lecturer hiring where you could certainly move these percentages much more quickly?

A: I agree that it is a quicker turnaround. We are limited by resources right now more than anything else in terms of putting together a more comprehensive strategy.

Q: For a number of years I’ve looked at the makeup of Ph.D.s, particularly in my field that were offered to U.S. citizens and permanent residents and only about 7% represented minorities. To some degree, having such a diverse student body here gives us the opportunity to encourage students from underrepresented groups to pursue Ph.D.s and then hopefully we can hire them back.

A: I’m so glad (Lee) you said that. Our efforts here to grow the next generation of lecturer and tenure/tenure-track faculty is a prime opportunity to take these students and turn them into the diverse workforce we are looking for.

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:
   A. Vice President for Administration and Finance: Moved to next meeting.
   B. Vice President for Student Affairs: Moved to next meeting.
C. Chief Diversity Officer: Moved to next meeting.
D. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): Distributed by email.
E. Statewide Academic Senators: Moved to next meeting.
F. Provost: Moved to next meeting.
G. Associated Students President: Moved to next meeting.

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.