

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2020/2021

Agenda

February 8, 2021, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/88068942856>

If you would like to attend this meeting, please contact the Chair (Ravisha.Mathur@sjsu.edu) or the Senate Administrator (Eva.Joice@sjsu.edu) for the password.

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Land Acknowledgement:**
- III. **Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of December 7, 2020
- IV. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President of the University
- V. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
EC Minutes of November 30, 2020
EC Minutes of January 11, 2021
EC Minutes of January 25, 2021
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of February 8, 2021
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
University Policy S21-1, Time-Limited Amendment of Research Oversight
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
 - A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1797, Amendment D to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees, Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters (Final Reading)

AS 1795, Amendment J to University Policy S15-7 Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures, RTP Procedures for Joint Appointments (Final Reading)
 - B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1790, Amendment to Standing Rule 7a, Inclusion of Land Acknowledgement in Academic Senate Agenda (First Reading)
 - C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

AS 1791, Policy Recommendation, Accessibility in Curricular Materials (First Reading)

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

- A. University Library Board (ULB):
- B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
- C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA)
AS 1802, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading)
- D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1804, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards To enhance service to students (First Reading)

AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (First Reading)
- E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1800, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S14-6, Policy and Assurance for Humane Care and Use of Animals (Final Reading)

AS 1801, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to F17-1, Protection of Human Research Subjects (Final Reading)

AS 1799, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F12-5, Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (Final Reading)

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

- A. Statewide Academic Senators
- B. Provost
- C. Associated Students President
- D. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- E. Vice President for Student Affairs
- F. Chief Diversity Officer
- G. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)

XI. Adjournment

2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes
December 7, 2020

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

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Mathur, Delgadillo Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Smith, Dudley Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Day, Faas, Del Casino, Wong(Lau), Papazian Absent: None	COB Representatives: Present: Rao, Khavul Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Shillington Absent: None	COED Representatives: Present: Marachi Absent: None
Students: Present: Kaur, Quock, Walker, Chuang, Gomez Absent: Jimenez	ENGR Representatives: Present: Sullivan-Green, Saldamli, Okamoto Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Walters	H&A Representatives: Present: Kitajima, McKee, Khan, Frazier, Taylor, Thompson, Riley Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: McClory	COS Representatives: Present: Cargill, French, White, Maciejewski Absent: None
Honorary Representative: Present: Lessow-Hurley	COSS Representatives: Present: Peter, Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Masegian, Monday, Lee, Yang, Higgins Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement: The land acknowledgement is a formal statement that recognizes the history and legacy of colonialism that has impacted our Indigenous peoples, their traditional territories, and their practices. It is a simple and powerful way of showing respect and a step towards correcting the stories and practices that have erased our Indigenous people's history and culture and it is a step towards inviting and honoring the truth. Senator Chuang read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of November 9, 2020 were approved (42-0-0).

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Mathur welcomed Senators to the final Fall 2020 meeting. This meeting will be recorded for transcription purposes. Please ensure you type SL in the Chat if you have a question. Please wait until you are called on. For amendments, please type SL Amendment into the Chat then when Chair Mathur calls on you put the Amendment into the Chat. When we are in debate, please clarify SL debate, SL amendment, or SL main motion. Please only vote if you are a Senator.

Today's agenda has Final Readings first. For those six Final Readings, we will move right into debate so be prepared for that. If we don't get to the first readings, which we optimistically hope will happen today, please provide feedback in the google doc Chair Mathur sent to you last week.

Chair Mathur expressed condolences on behalf of the Academic Senate on the recent passing of Jeanine Jones. Jeanine was an excellent member of the staff and very well known and loved by many members of the Senate including the Senate Chair and Senate Administrator. Jeanine will be greatly missed. Those who are interested can make a donation to the Student Hunger Fund in her name.

We received additional sad news that former Senate Chair and AVP of Research, Pamela Stacks, has announced her retirement as of December 30, 2020. We recently honored her with a Sense of the Senate Resolution. A zoom farewell session will be held on December 23, 2020.

The Executive Committee has reviewed and approved the nomination of Romey Sabalius for Faculty Trustee. We must now wait an additional two weeks per policy F86-1 for any additional nominations before forwarding to the Chancellor's Office. We thank Romey for his continued advocacy on the behalf of CSU Faculty and on the behalf our students and other stakeholders within the Board of Trustees.

The President's Senate Holiday Reception will be held December 16, 2020 from 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. There will be door prizes as well as an Ugly Sweater, and most Creative Zoom Background contests. We hope to see you there, stay tuned for the RSVP and Zoom link.

The Senate Retreat will be held on February 12, 2021 from 9 a.m. to noon via zoom. The subject will be, *SJSU and the Post Pandemic University*. Please save the date and time.

B. From the President:

President Papazian announced that the Chancellor's Office has advised us to stay home as much as we can with the increases in COVID exposure. They

also suggested we delay the start of in person classes for Spring 2021 to get through the next 8 weeks or so around the holidays. We are fortunate that we have already made the adjustment in our academic calendar and we don't start until the very end of January. Some campuses start a lot earlier. President Papazian will leave that to the Provost and Academic team to look at what makes sense there. Another suggestion was to think about what we are doing around spring break and whether we want to make adjustments. We took a look at that and we also heard from students and it appears people need a break, so to make adjustments right now would just add more stress than reduce stress. At this point we aren't planning to do that. We will be looking at the testing protocol for students leaving and then returning back after break. This will be a very deliberate process and something along the lines of what we did around Thanksgiving.

The court ruling around DACA allows new DACA applications to be accepted and this is good news for our students. This is a good short term win for now. Our UndocuSpartan Student Resource Center can provide assistance and is willing to help any student.

The newly elected officials are being sworn in today I believe. Things will start up again in earnest after the new year. With the support of our faculty trustee who has been a very articulate advocate for appropriately funding the budget for the CSU, the Board of Trustees increased the budget they were asking for to \$556 million. There will be a lot of work advocating for the new budget in the new year. You may hear more from the Academic Senate of the CSU. It will be heavy lifting to get this through. There is good news about revenue coming into the state budget, but the costs of the pandemic are severe. It is not clear whether this \$900 billion stimulus package being negotiated in Washington D.C. will come to pass. This depends a lot on what the new administration is able to get through congress. Part of this is making up for the cuts from last year and part of it is providing support for Ethnic Studies. It will take everyone advocating for this budget including faculty, staff, students, and community members.

We still have some room for nominations for the Campus Climate and Belonging Committee (deadline is December 21st). This is a large committee that will address in earnest and have the responsibility for beginning to understand the Campus Climate Survey and how we create the kind of environment on campus that allows all of us to thrive.

Last point, there has been a decline in enrollment applications across the country. There has been a decline in FAFSA applications being reviewed by the feds and there has been a serious decline at community colleges, which will hit us up in a couple of years. So, we know there will be some enrollment challenges over the next several years. CalApply has been extended until December 15, 2020. We are not in as bad a position in the aggregate. The

VPESA and the enrollment management team are working very hard to follow-up on that. This is going to be important for us to keep an eye on. We are optimistic the fall will be much more in person than we are now if vaccines go well, but clearly potential students are worried about it.

Questions:

Q: We received an email over the weekend about COVID positive individuals. Any additional updates on that?

A: No, if you had been exposed, you would have already heard.

C: Our case management team would reach out to you directly if you were actually exposed. We will continue to update the website if things change.

Q: Are we doing any outreach to stay in touch with people who used to support us like janitors who aren't currently part of SJSU? If we've failed to rehire some individuals, I'm wondering if we are providing any support for them?

A: We really need the custodial staff at the university right now more than ever, so we have been able to keep them employed. We haven't released any staff at that level. We have made a real effort to maintain the employment of folks. The Alumni Association is also doing what they can to reach out to folks. We do some outreach with counselors. There is a lot of effort on mental health and wellness.

C: Staff in CAPS are spending a huge amount of time reaching out to current students and we continue to provide a range of services to current students. We do live chats virtually to help students to return to the institution. If you have suggestions we would be happy to hear them.

C: We are having an employee connection session from noon to 1:30 p.m. tomorrow and 62 people have already registered. Staff morale is very important and we are working on it. We are working on more ways to make connections while people are feeling isolated.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of November 2, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of November 16, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of November 23, 2020 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of December 7, 2020—There was no dissent to the consent calendar as presented by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business: None.

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

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

Senator White presented **AS 1798, Amendment C to University Policy S14-5, Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (Final Reading)**. This recommendation will bring us into alignment with the changes the Board of Trustees made to Title 5 as an outcome of the law that was passed over the summer. It is a reduction in number of units in Area D from 9 units in the lower division to 6 units in the lower division and the addition of Area F for the Ethnic Studies graduation requirement. This is the structural step that will allow us to start the process to add this new requirement into our GE guidelines. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 13 where it reads, "CSU Executive Order 1100," to read, "CSU Policy on General Education (formerly Executive Order 1100, Revised August 2017)." **The Senate voted and AS 1798 passed as amended** (40-1-4).

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

Senator Sullivan-Green presented **AS 1787, Policy Recommendation, Adding Classes after Advance Registration (Final Reading)**. She noted key changes from the first reading such as movement to the top of the waitlist and priorities within graduating seniors. Senate has worked with the University's IT department on implementation issues and what can be done immediately and what can be worked on during the Spring semester (e.g., communication back to faculty about student adds from the waitlist). Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment to add at line 103 another bullet to read,"

- The instructor-of-record will be separately notified through Peoplesoft of each student added to class after advance registration to allow for consultation and communication regarding missed materials and assignments."

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Sullivan-Green amendment to change, "notified through Peoplesoft" to read, "notified through the enrollment management system (Peoplesoft)". Senator Del Casino presented a substitute amendment to the Van Selst amendment to the Sullivan-Green amendment to delete, "through Peoplesoft". Senator Van Selst withdrew his amendment. A motion was made to move the question on the Del Casino amendment. The motion passed with 1 Nay. The Senate voted on the Del Casino amendment and it passed (25-14-6). Senator Rodan presented an amendment to the Del Casino amendment to the Sullivan-Green amendment to change it to read, "will be notified automatically from the Student Registration System..." The Senate voted and the Rodan amendment failed (15-24-4). The Senate voted on the Sullivan-Green/Del

Casino Amendment and it passed (40-2-4). **The Senate voted and AS 1787 passed as amended (45-0-2).**

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1792, Sense of the Senate Resolution, On Continued Maximum Flexibility and Support of SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading).*** She noted that the campus was continuing to be impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, but also by the wildfires across the Bay Area that impacted the start of the semester, which ranged from campus being closed due to poor air quality to students and faculty having to be evacuated and losing internet services. Senator Del Casino presented an amendment to add another Resolved clause to read, "Resolved: that SJSU should, so far as is legally possible, convert all WU grades in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 to W grades." Senator Peter presented an amendment to the Del Casino Amendment to change it to read, "; and therefore be it Resolved: that SJSU should, where legally possible, convert all WU grades in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 to W grades; and finally". Senate Van Selst presented an amendment to the Del Casino Amendment to change it to read, "...possible, consider a resolution converting..." Senator Peter presented an amendment to the Van Selst Amendment to change it to read, "...possible, consider a policy of converting..." The Senate voted and the Van Selst Amendment to the Peter Amendment to the Del Casino Amendment failed (15-24-6). The Senate voted on the Peter Amendment to the Del Casino Amendment and it passed (37-6-2). Senator Del Casino modified his amendment to read, "...that SJSU should, so far as legally possible, consider a policy of converting all "F" grades in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 to No Credit." Senator Del Casino called the question. The Senate voted and the question was called. The Senate voted on the Del Casino Amendment and it passed (26-16-1). Senator Van Selst made a motion to split the resolution into a Sense of the Senate Resolution retaining all Whereas clauses while removing the two resolved clauses directing the university to take action, and then creating a separate policy recommendation containing all the Whereas clauses and all the rest of the Resolved clauses from AS 1792. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion to split the Sense of the Senate into a Resolution and Policy Recommendation passed (32-9-3). The Senate voted on AS 1792 as amended and it passed (41-2-0). The Senate voted on the new policy recommendation with the Whereas clauses and Resolved clauses from AS 1792 and the policy recommendation passed (35-8-1).**

A motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting until after debate on AS 1793. The Senate voted and the motion passed.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented **AS 1793, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S16-16, Probation and Disqualification, Temporary Amendment due to COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading)**. She noted this policy change would be for students who are currently on academic probation or would end up on probation. That will be, they will be allowed to continue on probation through spring 2021. There are equity gaps in probation and disqualification. Senator Sullivan-Green made an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the title to read, "Amendment D to University Policy S16-16.... **The Senate voted and AS 1793 passed as written (42-1-2)**."

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented **AS 1794, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards, Deleting an Obsolete Reference (Final Reading)**.

Senator Peter presented **AS 1796, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees, Deleting an Obsolete Reference (Final Reading)**.

Senator Peter presented a motion to suspend the rules to override the published agenda of the Senate and consider AS 1794 and AS 1796 together. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed (40-0-2). The Senate voted and AS 1794 and AS 1796 passed as written (46-0-0).

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): Moved to Next Meeting.

E. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

VIII. State of the University Announcements: (Due to a lack of time, no State of the University Announcements were given.)

A. Provost:

B. Associated Students President:

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

D. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

E. Chief Diversity Officer:

F. CSU Faculty Trustee:

G. Statewide Academic Senators:

IX. Special Committee Reports:

A. Update by Vice Chair McKee and CDO Kathy Wong(Lau) on the Committee on Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations.

This committee was developed as a result of Sense of the Senate Resolution, SS-F18-5, which called for a committee to combat bullying and preserve civility at SJSU. The tasks put forth in the resolved clauses were to make recommendations of any steps necessary to promote a safe and supportive environment. There was a specific task to craft a definition of bullying acceptable and appropriate for our campus, and also to make plans to combat bullying and recommend a formal process for resolving issues.

When the committee was officially charged a year after the resolution passed, the task of crafting a definition of bullying acceptable and appropriate for the campus was missing. There was a lot of debate in the Senate around the definition. The charge of the committee also does not include writing policy. There are some challenges for this committee. Bullying in the literature is an imprecise umbrella term as Appendix A of the Sense of the Senate Resolution touched upon. The fact of the matter is that we know anecdotally and through evidence-based research, such as the Campus Climate and Lecturer Climate Surveys, that bullying does take place within the SJSU community. The reality is that in the current absence of adequate laws, policies, and codes of conduct (and that is part of our audit of resources), those kinds of bullying, unsafe, unsupportive, and exclusive conditions have been somehow tolerated. The question is what is SJSU prepared to do about it?

We spent quite a bit of time in three hour retreats trying to analyze the literature on bullying and understand the inadequacies of resources as well as reviewing policies and other things that are available to try to act on any of these types of complaints and situations. What we developed were three major areas. One is to set expectations and possibly looking at codes of conduct. We discovered that students are held to a much higher code of conduct than employees on our campus in terms of types of ethical and professional behavior. We need to look at how we can use different types of disciplinary conduct and language in order to set some standards.

Another area is providing education and transforming the campus culture. We need to normalize discussions about departures from ethical workplace conduct. We want to make sure people are given tools and examples and we need to get people talking about these issues so they aren't suffering in silence. We also want to provide special programming and resources for people in units and provide communication training initiatives that define ethical workplace expectations.

Then we are also looking at restorative justice programs and frameworks. We would like to centralize and have web-based information. There would be a portal for resources, policies, codes of conduct, and also contacts and resources for mediation. We have accessed the types of resources available on campus, but they are spread out all over campus and none of them

address precisely what we are talking about. Moving forward we are looking at what other places and institutions have done. It is a common problem and struggle. In employment law it is difficult to define bullying and that is part of the struggle when trying to address it from a policy perspective, so these are the three avenues we are examining.

There is a preliminary structure for a committee report that is already being drafted. Our target date is June 1, 2021. What we would like to have is a history of how the committee came to be, a literature review on bullying in higher education, and then the evidence-based assessment of SJSU. The committee charge is very focused on making recommendations.

B. Update from the Athletics Board, the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), the Athletics Director, and the Deputy Director of Athletics

From Marie Tuite, Athletics Director:

Good afternoon everyone. Nice to see all of you via zoom. We will start with a presentation from our FAR.

I'm Tamar Semerjian. I'm the FAR and also a faculty member in and Chair of the Kinesiology Department. My role is to represent faculty perspectives on all aspects of our intercollegiate athletics program and to serve as an advocate for student athlete well-being and also to play a part in maintaining institutional control of the athletics program. First, I have a message from Colleen Johnson, Chair of the Athletics Board who couldn't be here today. Colleen says, "Good Afternoon, I hope you are all doing as well as possible during these challenging times. Thank you for your service in the Academic Senate. My apologies for not be able to join you via zoom. There are a few things I'd like to share with you about what the board has been working on and discussing. First, we have been updating the Athletics Board policy. We will have a referral submitted to the Academic Senate by the end of the semester with significant updates by the board members and it changes one of the positions from the co-curricular AS student member to a student athlete, because we don't have a student athlete on the board. Another thing we have been working on is that we continue to receive information on the various guidelines, modifications and adjustments from the Athletics Department, primarily how student athletes are affected due to COVID which has been going on since March 2020 and I know Laura will be speaking more to that later. We have also modified our meetings to have more focused discussions and not just have reports. Marie Tuite has been great about sending a summary of the report in advance so we can have more substantive meetings. We have continuing discussions about how to increase knowledge and support from main campus, particularly faculty, staff, and students. We have some ideas such as getting resident advisers in housing to incorporate athletic events into some of the programming and having student athletes provide invitations to their faculty for their prospective games and

events so faculty can see what their students are doing on the field and to have a better connection between academics and athletics. We have had continued discussions about how to better recognize our student athlete accomplishments. We are working to recognize our student athlete initiatives and working on ways to teach about racial inequality and advocate for social change. In the coming year we will be talking more about name, image, and likeness. That is a significant topic that is going to impact our campus and we will be talking about that through Spring 2021.

From Tamar Semerjian, the FAR:

As the FAR, I have the great privilege to be in a lot of meetings with our athletics folks, our student athletes, and the coaches. One of the things that has really struck me this year is the tremendous support from the Athletics Department for student athlete activism. SJSU Speaks Up is one example. I want to really emphasize to this body the support the administration and the coaches have given student athletes for student engagement with Black Lives Matter and speaking out about racial injustice and an array of other activities has been remarkable. That level of support is not typical across our conference or the NCAA Athletics Department. I'm really proud of the work that that has been done to support our student athletes within the Athletics department.

I've been working with academic advisers that work with student athletes to help create better communication with the Athletic Department. I've reached out to department chairs to identify academic liaisons in departments where there hasn't always been a strong connection between academic advisers that support our student athletes. This is something that will be ongoing. Eileen Daley is going to speak about the academic achievements of our student athletes during COVID so I'll let her speak more to that. I do want to say that it is my impression as the FAR that academics is really important in terms of the focus of our coaches and student athletes.

The whole athletic team has worked very hard to roll with the punches as COVID has overshadowed all aspects of athletics since March 2020 and the coaches are focused on keeping the athletes safe and engaged. They are zooming with them and doing everything they can to keep those connections. With the constantly changing landscape, it is difficult for the student athletes to navigate. Having their teammates together when they could has been really positive. Every team has had a really different experience. Coaches have worked really hard to stay connected to their athletes and keep them focused on their academic progress.

Another highlight is the Beyond Sparta program which is in the initial stages. This is an extension of Beyond Football which I think the Senate has had presentations on before. It focuses on leadership and community, and

academic engagement. This is now rolling out with other teams beyond football.

The last update I'd like to share is that David Rasmussen, who is in charge of Compliance on our campus, has started a project to ensure we are using best practices to ensure academic integrity and we are reviewing procedures in light of that. We are making modifications to ensure that we are in compliance in terms of reporting and communicating to ensure academic integrity on our campus.

From the Deputy Director of Athletics, Eileen Daley:

We did a historical assessment of where we came from and where we are today. We have been historically consistent with a GPA of 3.0 or higher and we are continuing on that trend. What I did want you to look at was Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, specifically men's soccer, you will see a 2.4 and a 2.73 and then if you look at men's basketball for 2017, there will be a 2.9 and a 2.76. If you then look at men's water polo for 2017 and 2018 you will see a higher GPA. These were some of our at-risk teams that we were very concerned about in terms of their overall performance, APR data, and GPA. I wanted you to hone in on those numbers.

Department average GPA is for Fall and Spring combined and you'll see a progression to 3.26. We are very excited with the outcomes in the spring in light of the pandemic and some of the struggles all our students have had in terms of transitioning online. Next, I'd like you to look at the WU's department wide. We actually improved in this area by 34%. I focused on Fall this year, because for Spring it is very consistent. We tend to perform better in Spring. Our initiatives seem to be working. Some of those initiatives included increasing peer mentoring opportunities for our student athletes. We have really triaged our incoming students with regard to their SATs/ACTs coming in the door. We have increased services for our first time Freshman, incoming Transfers, and International students coming in the door. So far our programs are working, but we have a long way to go, 77 WUs is not a happy number to us. However, a 34% decrease in the number of WUs is a huge win for us.

A little while ago I asked you to look at the men's soccer and basketball from 2017 and 2018. We put more emphasis and support in for them and you will see a 50% reduction in the number of student athletes from those teams that got WUs. There were 32 student athletes from those teams that earned those grades so that is why we put that emphasis into them. It was very alarming to us. You will see those numbers decreased by 50%.

I also looked at the overall student athlete population for Fall, because as I mentioned as a department we perform much better in the Spring. You will see in Fall 2016, 21.27% of our student athlete population had an "F", No Credit, or WU. We have decreased that to 14%. That is an improvement of

7.27%. We are definitely headed in the right direction. Our advisers are working diligently with different strategies to provide support. We have a graduate assistant also assisting our student athletes. What we are doing is working, which is what I wanted to highlight today.

From Laura Alexander, Head Football Athletic Trainer, Assistant Athletics Director for Student Athlete Enrollment and Leadership Development: I just want to highlight some of our COVID protocols that we have been utilizing with our student athletes as we have been repopulating and then participating and preparing them for their conference seasons. Feel free to ask questions. Before any participation, even on campus, we have the athletes decide whether they want to opt in or opt out. We want students to know there are risks involved and it is voluntary. We want them to know they will not be penalized for not participating. In addition, the students sign a COVID Acknowledgement Form stating they understand the risks and to ensure they uphold the protocols and guidelines in order to participate in athletics. As an addendum to the code of conduct for SJSU, we developed a student athlete COVID code of conduct. This is in addition to the acknowledgement form. We want them to understand that there are certain sacrifices they will have to make in order to keep our community as safe as possible. One of these is perhaps not going home for the weekend, or going to any parties. In addition, before they can even return to campus there is a quarantine process they have to undergo at home and on campus, along with having a negative COVID test.

Each of our teams is in a different stage of participation. The red phase includes students and teams that are not participating in any way, shape, or form. This could be students that have opted out or teams that have opted to keep their student athletes at home. The yellow phase includes teams that are participating in household only workouts such as voluntary strength training. Their risk is much lower in the yellow phase than the green phase. The green phase includes our teams that are actively practicing. Right now, that would be football, men's and women's softball, and a few other teams as well. Whatever phase they are in is how we determine the testing protocol and what daily procedures the teams have. The daily protocol includes the procedures we require the student to follow every day in order to come on campus and access our facilities. This includes a daily check-in form which is filled out online. When the student gets to campus, we check their temperature and then we give them a wristband. This allows the student access to our facilities for that day. Finally, when leaving our community student athletes are asked not to participate in any risky behavior such as attending parties/gatherings with people outside our community. We then make sure they follow protocol when they return which usually means a 7-day quarantine where they don't access our facilities and then we test them on the fifth day. On receipt of a negative COVID test, we can then allow them back in the facilities.

Our green teams include football, women's swimming, men's and women's basketball. We require three PCR tests per week. This is a requirement that came down from the county. The tests must be on nonconsecutive days. Every student athlete on a green team participates in these tests. The yellow teams that are practicing individually outdoors have 10% of their population tested once a week and the testing is random every single week. The red teams are students who have opted out.

We've been extremely fortunate. We've collected over 8,600 tests on campus and we've only had 9 positive results in all of athletics since we came back at the beginning of July. We are at a .1% rate.

From the Deputy Director of Athletics, Eileen Daley:
I've just had a couple of dates for our fall 2020 social justice initiatives as Tamar mentioned. What we thought was really important was providing a space for our student athletes to work through these very difficult social justice issues in a supportive environment with staff as advisers and with guidance and leadership. The student athletes developed a committee and they call themselves "SJSU Speaks Up." They are in partnership with "Student Advocates for Social Justice" which is a national organization. What we did was talk about what was important to them. We did our welcome back event in August around social justice and educating them on the resources we have here at SJSU. Dr. Patrick Day, Kathy Wong(Lau), Dr. Carter-Francique, Jahmal Williams, and Dr. Fletcher were extremely instrumental in helping us gear this event for our student athletes. That committee also chose two movies for the entire department to watch to promote education in the realm of social justice. The first movie was "13th" regarding the 13th Amendment. The second movie was "Ruby Bridges." The teams watched these via zoom before we came together for a welcome back event. They have been instrumental in voter education. We registered to vote as a department. Every team incentivized that with t-shirts. They also organized a "Strike for Justice" walk. Their goal was to raise \$1,500. They ended up raising \$3,000 and they donated that money to a local African-American Black Community Engagement Organization here in San José. Our football team has also gotten together and developed a committee called "People of Change." They organized solidarity walks and invited the entire department back in September 2020. They walked to city hall and had a collective gathering about the importance of us sticking together. We've had a good semester and have been very busy.

Questions:

Q: This is so impressive to see how far our academic support has come for our student athletes over the years. Thank you for that. A few years ago, we had some detailed data presented on the number of concussions in the various sports and I'd like to know how we are doing to see if we are doing

better than before? My other question is how much do these PCR tests cost for 8,600 of them and who is paying for that?

A: President Papazian directed me early in this process that no state dollars could be used for any of the testing that we do, so we are certainly going to have to look at other revenue sources. I will say that the football testing would be the most expensive and it is being funded by the Mountain West Conference. It is still an expensive venture. What we are doing is working and I'm convinced the safest place for a 18-22 year old is inside the bubble we've created for athletics.

A: Yes, specifically within the realm of football, the numbers have significantly decreased. Now, the risk of concussion is always going to be the same. I think the level of education we do regularly helps a lot. I think the procedure we take in supporting them through recovery has really helped with problems subsequent to the concussion. We do our best to prevent concussions, but what we can do is support them through the recovery process and any effects later. This is where we are seeing some real improvement.

Q: Tamar, could the Athletics Board track this over time and let the Senate know how we are doing in various sports annually? I know Women's Gymnastics had a really high number a few years ago and it would be nice to see that number go down.

A: This is an excellent point and we'd love to provide that data for you. We can do that on an annual basis in the Spring when we give our Athletics Board Year End Report.

Q: Thank you for this wonderful report. Does the Athletics Board work with the Institute for the Study of Sports, Society, and Social Change, and if they do collaborate what kind of collaboration are they doing? I do know they are doing a lot of social justice work.

A: Absolutely, we are working with the institute. One of the interns in the institute happens to be one of our basketball players, Caleb Simmons, who has been complimented on the work he has done in social justice. It is important that we have that relationship with the institute. We also look forward to enhancing that relationship. Dr. Carter-Francique has been instrumental and vital in providing our student athletes, our coaches, and us in general in our department with guidance for every step, every event. She has been amazing. She actually had a presentation at the Mountain West Conference.

Q: You mentioned the students are not penalized in any way if they opt out. Could you elaborate on what that means? Do you have any numbers on how many students opted out? My understanding is that the PCR test takes about 48 hours for the results to come back, so how do you handle the possibility that by the time you get the results it may be too late and the student has already infected others?

A: Those are three great questions. In terms of not penalizing the students, that is in regards to keeping them on the team and not taking their

scholarships. They aren't penalized in any way. In terms of the number of students who have opted out, we've had almost 100 students opt out this fall out of 550. A number of our International students chose not to return. Also, the NCAA has given an extra year of eligibility. We've also been fortunate to find some labs that get the results of the PCR tests to us generally within 24-36 hours. We are testing every other day almost every single week. When we test on Monday we usually have the results before the end of the day on Tuesday.

Q: I'm told our Track and Field Team is no longer going to have a track on our campus, when they were promised so I'm wondering what is being done to ensure their success?

A: You are correct. We were told a few years ago that if we could raise the money we could have a track, unfortunately, the plans for South campus changed and that will no longer be the case. I'm proud of our track and field program. We have 70 student athletes in the program. We continue to work with San José City College and to use their track. This is where we have been able to practice in the past. Over \$1 million has been dedicated to scholarships for track and field athletes. We continue to support them in other ways, but unfortunately we won't have a track on South campus. This is something we have to manage.

Q: Thank you for the report. The number of student athletes that have tested positive seems to be quite low, but when a student did test positive the teams did shutdown right?

A: Some tested positive when they first got here so we think they brought it with them and they were quarantined and isolated. Eight were asymptomatic. Secondly, I think the first six tested positive upon returning from their homes. There were three track and field, and three football players. We've had one football player who tested positive since August. We are finding most cases came from students moving out of the SJSU community. For every positive case we move forward with the quarantine guidelines from the CDC. When we have a positive case, I immediately contact the Student Health Center and they move forward with case management. They interview to see who has been in close contact. We don't quarantine people that have not been identified as close contacts, but we are very thorough in the process of case management and removing anyone that is a close contact.

C: [Marie Tuite] I'd like to thank Dr. Semerjian for her guidance as the FAR. I think this is her second year. She is the conduit for faculty and their spokesperson. I also want to note that all the presenters today are women, which is sort of unusual. We need to get some of the guys in here to report on the great things happening in Athletics. On behalf of all student athletes, coaches, and staff, we send our sincere thanks to all of you for supporting us. It has been very, very busy time. Our staff has been working non-stop over the last few months. We have an incredibly big football game this Friday. If

you get a chance, please watch the game. If there is anything we can ever do for the Senate certainly reach out to us. Go Spartans.

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

**SJSU Academic Senate
February 8th, 2020 Consent Calendar**

ADD					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Academic Senate	Thomas Austin	0249	47227	2021	Senator –Science
Instruction & Student Affairs	Thomas Austin	0249	47227	2021	Seat S – Science
Committee on Committees	Xiao (Rose) Wang	0101	44990	2021	Seat G – Science
Committee on Committees	Faustina DuCros	0122	45325	2021	Seat H – Social Sciences

Remove					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Committee on Committees	Joanne Rondilla	0107	45325	2021	Seat H – Social Sciences

**Executive Committee Minutes
November 30, 2020
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.**

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Delgadillo, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Papazian, Wong(Lau)

Absent: Faas

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur announced that we have a packed agenda for the Senate meeting of December 7, 2020. We will have 9 to 10 resolutions coming forward as well as two reports. There will be a report from the Athletics Board and another report from the Committee on Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations by Co-Chairs Kathy Wong(Lau) and Vice Chair of the Senate, Alison McKee.

The President will host the Annual Senate Holiday Reception on December 16, 2020 from 3 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Chair Mathur is working with the President's Office on this virtual celebration.

There will be two additional Executive Committee meetings added for January 2021. Chair Mathur worked with the Executive Assistants for the President, Provost, and VPs to ensure the dates work for everyone's calendar. The meetings will be on January 11, 2021 from 12 p.m. to 2 p.m. and on January 25, 2021 from 12 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. The meeting on January 11, 2021 will be dedicated to enrollment and presented by VP Day.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of November 30, 2020, Executive Committee Minutes of November 16, 2020, and the Consent Calendar of November 30, 2020) (14-0-0).

3. From the President:

The president commented that she hoped everyone had a great Thanksgiving at home and didn't travel too far. The new COVID guidelines from the county came down very quickly including the requirement to self-quarantine for 14 days if you travel more than 150 miles from the county. County health officials have been extremely complimentary to SJSU about how we handled the health and safety protocols in terms of the university and the athletics programs. They said SJSU had been exemplary. They have been involved in this with us all along and they were incredibly appreciative of our efforts. We have built a good relationship of trust with the county health officials primarily due to the work of many individuals across the campus including Barbara Fu, our health folks, and all of you. We are a big institution and it makes a difference that we are trying to do everything to get it right.

We spent some time yesterday and this morning working through the adjustments we will have to make on campus as a result of the new guidelines. We will continue to put out communication in regards to this. Many of our students returned yesterday and got in before the 150 miles quarantine went into effect. We have a pretty aggressive testing protocol for our returning students setup for this week. We had over 600 students setup appointments to be tested for COVID. This allowed our students to go home, but ensures they don't bring COVID back with them.

We are continuing forward on the research side. Mohammad and his team are working closely with faculty and others as part of the Adapt Plan. There is a lot of control on that in terms of density and space. They will make whatever adjustments need to be made to continue to be safe and also allow faculty to continue their research. In terms of face-to-face research, there are already some labs moving virtual but some are continuing, because we do have good protocols already in place. Many careful reviews have been done. The new criteria isn't really closing places. It is decreasing the density to 25%. The other piece is around athletics. The 49ers are going to Arizona. We don't know for how long. We are working on some closer to home solutions that will align with county guidelines, but still allow the programs to continue to move forward. We don't have the details ready to announce

yet, but we hope to be able to announce something by tomorrow. This may be playing games at our sister institutions not in our county, but aligned with their public health officials. We have also discussed this with our health officials so they are aware and appreciate we are doing what we can within guidelines. That is the strategy we are using.

Questions:

Q: Can you clarify what “aligns” means for out of our county?

A: Different counties have different guidelines so it means if we were to go out of county, we would be sure to follow whatever criteria the county has set. For instance, if we were to go more than 150 miles, then we would have to quarantine for two weeks upon return.

Q: The Stanford Football team is going to move out of state, but the controversy that has erupted is whether their equity guidelines apply to all their sports. They haven’t announced any similar plans for their women’s teams in Volleyball and similar sports to continue, only their football team. I’m not sure what our women’s sports are for fall, but are the arrangements we make for our football team going to be similar for all sports?

A: There may be different solutions, but there isn’t much going on right now. Most of our sports were moved to spring. Gender equity is always a question we ask. Where it will come into play is maybe for women’s basketball and we wouldn’t do something for men’s basketball that we didn’t do for women’s basketball. The strategies will look different. We don’t have the equivalent of men’s football for women to be frank. The only women’s sport that may have started is women’s gymnastics, but I’m not sure exactly where they are. The idea is to work with all the teams and to do what makes sense and is right for each of them. Most of our sports will resume in the spring. The only sport this fall was men’s football. We have to look at indoor vs. outdoor sports. I appreciate the question a lot and we will be looking at this closely.

One of the conversations we have been having with the senior leadership at the Chancellor’s Office and the Vice Chancellor and the Presidents is about the next eight weeks and really the start of the fall semester. A lot of the schools, like Cal Poly, start early in January. There is an expectation that things will continue to be challenging through January. Where they go from there is hard to say, we aren’t sure yet. This is what we are hearing from the Epidemiologist. There was some talk about encouraging folks to be more online at the start of the semester through January. The good news for us is that we are already doing this and the start of the semester isn’t until January 27, 2021. We are well positioned to start the spring.

At the last trustees meeting, the trustees passed a pretty robust budget request trying to rollback Graduation 2025 budget dollars that were lost in the last budget. They tried to build that back in and that is going to be really important. As far as the surplus information we are hearing about at the state level, who knows. There is still going to be tremendous pressure on the state budget and we will be watching that. We don’t really have the guidance on this yet.

Questions:

Q: There was some discussion that the state was going to give us some additional money to see us through and I’m just wondering if you have heard any update about that?

A: No. Nobody knows. We may request. For example, one request was to add \$16 million worth of line items for Ethnic Studies implementation given that it is a legislative mandate. That is the evaluated cost. We’ll see. We really won’t know anything until the governor proposes his budget in January 2021.

4. The Executive Committee moved into Confidential Session to discuss SJSU CSU Faculty Trustee Nominations.
5. Stanford University has suspended final exams for the entire year due to COVID. There was a concern that they needed to reduce stress on students. There was also a concern that online exams are faulty and unreliable. There were a variety of arguments for why this should be done. SJSU has a

policy that requires culminating experience, but we are wondering if this should be suspended so faculty could do without final exams if they chose to do so.

C: The Stanford move is interesting. I don't necessarily believe in final exams, but I abide by policy. I have chosen to make my final exam a culminating experience, but it is low stakes to reduce stress and is a legitimate activity for the class. I would be in favor of this, but faculty have already built this into their syllabi, so I wonder how this would be handled.

A: I would think the suspension would have to allow final exams as an option.

C: There could be potential accreditation issues, especially in capstone courses. This is a much larger pedagogical question. Do we think high stakes exams have any value in higher education? Giant exams do nothing to advance student work. This pertains to the concern students have about online proctoring. High stakes exams demand some type of proctoring for accountability. When you change the nature of the game, you can get around those kinds of approaches in support of what the students are asking for. This would also probably be very expensive though. It is worth the conversation, but it is a much bigger conversation than just this semester.

C: This is an interesting question, but it is just too late to deal with for fall. We could consider for spring. We do have a policy that says students are required to have culminating experience and it doesn't have to be exams, but it needs to be comprehensive. Maybe we can take steps through the Center for Faculty Development to encourage alternatives to high stakes exams, different types of assessment, specifications grading, and different things like that. As it stands, our faculty have not been trained to do things like that and to ask them to make that adjustment now for fall is too late and even for spring that would require more training. We have a grant from the California Learning Lab that's dealing with specifications grading, but it is going to be small scale and the training isn't starting until summer. People may be aware of it, but they don't know how to do it. It is kind of a unique process.

C: Agree it is too late in the game. There could be a huge outcry from faculty if they couldn't do final exams.

C: Could we look more seriously at this for spring. Unless a vaccine is out, spring is not going to return to normal. I agree there is a major philosophical issue with exams in general. However, we aren't talking about in general. We are talking about during COVID. The stressors are higher and the nature of the exams we give have been altered by this pandemic. It will continue to be so for spring. I would like to see some investigation into ways to introduce flexibility into high stress events for spring semester even if we can't get it in for fall semester.

C: Thank you for bringing this up. There are lots of students that need that final exam to bump their grades up, but there are a lot of students just passing a class because they've been hit with so many burdens related to the pandemic, whether it be financial, mental, or physical. I think looking at this possibly for spring would alleviate some stress for students just because of the different impacts of the pandemic.

C: Final exams don't need to be high stakes. We aren't doing away with assessment. Assessment is still extremely important. There are other ways students can demonstrate what they've learned in the course. It doesn't have to be on the final day. However, it does require planning ahead. I don't think fall is possible, but if we were to try for spring I would encourage that we start planning as early as possible.

C: You don't have to have the culminating experience be high stakes. It does require planning in advance, but that was one of the things I learned in the teach online seminar. It was a different way of looking at it. I agree it is too late for fall though.

C: Two quick points about the spring. If we do encourage faculty to think about non-final exam culminating experience. It would be great if we could do before the end of December, because a lot of

faculty begin writing their syllabus in December. Also, it would be great if the Center for Faculty Development could put together a module on non-final exam modes of assessment as a self-based course in December or January.

Recap by the Chair:

What I am hearing around the room is that there is some support for thinking about alternative ways to assess students in this current environment, but also moving away from high stakes testing in higher education. However, it is too late in the semester to make a move that would cause significant disruption to faculty and staff. We should put this on the list of things to consider early in spring if not earlier.

C: I can even imagine a Sense of the Senate Resolution urging faculty to design their course to reduce high stakes final exams at least for the spring semester due to the stresses of COVID and citing as examples the number of other universities that have abolished final exams altogether. This should have been discussed in September. We shouldn't make the same mistake next semester.

C: At Western Michigan, we began discussing this way in advance and went to less high stakes testing. It ended up stressing out students even more. Faculty designed their courses around a number of group projects and such during finals week. Students ended up having all these projects at the same time during that week for each class. There must be a thorough discussion and then discussions at the department level so we don't overwhelm students.

C: Our policy does say the culminating experience must be during the final exam period.

C: In our next Senate Executive Committee meeting we should start to think about what the Senate needs to consider for Spring 2021. We have a list of two so far. This way we can start planning early to allow for changes and planning.

6. From the Administrators:

a. From the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

First, here is an update on our COVID testing protocols. Students leaving housing were tested before they went home and we are requiring students to be tested upon their return outside the residence halls on Tuesday and Wednesday. Whatever is found out in these tests will result in us activating our ongoing protocols. Just so everyone understands, we have quarantine spaces setup and protocols if students need to go into quarantine on campus. We are likely to see a number of folks that test positive. That is to be expected. It is important for us to find out and get those students the help they need. This is step one. When we go into spring, we will go into a similar process that will occur upon reentry into the residence halls. We will ask students to sequester until they find the results of their test out. To be clear, students who are quarantined are not sitting in a room at the end of the hall by themselves. We have a process to get them the support they need. There are about 800 students living in the residence halls right now. What that means is that it allows for students to have their own individual rooms primarily. There were some adjustments, because our student athletes are now required to live in the residence halls, but generally students have their own rooms. This also allows us to have additional quarantine space. These are required tests for students. There are 381 students who live in our residence halls who live 150 miles or more away from the county. That is as meaningful or meaningless as you make it. It doesn't mean a student went home or didn't go home with another student who lived more than 150 miles away. Nevertheless, all students will be tested.

Questions:

Q: Are student paying the single room rate or their previous rate?

A: They are paying their original room rate.

Q: Do you have information on the insurance students have such as how many are on their parents' insurance, and how many are Californians, and so on?

A: We don't require students to have insurance. In another space I could tell you why that is, but we don't require it. However, we do provide services.

C: So just to clarify, as a university we do not collect any data on student's insurance?

A: Correct, we do not.

Q: Is it possible to make it a question on some type of intake form that is optional just so we can have some idea?

A: I'll have to talk to my boss. There is some sensitivity around doing this and dealing with the insurance of our students in the CSU, so we don't do it. I think this might be something that would have to be approved at the Chancellor's Office level.

A: This is a question we have asked numerous times and there are various complications. It remains something that is of interest to us because we all want our students to be in a position where they can have the best support they need. We will continue to look into it.

C: Before my children went to Santa Cruz and Berkeley, we had to prove they had insurance or buy into their insurance plan.

A: We are not the UC. That is the simplest answer I can give you. The CSU serves different students and this is something managed by the Chancellor's Office. We think there is a lot of logic to looking at this seriously, but there are lots of things that happen in the UC that don't happen here. We'll take that up again. There haven't been any recent conversations about it.

Q: I've had several students ask me where they can get medical assistance on campus. They are students who don't live in housing. I looked around the county to find assistance for some of these students. When the Health Center became the Wellness Center it stopped providing health services. The interesting part is that students don't know where to go either. I believe the last time I looked at the fee structure, part of the student fees went to the Wellness Center. What are these fees paying for?

A: Based on the numbers, there are a lot of students who do know about the Wellness Center. We've remained open at least three days a week. We are having visits to come in and see a general health practitioner, we are doing counseling and psychological services by telehealth, and we are doing telehealth for after-hours services. This is not based on the student living on campus. If they come in with their tower ID card they can get into the student wellness center. This is part of why it would be great to know if people had insurance, because if we setup a network could go to a clinic in their local neighborhood and show their tower card and get local assistance. Students can absolutely access services. If you ever need to you can refer a student to VP Day and he will ensure they get in there right away and get taken care of.

Q: You said that testing was required for students. Is there any resistance from students that don't want to be tested?

A: Not yet, but there will be some folks. The high number of students registering makes me think students are nervous. However, our students get it. When it comes to business items like this they get it. Also, you can't turn on the television right now without seeing something about COVID. There will be some pushback, particularly in the spring if things start to look a bit less dim. However, we have ways to deal with that. Right now we haven't had much pushback. Keep in mind, our student athletes have been doing this three times a week.

Q: Are our student athletes who are tested three times a week all tested or are they spot tested?

A: It depends. In football they are all tested because it is part of the Mountain West protocol. They have an agreement with Quest and Quest comes in and does it. For some of the teams that are only in the early stages it is spot testing. This is what we did with the football team when they first came back. For Basketball it is all of them, because now they are moving into competition. The stages and winter and spring teams in the early stages are handled a little bit differently. In the spring, we will do the testing to begin with and then spot test students. Student athletes will continue to test as per protocol for their own conferences, but we will spot test the rest of the student community throughout the spring.

b. From the Provost:

The faculty panel we have going with Native-American Indian Studies already has 130 people sign-up to listen. We are going to be hiring a senior scholar in that space for the first time.

VP Day and the Provost will be looking at the budget because we need to generate another \$4 million to meet our goal. We are looking at what services we may have to forego or limit in spring. We wanted to do a deeper investment in advising, but we're not sure we will be able to do that. The goal is still \$92 million. The spring will be tighter than we had hoped.

c. **From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):**

We have released the information for the Campus Climate Survey findings report and the slideshow from the Town Hall meetings. The report is about 500 pages long. Only about 30 slides were used at the Town Hall meetings. There are about 220 slides in total. There wasn't time to see all the findings. Those are all available for SJSU identified people to log in and view. We also have the recordings from the two Town Hall meetings for people to review. The CDO encouraged everyone to view the materials and read the report. There are details that are very "sobering." It is also very insightful about how people view the campus. We will also be announcing over the break, the procedures for people to request data from the reports. We own the data set. For those requests in which we find the population within a data set you are requesting as being too small, to preserve confidentiality, we may end up giving out summary information. All of that will be determined through a request process for the data. There will be some forums setup near the end of January where people can give feedback regarding the findings. Information will go out about these during the break.

An invitation for people to self-nominate or nominate someone for the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has went out and will be open through December 21, 2020. It is a committee that will be doing some heavy lifting around the findings. There will be 32 members. We are trying to make it so there are ample opportunity for different representatives across campus. There are seven students. There are more students than many other committees. The committee will be appointed in the spring. There will be two co-chairs—one faculty and one staff member.

d. **From the CSU Statewide Senate:**

We are having midterm committee meetings on December 4th. Senator Curry is on the Faculty Affairs Committee and they will be looking at quality of life issues around COVID. Senator Rodan is on the Academic Affairs Committee and they will be involved with the continued discussion around Ethnic Studies. Senator Van Selst is Chair of the GEAC Committee. We will also be having a second emergency meeting of the ASCSU to complete the discussion that we were unable to complete given the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting and AB 1460. We need to pass a resolution for the Faculty Trustee so he can tell the BOT that we are no longer in support of the GE lower division recommendation.

There was an interesting piece of the BOT meeting about how overly burdened and intrusive General Education is in the CSU and how we have way too many GE courses.

C: Watching that BOT meeting, I was reminded of just how uninformed some of our trustees are and why they shouldn't be involved with the curriculum in the CSU.

e. **From Associated Students:**

AS is planning their winter retreat for some time in January. AS is also interviewing for a Director of Internal Affairs and hopes to have someone appointed by their meeting on December 8, 2020. The Cesar Chavez Community Center has some of their own de-stress events going on through December 14, 2020.

7. From the Policy Committees:

a. **From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

O&G will be bringing an amendment to the standing rules to include the land acknowledgement to the Senate meeting on December 7, 2020.

b. **From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):**

I&SA is working on the waitlist policy, a Sense of the Senate Resolution for grades and transcript notations for 2020 that will ask for maximum flexibility, and a policy that suspends the DQ portion of S16-16 similar to what we did in Spring 2020. I&SA will be bringing these three to the Senate meeting on December 7, 2020.

Questions:

Q: Will it be possible to track the DQ's in terms of what percentage and what year and so on? I'm thinking about programs with accreditation issues, so they can account for that in their reports.

A: They are tracking these students. AARS and the Student Success Centers are doing outreach. They track this by college and by department.

c. **From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):**

The PS Committee will be bringing four resolutions to the December 7, 2020 Senate meeting. Two of the resolutions are updates to two of the three RTP policies with regard to the College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE) name. We already fixed this issue in one of the three RTP policies.

Two other policies are first readings related to joint appointments. One is an amendment to the appointments policy that would define what a joint appointment is. The other is an amendment to the procedures policy that would define how RTP committees will deal with joint appointments.

PS is cancelling today's meeting because we have setup lots of subcommittee meetings for January. There will be subcommittees on revising the lecturer policy, making RTP more friendly for people of color, and others for that matter, by broadening our definition of scholarship and reemphasizing our service to students, and one on creating a Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing the University of Chicago Board of Academic Freedom Statement from 2014. The University of Chicago Board of Academic Freedom Statement from 2014 has been endorsed by more than 100 universities across the nation and we think we should join them.

Questions:

Q: Has Professor Brent, Chair of the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Standards, been in contact with you regarding the time, place, and manner presidential directive recently?

A: No. At the beginning of the semester we had some exchange, but not recently. I know the Board of Academic Freedom was providing some feedback on the time, place, and manners presidential directive. Should I be in contact with him?

A: Yes, I think so. They have come up with something I think Professional Standards should take a look at.

A: I will ask him.

d. **From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

C&R will be bringing two policies to the Senate on December 7, 2020. The first policy amends our General Education (GE) policy to incorporate Area F and shorten Area D by three units and will be a final reading. The second policy is a new policy on Accessibility in Curricular Materials. We have worked on this policy for two years. The materials are not ready for a final reading, but we need to get feedback in its current form. It could be a little controversial. We will probably include some form of a white paper to give context. In addition, C&R continues to work on curriculum.

Comments from the Chair:

We have been working with the Provost and Ethnic Studies faculty regarding the GE policy coming forward. Specifically, there is a message going out campus-wide regarding the GE policy as far as where we are and the progress we have made going forward.

Questions:

Q: We won't be voting on or looking at the actual criteria, but the learning objectives and questions will be decided at a future event, is that correct?

A: Yes, but I think that the majority of those questions will be answered by the Executive Order. It is my understanding we could add to the learning outcomes, but there are five of them already being proposed. Once the Executive Order comes out that will help guide us.

Q: Can SJSU be more strict than the Executive Order?

A: Yes.

C: The current guidelines can be an overlay with only areas C and D.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:38 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on November 30-December 1, 2020. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on December 2, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 25, 2021.

Executive Committee Minutes
January 11, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Delgadillo, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Papazian, Faas

Absent: Wong(Lau)

Guests: Anagnos, McElroy, Scalfani

1. A motion was made to approve the agenda of January 11, 2021. The motion was seconded. The committee voted and the motion passed (13-0-0).
2. Chair Mathur presented a policy recommendation, *Time Limited Amendment of Research Oversight (Final Reading)*. Chair Mathur noted that the Executive Committee was acting on behalf of the full Senate while the Senate is not in session in accordance with Senate Bylaw 4.2.1. Senator Peter presented a motion to approve. The motion was seconded. The Executive Committee voted and the motion passed (14-0-0).
3. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair Mathur and President Papazian expressed sadness over the recent deaths in the Capitol protests as did the entire committee.
4. Enrollment Presentation by Vice President (VP) Day:
VP Day expressed appreciation to the Executive Committee for all their hard work. We have been in a pretty strong enrollment state. However, VP Day shared some concerns he has about the sustainability of our enrollment and where we are headed. VP Day expressed appreciation for all the conversations that the Executive Committee has had on this subject and any feedback given. Enrollment belongs to all of us and we all need to think about it.

Over the last year, we engaged in an enrollment management process where we tried to pull together some ideas. What we are hoping for today is to talk a little bit about this concept, but also talk about some of the questions and concerns you may have about enrollment. The concept before you came about as a result of the Strategic Management Enrollment process. There are a series of 19 recommendations. Today we will talk about the ideas and your concerns, and what you think we should be looking at in the enrollment management process. We will not go through all 19 of the recommendations, but will touch on a few key points.

VP Day was at UOP when the bottom fell out of Law School Enrollment. It was a very challenging situation. Law School is not as expensive as many of the Ph.D. programs. It was a fairly safe bet and had been successful for a very long time. One day the bottom fell out. Many institutions were trying to figure out if they could even continue to have a law school and some could not. Some schools had to consolidate with other schools, and some had dramatic reductions. It was cataclysmic across most law schools. The elite laws schools still did well but for most it had a dramatic impact. This is why we need to be talking about this right now and work on where we are headed. We need to look at the trends and continue looking at those trends. Things will not stay the same no matter how much we wish they would. Sometimes it is the quiet shifts that do the most damage.

Our spring application period just concluded. Right now, our fall undergraduate applications are down 5.1%. That is not bad compared nationally. Our frosh are down 5.9%, and our transfers are down about 3.5%. Overall our headcount is up for the spring, but our frosh enrollment is down almost 8.5%. This is about 217 students. That is not a small number. Our spring sophomore enrollment is down almost 9.5%, which is 241 students. These are things that we need to be paying attention to,

particularly frosh enrollment. There are two other things VP Day would like everyone to think about. First, we don't currently have a strategic enrollment plan. We have done well in terms of our enrollment, but we don't have a strategic enrollment plan. We have limited recruitment strategy. We do not have the kind of recruitment strategy plans that are going to develop markets and those kind of things. VP Day is concerned that we need to diversify our enrollment across programs. We need to look at if we are spread well across our 145 programs, or do we have large blocks where students are and then other places where students are not. We need to talk about where we have the opportunity to grow. The softening of our frosh enrollment is something that has been happening over the last couple of years. Also, the decline in international students has had a significant impact on our campus, which has one of the largest populations of International students. This then begs the question of how do we make up those numbers? What does this mean for other opportunities for out-of-state enrollment?

We setup four working groups headed by Thalia Anagnos and Sharon Willey talking about academic planning and student success. The four groups included Academic Planning Infrastructure, Improving Retention Rates, Enrollment in Current and New Programs, and Branding and Marketing. We are not going to go through all 19 of the recommendations today, but just a few in each category. The one that is of particular reference to this group is Academic Planning Infrastructure. There may be some opportunity for us to strengthen our current policy and also our practices, and to think about ways to program. Academic strategy and the Academic Plan are incredibly important because it drives how we think about the future of our enrollment and how we use resources.

The second category is Improvement and Retention Rates. We talked about this a little bit. We really need to think about what it means to be an SJSU student and how do we make sure students across the campus have that experience. How do we bring students into the institution? Do we bring them in living in the residence halls, or not living in the residence halls, and how do we do this? We have made improvements, but there is much work to do. We are also not moving our achievement gap. We need to increase the sense of belonging for frosh and transfer students.

The third category is Enrollment in Current and New Programs. We have thousands of students who are eligible to come to SJSU who we do not have space for. That is something we need to think about. We need to consider if there are other ways to increase capacity and where that makes sense for us. We need to consider the scalability of graduate programs, and think about how we can increase the number of graduate students that we have. We think this is a real opportunity. We also need to think about how we can keep undergraduates and bring them into 4+1 programs. This does not mean we would not continue to serve those graduates we currently have. This goes back to the question of enrollment diversification. Just like in your portfolio, you need to have multiple places to move around so that when something shifts, we have ways to back that up.

The fourth category is "Branding and Marketing". We need to really look at our digital communication and how do we communicate with students. Some of you have college students and you are seeing the ways other colleges are communicating with them on a regular and ongoing basis. We have an opportunity to build some capacity in this space for our own communication to recruit, and also to communicate with them once they are here. How do we over time move them from recruitment to application. This is a deliberate process.

The next slides are some projected recommendations including a pandemic recommendation and post pandemic recommendations. What will our percentage of online classes look like versus in-person classes? This is not saying lets have 4,000 additional students in One Washington Square. This is a recommendation around how do we think about a distributed increase in the number of students on the campus.

If anyone has additional areas you think we should be looking at, VP Day would appreciate your input. The role of this committee was to put forth recommendations. This is not the final version. This is just the beginning of the process.

Questions:

C: I'm from India and I get a lot of questions from people who have children who are ready to go to college. I can tell you that America is no longer number one in their planning. There are many opportunities now in India as well as Australia and Canada. Interestingly enough, although cost has been an issue, safety is their concern now with America.

A: Yes, we are considering all of these issues and concerns and thinking through how to address these concerns. I want to emphasize having been to Australia, I have heard the safety issue from parents and it is beginning to show in the numbers. The enrollment in Canada and Australia is increasing. Your point is very well taken.

Q: How do you see doctoral programs, which are very expensive to setup, fitting into the CSU?

A: [Provost] It is important to frame that I don't think we are talking about academically-oriented doctoral programs. Today, 65% of Ph.D. holders in Computer Science go into the private job market. They don't go to the academy. We aren't talking about your classic doctoral programs. We are looking at Ph.D.'s in other areas like Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy.

[VP Day] My point about the law school is a relative comparison. Certainly, having the support services, particularly as the legal profession changes has become more important. My point is that historically people did not think about law school in the same kind of way as professional preparation where you go out and there is a job waiting for you and so forth.

Q: If you haven't already, take a look at our curricular priorities policy that says when programs need to be created or removed. This may be very helpful. Regarding the First-Year-Experience (FYE), we have a rich history of FYE programs. When Marshall Goodman was Provost that was his one claim to fame. The university invested a lot into it. It took a lot of resources. Seminar rooms were built in Clark Hall. I happen to think it was a big success, but it died do to a lack of support. We were losing money on every section taught because the sections were so small. All we need to do to reactivate the program is to take it out of the moth balls and provide the resources. Regarding the equity gap, one of the RTP reforms we are contemplating is reintroducing civic sense into our RTP documents. It was in the old policy, but did not make it into the new policy. This might be one way to encourage our tenure track faculty to start taking educational equity seriously. As far as the ninth concept of matching capacity to demand, I can think of programs with far less demand, such as animation and illustration, that would bankrupt the university if we met all the demand. These are programs that are in high demand but are also very expensive. We need to increase demand in areas we can afford.

A: [VP Day] I think the idea is that we want to be mindful that we are not completely divorced from demand. I hear what you are saying.

[Thalia Anagnos] We have about 1,000 students we are turning away every year and I think the question is could we do more for the local community since the demand is so high? There is a fine balance to not bankrupt the university as you said, but also meet the demands of the local community.

Q: Graduate programs are very challenging to support for faculty in terms of getting students through them, and COVID-19 just adds to that. I'd recommend talking with other universities that have tried this strategy to see what worked and did not. I'd recommend talking to Director of Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership in the College of Education. He has been at universities where they have tried to double their doctoral programs and it was an absolute disaster. We don't want to make the same mistakes. Also, which programs are most easily scalable graduate programs?

A: [Thalia Anagnos] I didn't do graduate enrollment, Marc d'Alarcao has been modeling that. We split into five groups and one of them had graduate programs and they had a list of criteria. What I can do is ask Marc to contact you.

[Provost] Having done this at other universities and having looked at the market, many doctoral programs such as Nursing and Occupational Therapy have workload issues and we have to manage that. However, these programs are project-based, so the workload goes differently. There are Nursing Practitioner programs that have 300 to 400 people. These programs can be quite large when they are meeting market demand. The big picture is that as we do some of this stuff, we shift where we are

ranked and against which schools. This also has an impact on undergraduate enrollment. People are looking at you then in the national rankings versus the regional ranking. There are different effects that are sometimes not as measurable as the number of doctoral programs you need to have to move into those categories. They are not as large as you might think.

[Thalia Anagnos] Also, I think part of this from the perspective of curriculum development, is additional graduate programs. We have seen a lot of new graduate programs being developed. There is a tradeoff between growing an existing program, when there is capacity and if it is easily scalable, versus developing a new program. This is a nuance that sometimes people don't think about in terms of growing a program instead of creating a new one.

[Provost] In terms of Ph.D.'s that we don't have right now, they are probably going to be in areas where we have high research capacity and have connections to other doctoral universities if we can't offer those on our own. There is a lot of work to be done in that space, but if you are going to try and become an expert or become a regional center of say, fire research it is very handy to have doctoral students around working in those labs. You are generating different kinds of effects. However, there is no doubt that there will be a differential workload. There would have to be a different way of measuring the workload if say you were carrying four or five doctoral students. They take a lot of work.

C: You mentioned student advising experience and what is working and what is not. It would be very helpful to have an update in the future to the Executive Committee on this. Also, you mentioned "quiet shifts" and I follow quiet shifts in my research on data and the use of the data especially by third party companies that are partnering with universities. One of the quiet shifts that is happening is misuse of predictive analytics to try to strategize which students should be admitted based on their likelihood to succeed and to graduate and things like that. I would urge serious caution, especially since we are concerned about equity issues. Many of these solutions come with language that sounds like they are going to be equity-minded, but they are absolutely racist if you look at the way they are labeling students and are using past historical data from datasets that are based on problematic analyses. Just as a heads-up about it.

A: [VP Day] Let me just say one thing. There are no predictive analytics used in the enrollment process. You are eligible or you are not. I want to be clear on that. However, your point is very well taken, but it is not part of our admission process.

C: Good to know.

Q: Before we dive into doctoral programs, we need to look at the negative consequences. Growing doctoral programs would significantly impact research grants. Many of our grants are based on our status as a minority institution. We could lose that with these doctoral programs.

A: [Provost] It would have to be a very large number to change that. We are not looking at 15% to 30% of our graduate education being doctoral.

C: Not right now, but as we grow that could be a consequence.

A: [President] I've been through this at other institutions. It is an important question. These are all questions that go into the branding. Who knows where this is going to go over time. There is a lot of discussion on this. We are also growing the research in other areas of the support and infrastructure. It all goes hand and glove. These are important questions to ask, because we want to be sure we can continue to grow the support that faculty and students have for their initiatives. That will be part of the work the research development folks engage in. What we don't want to see is that we are doing this and then there is a drop off. We will pay attention to that.

C: I think the key is growth and not subtraction from other programs. We already have a very important structure in Biological Sciences. However, the start-up funds our faculty get for research are nowhere near what you get at CSU East Bay or San Francisco State University. This has been a complaint for the 15 years I've been here. The start-up funds we gave our faculty last year were the same as I got 13 years ago. That is a big issue. One of the things we do well is work with undergraduate students and minority students in putting them into doctoral programs. We have an opportunity to increase the number of minority students. However, if you move money away from us that would cripple us. The key is growth versus redistribution of funding.

A: [President] I think that is right. Nobody is looking to hurt any programs. It is a question of where are the needs? Where can we make a difference? What is the impact? Things shift all the time. The key

is to continue to evolve and develop better supports. The Provost is working with the VPRI on how to continue to enhance the start-up costs. I will say that the start-ups exist in different fields and in some areas may need more, but say \$20,000 in the Humanities or Education field could make a huge difference in terms of the ability of that faculty member to be successful. The key is to try and figure out how to provide support that faculty need across the board and continue to find ways to grow the resources and the impact. I don't see us jumping into a Ph.D. in Biology tomorrow. We are talking about more filling gaps that don't exist, like the Wild Fire Sciences example. That is a gap that doesn't exist and there is a need. One would have to make the case for some of the other sciences. This is a planning document to start these discussions. This is so that we can come up with a strategy which is very much in the process right now. We want it to make sense and to align with our RTP plan and enhance our commitment to equity. Frankly, we are also going to be going out with a comprehensive campaign to try and raise support. There is a lot to think about. As we go forward there will be many more opportunities to ponder this and bring forward questions and recommendations.

Q: I think it is really important to think about enrollment. I've had lots of conversations with Sharon Willey even before the pandemic about trends that were coming. I would like to talk about retention. It is great when we get students here, but we may not be able to keep them. The key point I think is a sense of belonging. Although I'd like to say coming to my class keeps every student coming back to SJSU, but what really increases a sense of belonging is what is happening in terms of the co-curricular experience of our students on the campus. It is also important when addressing eliminating equity gaps that if you look around the campus and you don't see yourself there, or you don't see yourself being supported at the campus level even in terms of walking into an office to get help, those are things that we don't really talk about as much publicly as we should. We talk a lot about the Academic Affairs side since we are all academics and that is where we can really move the needle, but I feel like we need to think about what are those co-curricular experiences that keep our kids connected to the university. If you all think about your own degrees and what keeps you connected to those institutions, mine is based on many of the co-curricular experiences as a Frosh in the dorms. We do need to think about this more deeply in terms of the student experience on our campus. I don't know what strategies have been discussed thus far in terms of improving that sense of belonging as our students walk the campus. The second thing is dollars. When we think about graduate recruitment, my budget as the graduate coordinator in my department was \$0. I would meet with students and try to encourage them to come, but I did not get any release time or funding. I did that for free for essentially five years. We had nothing to entice students except for the quality of our program. In terms of growing our program, graduate recruitment requires investment around the recruiting process. Has this been discussed?

A: [Thalia Anagnos] Marc d'Alarcao has been working closely with the Strategic Communications group and they gave us an amazing presentation a few weeks ago. They are identifying specific programs and have ideas about recruiting and taglines that we haven't used in the past as well as new materials. We have never had a cohesive strategy. The idea is to have a much more cohesive branding of the way we create our materials and who we send them out to. It is coming along and in the next year or two I think you are going to see a lot more coordination with respect to that outreach.

C: That is good news because it was one of the most frustrating experiences. There were no dollars and I felt like I was out there alone, even in terms of the graduate adviser network on the campus. My last comment is about enrollment. To recap, what I think we are talking about in this meeting, in terms of the pandemic and then in terms of where we want to be in 2027, is trying to increase our population by 3,000 to 5,000 students. The way we are thinking about doing that is by accessing different markets or providing space for students trying to get into our programs, but this also might change the nature of the population of students on our campus. One of the things we are very proud of is being a transformative university, we even use it on our tagline. We may be accessing different pockets of students we haven't accessed before, but they aren't necessarily aligned with the transformative aspect of our university. Has there been a discussion about how these 3,000 to 5,000 students might actually change that aspect in terms of maybe getting fewer first generation students in our programs than we have in the past?

A: [Provost] If you are talking about adult learners, they are much higher first generation and tend to be more diverse in addition to having higher eligibility than our campus. We are not the high Pell eligible first generation campus that people talk about compared to Stanislaus or other places, or

Davis even. We already have a more diverse population than some of the other institutions. If the road we choose to go down is the adult learner population, then they certainly would not hinder us in that way. They could bring more diversity to the campus.

[VP Day] I really appreciate this point. It is one we need to be really focused around. I think the development of new markets doesn't necessarily translate into the development of new and different students. Will there be some, perhaps. I'll give you some examples. Fifty percent of our African-American students are coming from Los Angeles. I could name three or four different high schools in Los Angeles that we don't have a strong recruitment base where we could recruit more of the same students we have right now, but we don't have the relationships there. We have gone out to ask for reconsideration of our local admission area to recruit the same students that we are serving now but diversify that in the East Bay and particularly South of where we are. The markets we are talking about look a lot like what we have right now but we are not as developed relative to recruitment strategies to bring those students to our campus. Your point is very well received. I don't think it is about, "Let's become something totally different." I actually think it is about taking advantage of places we are undersubscribed relative to the populations that continue to have us as a Hispanic-serving institution, as an Asian-serving institution, and then increase the number of Black students on the campus for example. However, your point is well taken

C: [Coleeta McElroy] I just wanted to address one of your earlier comments about co-curricular experiences. One of our committees that was under the same umbrella was the, "Undergraduate Student Experience." As part of that strategy, not only did we look at our first-year experience and our transfer experience, but also we looked at how we can work with all of our students. If you look at our numbers, we have a large number of students who are juniors and seniors who have registered for spring because they know they are that close but then we need to look at are they having a great experience here, or are they just rushing to get out of here. We are looking at different programming as to how we can communicate differently with these students to improve their experience here, what programs need to be incorporated, and how do we work with our advising units in order to get that done.

C: I was talking with Zobeida Delgadillo and one of our conversations was about why students leave SJSU early. It really wasn't related to academic reasons. It was because of reasons such as they were struggling to do things like fill out a lease and they didn't know where to go to get the support they needed for off campus housing. This was something I had never even thought of until Zobeida brought it up. It made sense as soon as she said it. They didn't know how to navigate that process. I am concerned about the co-curriculars in terms of students feeling that SJSU is their campus and there are people here they can turn to for assistance and help with whatever they need.

C: That's also where we need to look at our financial literacy programs and what we need to improve in order to provide that for our students. A lot of the students who are first time out of the home may have more knowledge than their parents depending on their background and where they came from. Not only are these students learning but they are going back and teaching their parents, because a lot of the parents are involved in their financials. These are services and programs we need to look at.

C: I just want to say one thing about the parents, I think we need to do education for parents, because I've tried to recruit many students from our undergraduate programs into our master's programs and one of the things they say is that their parents aren't convinced that a master's degree is going to help them in the job market. Even though I can show them evidence it is hard as the professor in the classroom to say, "Don't listen to your parents, it will make a difference." Working with the parents and getting that information about the value of a graduate degree even in those degrees where there are definitely applied reasons for getting a graduate degree. My program is actually one of those degrees because we do go out into fields that require those master's degrees if you want to be in a supervisory or managerial position.

Q: I'm on campus in Clark Hall right now. In getting here this morning, I noticed it is a complete urban wasteland. The money is leaving Silicon Valley. To what extent are we able to predict and take into account the changing economic context of where we are located? How did you factor that in?

A: [VP Day] I think for us, it provides an opportunity. Education allows people to navigate some of those things and we can look at similar urban serving public universities in places where that trend has already happened, or rust-belt institutions that have continued to thrive when they had a balanced strong academic program and market awareness. We still have an opportunity and we are

at a price point that is good and solid. I do think though that we will have to strengthen our outcomes. We are going to have to think about advising. If you come to SJSU what happens? We have to get that narrative out there. That doesn't exactly answer your question, but I think that to the extent that we can prepare to have stronger outcomes and be something people believe is worthwhile investing in, our position is actually quite well. As a rust belt kid in some of the institutions that I studied, they were in a much worse position than we are and they found a way to thrive.

Q: Do we know exactly how many adult learning students we are talking about?

A: [VP Day] There are real numbers of students who want an SJSU degree but can't stop working to get it.

[Provost] The number of students who leave California and get online degrees elsewhere is between 150,000 to 200,000 students. They are actually very diverse. When we did this at Arizona, we thought we would get a very White population, but it turned out that we got more Hispanic students than we did on the main campus, so it actually helped diversity. The market has changed dramatically the last 10 years. There are a lot of places we can increase diversity and we have the pricing ability to do that.

[VP Day] This is a real strategy.

C: The title of the Senate Retreat is "SJSU and the Post-Pandemic Campus," and I'm putting together a panel of students to discuss attracting, supporting, and retaining students at SJSU from the student perspective. The topic of enrollment has some real intersections.

Q: I wonder if anyone here remembers the over 65 program we had at SJSU which was for some reason dropped. I always had one or two seniors in every class and it was wonderful. It diversified the classroom in a different way. As I get older, I am learning about the rampant ageism in our society, another form of bigotry. Bringing more seniors into our classrooms would be wonderful. If they were all learning online it might not work as well for my purposes, but could we diversify who we attract by going to seniors and getting them back in the classrooms? My second question is can we stop using SAT scores in admissions? It seems to me that using them in admissions probably deters the people we are trying to attract.

A: [VP Day] Here is my sense. It is tough to get enough seniors to enroll in large numbers. That doesn't mean we couldn't create pathways. Where I do think we are seeing students engage is in non-degree seeking programs. Some institutions have actually built residence halls to attract seniors for both financial reasons and also to add a different element to the campus. We may or may not be a campus that can do that given our location, but those are the kinds of engagements I have seen around seniors and where they tend to be most interested. As for your second question, there is a real discussion going on right now. The Provost and I have a joint meeting with the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs across the CSU system discussing whether or not post pandemic, we should be going back to using standardized test scores. From my meetings, I can tell you most people are not interested in going back to standardized tests. They feel like there are other ways students can get there. I will report back to the Executive Committee on this.

Q: I experience a lot of trouble when trying to help at risk students to stay at SJSU, or to come back to SJSU after being gone for a while. This past year, I helped two students who were trying to come back to SJSU. It is very difficult to navigate the petitions and the requirements, the 7 year rule, and determining who gets to decide if they are let into a class or not. I had to ask a professor, "Who makes the decision to add the student into classes?" He said he did. I asked, "Why?" I didn't think it was his decision to do that, but he did and this created yet another barrier for the student. As for seniors, I believe there is interest there. When I taught at Holy Lake College, we had students that were supported by their corporation that allowed them to attend weekend college courses. I taught late nights and weekends and I had very diverse students there. That has not been my experience at SJSU. All of my over 65 students have been White, but I think it is worthwhile thinking about them. I'd like to make one additional point. About four years ago there were a number of students admitted into the Social Work program and they encountered a lot of problems, because although they were admitted, there were no classes for them to begin to complete their requirements. Those students were very disappointed. They came to SJSU because it had been marketed to them that this was the

place that served the Latino population. They ended up in one of my classes and mentioned the problems and I told them all the names of people to talk to. The point I'm making is that students who come from different backgrounds encountered the kind of issues Chair Mathur raised about the quality of life, how they fit in, whether they are paid attention to, and whether their questions are addressed. One last point I'd like to raise is that I think we really need to think about when we are considering solutions to problems of reduced enrollment, how can we ensure that we are actually meeting the needs of our population in terms of the various ways students can enter the university and are we meeting their expectations. Being first generation and/or a second language speaker doesn't mean they don't know things. They often come from families that are incredibly resourceful in finding ways to survive. I sometimes think when we look at the cost benefits we sound a little bit like we are a business. I don't think of higher education as a business.

A: [VP Faas] We are a \$700 million dollar entity, this is a business. Make no mistake about it. I agree with the direction you are going in, but this is a business.

C: I understand that and that it costs money, but it is a public university and I'm proud of that. That means service to the public in a variety of ways. That is what I was referring to. We need to think about these things and what we should be proud of at the end of the day is continuing to meet the needs of our community. That is what we are about. I think that is important.

[VP Faas] One of the things we are looking at is a different angle on the enrollment side. We look at what is the cost to educate students and those type of things, but what we really look at is the opportunity cost. We have nights and weekends and Fridays where the campus is a ghost town. If we were to attract seniors for classes on those days and nights that would be an opportunity where we are sitting completely idle right now.

C: The range of experiences that seniors can bring to a class is tremendous.

A: [VP Day] There are institutions like us that have moved the needle, and the way they have done that is by shifting process, they have redesigned classes, and they have dramatically shifted advising. It's not magic. They have done things in very different ways. We are going to have to do some of that. We need to get to 37,000 to 40,000 students by keeping some of those students we already have, not just by adding students. We are going to have to really wrestle with some things that are going to challenge all of us in all areas and in the way we do business. If we did a classroom utilization survey right now, I'll bet we could find all kinds of opportunity. It will be about the students and not about us, such as people teaching classes on days and times that are best for those students, and advising being available on alternative days and times that the student is attending classes. We have the resources to get this done. It will be hard but we can get there.

C: [VP Day] I want to acknowledge Thalia Anagnos, Sharon Willey, Coleeta McElroy, and Jennifer Sclafani. Jennifer Sclafani is the incredible staff member who does all the communication that happens with our students in the enrollment process.

C: Sometimes I feel like this university has conflicting initiatives because the idea of using classrooms in the evenings and on the weekends is a great idea, but we are also trying to move the needle on our research enterprise. For faculty it is a very difficult decision about how to utilize their time, and when and where they can get research done. I think it is sometimes a very difficult balance. Sometimes I think we are going in opposing directions. This is confusing for faculty.

C: Many of us do teach at night. I am often scheduled from 7 p.m. to 9:45 p.m. We don't have the resources when we teach. If we do these online programs are students getting a degree from SJSU or SJSU online?

A: [Provost] You have to give them the same degree with the same requirements. If we can't do that then we shouldn't be offering them.

[VP Day] Great question though.

[Provost] There are institutions that have separated the balance but it is a horrible way to go. It takes a lot of the authority out of the hands of the faculty, which is a bad idea. Faculty need to manage the curriculum and what the learning objectives are and so on.

Q: It sounded as though you had met some resistance to online classes and attracting different groups of students. Has there been some kind of formal resistance?

A: [Provost] There is a little active and passive resistance. What I'm not doing right now is going out and hiring a new Vice Provost for Online Learning. We have really let people volunteer in. The

College of Education is running a new program. There is another college right now where people think this is an attempt to move SJSU to a completely online campus. That is as far away from where I want us to be as possible. However, there are some students out there who we could teach if we can reach them. There are also some workload issues. People are nervous given the current economic climate. What I often get is, "We are not quite ready." Okay, but if we keep going there we are not going to build anything that effective. The challenge is with only one or two programs out there, there isn't enough catalog for people to get interested. You really need 10, 12, or 13 programs to go out and market the experience. Those are the kinds of things we are looking for right now. By the way, it is not just SJSU. In the CSU system everything is in our way. It really is having someone in charge of it that can answer the questions. However, I haven't wanted to add another administrative position since we are doing pretty good financially right now and I don't want to invest in another position; so we are letting this evolve organically a little bit. I hope people turn the corner. I just want to remind everyone that the 25 to 45 year old population would love to come sit in your classes, but they can't because they are working. This is the economic reality. This is the challenge that this group faces. That is the struggle. If I had my way, everyone would get four years of free college and we'd pay for it as a country. We don't have that so how do we get to people? The resistance has been around whether this is a different degree. Well no, but how do you meet the learning outcomes? The resistance is like you can't do that asynchronously, but yes you can. It is hard and takes work. This is where things breakdown.

C: We don't do enough recruiting. We have a lot of opportunity to bring students here. You mentioned recruiting black students from Los Angeles, but why aren't we recruiting students from other states as well?

A: Yes we need to consider that as well.

5. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on January 11, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on January 19, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 25, 2021.

Executive Committee Minutes
January 25, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Papazian, Wong(Lau)

Absent: Delgadillo

1. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of January 25, 2021, Executive Committee Minutes of November 30, 2020, and January 11, 2021, and the Consent Calendar of January 25, 2021) (13-0-0).
2. President's Update:
There will be a Board of Trustee's meeting tomorrow. We do not expect the cuts in funding that we had last year. After the tax returns are received we should know more. Where we may see an increase in funding is for the Graduation 2025 initiative. However, it may be one time base funding to cover mandatory costs. Any deferred maintenance will also be with one time funds. CARES2 is expected to bring us about \$46 million. We may see some money from MSI grants. We received a couple of million dollars last time. With the CARES funds, we will provide support to students again. We gave \$14.6 million to students from the first CARES Act. We still need to be prepared for shortfalls over the next three years. We also want to continue to support faculty development such as with the e-campus. We also need to invest in technology.

The Policing Taskforce has been meeting and working on their report and recommendations. In addition, the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusiveness is reviewing nominations.

The CSU Wang Family Excellence Award was announced and even though we did not have a campus winner this time, we had some excellent nominees.

The term of the FAR is expiring this year and with the pandemic it is especially important to have consistency and experience in this vital role. President Papazian recommends reappointing Tamar Semerjian for a second term and noted that Lisa Millora will be reaching out to consult with the faculty members of the executive committee regarding this reappointment as outlined in policy.

Questions:

Q: Higher Education is in tier 1B for the COVID-19 vaccine, is the campus doing anything to get us vaccinated? And, if you don't live in Santa Clara County will you be able to get the vaccine on campus if you are an employee?

A: We are having conversations with the county about becoming a vaccination site. We don't know if that will happen yet. If it does, we will vaccinate our employees.

A: What we need to understand is that some CSU's are the biggest employer in their county such as SLO and Humboldt. We are not in Santa Clara County. We are making strides to show the county how we can contribute. We have been more of an afterthought prior to President Papazian's arrival. Long Beach has a long standing relationship with the county so their situation is different. We are finding that the fairgrounds are more of a drive-in and it is a lot of hard work to vaccinate there. We have a lot more to offer here.

C: What I don't want to see is some of SJSU get the vaccination and some not.

Q: What percentage of employees must be vaccinated before we can return to campus in Fall 2021?

A: We can't require it from employees or students. We might be able to as part of our athletics program and for those students living in the residence halls. The Chancellor's Office is working through this now. However, it is very clear that we cannot require it.

C: We won't ever really know if we hit 70% vaccinated. We will take precautions. There will be no large lecture classes over 50. We will plan based on the size of the classrooms. Many students are telling us they don't want to physically come back. They want a more diverse schedule and many

want to stay online. When surveyed, only 54% of our students wanted to return to face-to-face instruction. Our future will involve more flexibility.

Q: When we have students who don't want to return, are we expected to continue with hybrid classes and zoom when we return to in person teaching?

A: I've been telling people to offer flexibility where you can. On the other hand, I've told students we can't send the airplane parts to you for you to do a lab at your home. The critical thing is whether vaccinations are not done by August 1st for the students. We could have lots of students not vaccinated. This could be very risky. We will be tracking this all semester.

Q: I heard women's basketball was cancelling due to COVID. Are we cancelling women's sports? What about men's basketball?

A: Each team made their own decision. The teams are tested all the time. There have not been many issues with the male teams. However, there were some positive tests with women's basketball. Each team decides on a case-by-case basis.

3. The Executive Committee discussed nominations for review committees for Dean Walt Jacobs and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Thalia Anagnos.
4. The Senate should review and consider any critical changes in policies needed early on in the semester. For example, the Chancellor's Office is not happy about the change we made from WU's to W's. They have suggested changing WU's to NC's for Spring 2021. The committee discussed what could be done quickly. A member suggested a referral to I&SA immediately. I&SA noted that they will work on this critical change to F20-2 immediately to present an amendment for the February 8th Senate meeting.

I&SA is currently working on a referral from the students requesting CR/NC for Fall 2021, this could be added to the now new resolution coming before the Senate at the February 8, 2021 meeting. The committee discussed and the president and provost are not in favor of CR/NC. WU's to NC takes what is already done and aligns with the Chancellor's Office. "F" and "W" are equivalent in the transcript. WU equates to a failing grade. I&SA has a formal referral from the students and must respond to that referral. Allowing CR/NC for Spring 2020 took a lot of the pressure off students. The administration noted that faculty and students should be more prepared after Fall and now have experience being more flexible.

C: The extra long discussion on the Senate floor at the December meeting left some students feeling traumatized by some things that were said. Some described it as feeling like they were in a car wreck. Students felt forced to share their personal stories in order to get faculty and administrators to hear them. So, we need to listen and collaborate closely with our students.

From the President:

There is another element here. We need to really look at ways we can continue to support students with intervention for them to be successful.

C: Moving to CR/NC is outside the memo the Chancellor issued. It may be in violation of EO 1037. I will have to double check. A memo came out in November suggesting that changing to a wholesale grading system was in violation of the EO.

C: We need to strengthen input from our students. There is not a lot of clear communication with students themselves about what is possible and allowable within the CO's mandates. We need to clearly communicate with them about these key grading issues.

5. The February 8, 2021 Senate meeting will be just as packed as the December 7, 2020 meeting. So we will need to think of priorities within that meeting. Maggie Barrera will present the feedback of her discussions with BIPOC faculty at a time certain of 1 p.m. next week.

6. The VPRI has completed his analysis of RSCA. He will reach out to Chair Mathur to discuss and set up a time for presentation to the executive committee.
7. There will be presentations of the Campus Climate survey in two sessions within the next couple of weeks.
8. The Board of Trustees (BOT) meet tomorrow and Wednesday.
9. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on January 25, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on January 29, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 1, 2021.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1790

6
7 **Senate Management Resolution**
8 **Amendment of Senate Standing Rule 7, Inclusion of Land**
9 **Acknowledgement in Academic Senate Agenda**

10
11 **Whereas:** Land acknowledgements are important for recognizing past and current
12 injustices to Native Americans; and

13
14 **Whereas:** It is important that the Academic Senate, as a visible space of
15 leadership on this campus, incorporate a land acknowledgement in
16 a public and official way; and

17
18 **Whereas:** Adding a land acknowledgement to the agenda as outlined in the
19 Standing Rules will institutionalize it in Senate practice and philosophy
20 beyond the current Senate Chair and any future chair; therefore be it

21
22 **Resolved:** That we amend Senate Standing Rule 7a to include 'Land
23 Acknowledgement' after the Call to Order, and Roll Call if taken,
24 and that we subsequently renumber the rest of the agenda outlined
25 in the Standing Rule.

26
27 **Approved:** February 1, 2021

28
29 **Vote:** 11-0-0

30
31 **Present:** Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory, Millora,
32 Okamoto, Sasikumar, Thompson, Taylor

33
34 **Absent:** Maciejewski

35
36 **Financial Impact:** None

37
38 **Workload Impact:** None

39

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1791

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Accessibility in Curricular Materials**
9

10 **Rescinds:** S08-3
11
12

13 **Whereas:** Equitable education requires equal accessibility to all curricular materials;
14 and
15

16 **Whereas:** Ensuring accessibility should be the responsibility of all divisions at SJSU
17 and not limited to the Accessible Education Center, the Center for Faculty
18 Development, SJSU Information Technology, and Procurement; and

19 **Whereas:** Executive Order-11111 requires all CSU campuses to create and
20 implement plans to promote faculty and administrative practices that will
21 assure timely access to curricular materials for all students, and states
22 that “Each campus and the Chancellor's Office shall provide funding,
23 resources, and training to members of its campus community to ensure
24 compliance with this executive order. CSU campuses and the Chancellor's
25 Office may consult with Systemwide Professional Development in the
26 Human Resources Division of the Chancellor's Office for assistance in
27 locating available resources and tools that will meet campus-specific
28 needs;” and

29 **Whereas:** Incorporation of accessibility is an ongoing process that requires faculty
30 and staff time, resources, and training, and faculty need support in
31 adapting course materials to meet accessibility standards; therefore be it

32 **Resolved:** That S08-3 be rescinded effective immediately and the new policy
33 described herein be approved; and be it further

34 **Resolved:** That faculty shall select or create accessible versions of all curricular
35 materials (including but not limited to course textbooks, syllabus,
36 handouts, electronic materials, learning management system, etc.), which
37 shall be made available to all students simultaneously; and be it further

38 **Resolved:** That if materials cannot be made accessible due to technology limitations
39 then an equally effective alternative must be created or provided; and be it
40 further

41 **Resolved:** That faculty shall be informed regularly of available resources to train
42 them in developing accessible course materials or equally effective
43 alternatives, which are offered through campus units such as the Center
44 for Faculty Development, the Accessible Education Center, Affordable
45 Learning Solutions, and eCampus; and be it further

46 **Resolved:** That all faculty and staff shall undergo accessibility training appropriate to
47 their duties; and be it further

48 **Resolved:** That the appropriate Vice President(s) shall conduct a baseline
49 assessment to determine compliance with federally mandated accessibility
50 requirements for courses and designate the appropriate resources to bring
51 the campus into full compliance; and be it further

52 **Resolved:** That a report be submitted by each department, as part of the normal
53 program planning process, assessing the extent to which its existing
54 courses meet federally mandated accessibility criteria and faculty and staff
55 have received appropriate training.

56 **Rationale:** Each CSU campus is required to develop "a method to incorporate
57 accessibility as a required component in the curriculum review and
58 approval process." University Policy S08-3 established timelines that have
59 since expired and the policy needed to be updated significantly with
60 additional details on accessibility. The print-based and electronic curricular
61 materials covered in this policy must be accessible or equally effective
62 alternatives to all students simultaneously. The development and/or
63 conversion of curricular materials to accessible format is an important
64 aspect of the SJSU mission to provide quality education for all students.
65 Curriculum and Research has worked the last two years on this policy and
66 obtaining information from various parties across campus on how to
67 update the policy appropriately. An inherent problem in ensuring
68 accessibility is the cost associated with accessibility and C&R was unable
69 to put an accurate estimate on this cost.

70
71 **Approved:** 11/30/2020

72 **Vote:** 11-0-0

73 **Present:** Anagnos, Backer, d'Alarcao, Dudley, Hart, Kaur, Kitajima, Khavul, Maffini,
74 Masegian, White (chair)
75 **Absent:** Stacks
76 **Guests:** Schraeder (recording)
77

78 Relevant documents are available online:

79 EO-1111: calstate.policystat.com/policy/6590867/latest

80 SJSU University Policy F07-3 (www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/F07-3.pdf) outlines
81 procedures for the timely adoption of textbooks, course readers and library reserves.

82 **Financial Impact:** The magnitude of the financial impact will depend upon the needs
83 assessment, but we expect that it will be substantial.

84 **Workload Impact:** We anticipate increases in workload for:

- 85 ● departments that are undergoing program planning to review
86 accessibility of all department curriculum
- 87 ● faculty involved in creating new accessible course materials or
88 finding equally effective alternatives
- 89 ● campus staff to work with faculty to create accessible materials
- 90 ● university to conduct a needs-based assessment to determine the
91 actual cost of implementing accessibility campus-wide.

92

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1795

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment J to University Policy S15-7**
10 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION: RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR**
11 **REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES: PROCEDURES**
12 **RTP Procedures for Joint Appointments**
13

14
15 **Resolved:** That S15-7 be amended as shown in the underlined addition to the
16 excerpted policy.
17

18 **Rationale:** The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for joint RTP committees
19 for “joint appointments,” and since SJSU has recently added a number of
20 faculty with duties in more than one department/college, policy needs to
21 provide for joint committees for joint appointments. Otherwise the CBA
22 requires that a candidate be evaluated by TWO department committees.
23 This amendment creates a simple mechanism for creating joint
24 department committees to evaluate joint appointments—as provided for in
25 the CBA.
26

27
28 **Approved:** November 23, 2020

29 **Vote:** (10-0-0)

30 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Riley, Quock, Mahendra, Barrera,
31 Monday
32

33 **Absent:** Saldamli
34

35 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact
36

37 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
38
39
40
41

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amending S15-7
POLICY RECOMMENDATION: RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR
REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES: PROCEDURES
RTP Procedures for Joint Appointments

....
3.0 Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

....
3.7 Modified Procedures for Joint Appointments

3.7.1 Candidates who hold joint appointments, as indicated in their appointment letters (S15-6, 5.6) shall be evaluated at the department level by a committee with representation from each relevant department, and this representation shall be roughly proportionate to the assignment of the candidate. The committee shall be chaired by a committee member from the home department as identified in the appointment letter.

3.7.2 Members on joint committees shall be elected as per all normal procedures of policy, save only that a current department committee may simply designate some of its already elected members for simultaneous service on the joint committee.

3.7.3 The chair of the home department shall hold the normal functions of chair for the evaluation of a joint appointment; the chairs of other departments in which the appointment is made are eligible to serve on the joint department-level committee.

3.7.4 Candidates who hold joint appointments across more than one college shall be evaluated by the college committee and the college dean corresponding to their home department.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1797

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment D to University Policy S15-6**
10 **University Policy Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees**
11 **Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters**
12

13
14 **Resolved:** That S15-6 be amended as shown in the underlined addition to the
15 excerpted policy.

16
17 **Rationale:** The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for joint RTP committees
18 for “joint appointments,” and since SJSU has recently added a number of
19 faculty with duties in more than one department/college, policy now needs
20 to provide for joint committees for joint appointments. Otherwise the CBA
21 requires that a candidate be evaluated by TWO separate department
22 committees. This amendment defines joint appointments, so that a
23 related amendment to the procedures policy can establish a simple
24 mechanism for creating joint department committees.
25

26 **Approved:** November 23, 2020

27 **Vote:** (10-0-0)

28 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Riley, Quock, Mahendra, Barrera,
29 Monday

30
31 **Absent:** Saldamli

32
33 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

34
35 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
36
37

38 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

39 **Amending S15-6**

40 **University Policy Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees**

41 **Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters**

42

43

44

45 5.0 Appointment letters

46

47

48

49 5.6 A joint appointment occurs when an appointment letter specifies that a faculty
50 member will have duties in more than one department or equivalent unit. The
51 letter shall determine the parameters of the assignment shared between the
52 relevant departments as per the CBA (12.1), and the letter should indicate which
53 department will be the home department.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1799

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment A to University Policy F12-5,**
9 **Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct**

10
11 **Amends:** University Policy F12-5

12 **Effective:** Immediately

13 **Whereas:** Federal and state regulations require continuity in university oversight of
14 research, and

15
16 **Whereas:** The Associate Vice President in the Office of Research (AVPR) retired at
17 the end of December 2020, and

18
19 **Whereas:** The search for a new AVPR is expected to take several months, during
20 which time research oversight will continue, creating the need for a
21 replacement for the AVPR in responding to allegations of research
22 misconduct (F 12-5), and

23
24 **Whereas:** A backup for the AVPR should be created in policy to maintain continuity
25 in the future, and

26
27 **Whereas:** The Senate Executive Committee passed a time-limited amendment to
28 F12-5 at its meeting of January 11, 2021 that was later signed by
29 President Papazian to allow for the university to remain in compliance with
30 federal regulations, and

31 **Whereas:** The time-limited amendment is set to expire on the date that the Senate
32 holds a final vote on the amendment of F12-5, therefore be it

33 **Resolved:** That the following sentence be added in Section I (B) designating the Vice
34 President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) as the backup for the
35 AVPR: "When an allegation is made and an inquiry (preliminary
36 assessment) is warranted, the Associate Vice President for Research
37 (AVP Research) will act as the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) and
38 recommend to the Deciding Officer (DO, the campus President) who will
39 determine if the inquiry will be investigated (formal development of a
40 factual record to determine whether research misconduct has been
41 committed, by whom, and to what extent). If the RIO is unavailable to

42 carry out these duties, the VPRI will serve as SJSU's RIO," and be it
43 further

44 **Resolved:** That the following sentence be added in Section II designating the Vice
45 President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) as the backup for the
46 AVPR: "Research Integrity Officer (RIO) means the institutional official
47 responsible for: (1) assessing allegations of research misconduct to
48 determine if they fall within the definition of research misconduct, are
49 covered by 42 CFR Part 93, and warrant an inquiry on the basis that the
50 allegation is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of
51 research misconduct may be identified; (2) overseeing inquiries and
52 investigations; and (3) the other responsibilities described in this policy.
53 For this policy, the RIO is the Associate Vice President for Research (AVP
54 Research), unless otherwise designated by the President. If the RIO is
55 unavailable to carry out these duties, the VPRI will serve as SJSU's RIO,"
56 and further be it

57 **Resolved:** That a sentence be added in Section III (A) designating the Vice President
58 for Research and Innovation (VPRI) as the backup for the AVPR: "The
59 Associate Vice President for Research (AVP Research) will serve as the
60 RIO. The RIO will have primary responsibility for implementation of the
61 University's policies and procedures on research misconduct. If the RIO is
62 unavailable to carry out these duties, the VPRI will serve as SJSU's RIO."

63 **Rationale:** Having a backup for the AVPR will allow for the continuous operation of
64 the mechanism to respond to allegations of research misconduct, and
65 maintain compliance with federal regulations.

66

67 **Approved:** February 1, 2021

68 **Vote:** 9-0-2

69 **Present:** Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory, Millora,
70 Okamoto, Sasikumar, Thompson, Taylor

71 **Absent:** Maciejewski

72 **Financial impact:** None

73 **Workload impact:** Additional workload for the VPRI, when the AVPR is unable to carry
74 out their duties.

75

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1800

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment A to University Policy S14-6,**
9 **Policy and Assurance for Humane Care and Use of Animals**

10
11 **Amends:** S14-6

12 **Effective:** Immediately

13 **Whereas:** Federal and state regulations require continuity in university oversight of
14 research; and

15
16 **Whereas:** The Associate Vice President in the Office of Research (AVPR) retired at
17 the end of December 2020; and

18
19 **Whereas:** The search for a new AVPR is expected to take several months, during
20 which time research oversight will continue, creating the need for a
21 replacement for the AVPR in ensuring the humane care and use of
22 animals; and

23
24 **Whereas:** A backup for the AVPR should be created in policy to maintain continuity
25 in the future; and

26
27 **Whereas:** The Senate Executive Committee passed a time-limited amendment to
28 S14-6 at its meeting of January 11, 2021 that was later signed by
29 President Papazian to allow for the university to remain in compliance with
30 federal regulations; and

31 **Whereas:** The time-limited amendment is set to expire on the date that the Senate
32 holds a final vote on the amendment of S14-6; therefore be it

33 **Resolved:** That the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) be
34 designated as the backup for the AVPR, in all cases where the
35 Institutional Official is mentioned in the policy; and also be it

36 **Resolved:** That the text of 4.3 be amended as follows: "The University President
37 designates the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and
38 Research as the Institutional Official with the responsibility to oversee and
39 administer the institution's program of animal care and use. If the AVPR is
40 unavailable to carry out these duties, the VPRI will serve as SJSU's
41 Institutional Official. The Institutional Official will have the administrative

42 and operational authority to: 1) allocate University resources to ensure
43 that the animal care and use program complies with all applicable laws
44 and policies; and 2) define and assign responsibilities and reporting
45 channels essential to the animal care and use program.”

46 **Rationale:** Having a backup for the AVPR will allow for the continuous operation of
47 the mechanism to ensure the humane care and use of animals, and
48 maintain compliance with federal regulations

49

50 **Approved:** February 1, 2021

51 **Vote:** 9-0-2

52 **Present:** Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory, Millora,
53 Okamoto, Sasikumar, Thompson, Taylor

54 **Absent:** Maciejewski

55 **Financial impact:** None

56 **Workload impact:** Additional workload for the VPRI, when the AVPR is unable to carry
57 out their duties.

58

59

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1801

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment C to University Policy F17-1,**
9 **Protection of Human Research Subjects**

10

11 **Amends:** F17-1

12 **Effective:** Immediately

13 **Whereas:** Federal and state regulations require continuity in university oversight of
14 research, and

15
16 **Whereas:** The Associate Vice President in the Office of Research (AVPR) retired at
17 the end of December 2020, and

18
19 **Whereas:** The search for a new AVPR is expected to take several months, during
20 which time research oversight will continue, creating the need for a
21 replacement for the AVPR for protecting human research subjects, and

22
23 **Whereas:** A backup for the AVPR should be created in policy to maintain continuity
24 in the future, and

25
26 **Whereas:** The Senate Executive Committee passed a time-limited amendment to
27 F17-1 at its meeting of January 11, 2021 that was later signed by
28 President Papazian, to allow for the university to remain in compliance
29 with federal regulations, and

30 **Whereas:** The time-limited amendment is set to expire on the date that the Senate
31 holds a final vote on the amendment of F17-1, therefore be it

32 **Resolved:** That the following sentence be added in Section 3.3 designating the Vice
33 President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) as the backup for the
34 AVPR: "SJSU's Institutional Officer, the Associate Vice President for the
35 Office of Research, has administrative authority for the protection of
36 human subjects. If the AVPR is unavailable to carry out these duties, the
37 VPRI will serve as SJSU's Institutional Officer," and also be it

38 **Resolved:** That all instances of the term "AVP of Office of Research" be replaced by
39 "SJSU's Institutional Officer."

40 **Rationale:** Having a backup for the AVPR will allow for the continuous operation of
41 the mechanism to protect human research subjects, and maintain
42 compliance with federal regulations

43 **Approved:** February 1, 2021

44 **Vote:** 9-0-2

45 **Present:** Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory, Millora,
46 Okamoto, Sasikumar, Thompson, Taylor

47 **Absent:** Maciejewski

48 **Financial impact:** None

49 **Workload impact:** Additional workload for the VPRI, when the AVPR is unable to carry
50 out their duties.

51

8 **Amendment A to University Policy F20-2,**
9 **Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students**
10 **During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic**
11
12

13 **Whereas:** The Chancellor’s Office has raised concern with the grade changes called for in
14 F20-2 related to automatic adjustment of Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) grades
15 to Withdrawal (W) grades; and
16

17 **Whereas:** The Chancellor’s Office has stated that Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) grades
18 could be changed to No Credit (NC) grades; therefore be it
19

20 **Resolved:** That SJSU should consider, so far as legally possible, consider converting all
21 grades of Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) be changed to No Credit (NC) for
22 Spring 2021.
23

24 **Approved:** February 1, 2021

25 **Vote:** 16-0-0

26 **Present:** Austin, Chuang, Delgadillo, Gomez Marcelino, Hill, Jackson (non-
27 voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rollerson, Sen,
28 Sorkhabi, Sullivan-Green, Walker, Wilson, Wolcott, Yang, Yao

29 **Absent:** Rao, Walters
30

31 **Financial impact:** No resources other than what was identified in F20-2.

32 **Workload impact:** No resources other than what was identified in F20-2.

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Appointment, Evaluation, and Range Elevation**
10 **for Lecturer Faculty**

11
12 **Rescinds:** S10-7

13
14 **Resolved:** That S10-7 be rescinded and replaced by the following policy effective as
15 soon as administratively practicable.

16
17 **Rationale:** In 2018 Professional Standards received two referrals noting several
18 provisions in this policy that were obsolete, and in response began an in-
19 depth review. The committee discussed the policy directly with the Senior
20 Associate Vice President for University Personnel, the CFA Lecturer
21 faculty Representative, two Provosts, and a representative of concerned
22 department chairs. The questions principally concerned the “range
23 elevation” section of the policy, which is a method under the Collective
24 Bargaining Agreement (CBA) whereby lecturer faculty with substantial
25 experience may apply to move up to a higher pay scale. The CBA
26 generally leaves the criteria to local campuses to determine, although
27 recent arbitration rulings have set some precedents that local policies
28 must respect.

29
30 For example, the old policy contained one particularly notable confusion
31 that has led to numerous grievances. The discussion of terminal degree
32 requirements for lecturer faculty is handled under the “Range Elevation”
33 section of the old policy, although case law prevents terminal degrees
34 from being the principal qualification for a lecturer faculty to receive a
35 range elevation. However, terminal degree requirements are not
36 discussed under the “Appointment” section of the policy, even though
37 terminal degrees are relevant to the initial appointment of Lecturer faculty.
38 We moved the discussion of terminal degrees out of the Range Elevation
39 section and into the Appointment section where it belonged.

41 Another major confusion has to do with the criteria on which lecturer
42 faculty are to be evaluated. We have emphasized that lecturer faculty
43 must be judged on their actual assignment and not on areas of
44 achievement that they are not appointed to do. For example, there are
45 some lecturer faculty assigned to do service and research, but these are
46 rare, and most lecturer faculty are appointed strictly to teach. For lecturer
47 faculty assigned strictly to teach, materials on research or service would
48 be provided on a voluntary basis to the extent that the faculty member
49 desires to make the case that the activities enhance their teaching.
50

51 As the committee reviewed S10-7, it found numerous passages which
52 were obsolete, abstruse, unnecessary, and in some cases, insulting to
53 lecturer faculty. For example, the preferred term is “lecturer faculty” since
54 this is parallel with the commonly used “tenure/tenure track faculty,” and it
55 calls attention to their status as faculty. This is the term we use. We also
56 have established a non-policy procedure for the Provost to revise the
57 dozens of rarely used titles applied to our “temporary” faculty (see
58 Appendix B) and we propose a new title of “Senior Lecturer” for lecturer
59 faculty with multi-year contracts and six years of seniority.
60

61 The policy seemed to us to need a wholesale rewrite. We have attempted
62 to craft a policy that is less likely to become obsolete with each revision of
63 the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and which we hope will be more
64 intelligible for the average reader. We also modernized the numbering
65 system for ease of reference.
66

67 **Approved:** February 2nd via email vote

68
69 **Vote:** (9-0-0)

70
71 **Present:** Peter, Barrera, Monday, Riley, Wang, Smith, Raman, Mahendra, Cargill

72
73 **Absent:** Saldamli*, Quock*
74 *were present at the meeting but did not participate in the email vote.
75

76 **Financial Impact:** No direct impacts

77
78 **Workload Impact:** No direct impacts

79 **APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION POLICY FOR**
80 **LECTURER FACULTY**

81
82 **1. Introduction**

83
84 1.1. Purpose

85
86 1.1.1. This policy covers the procedures for appointment,
87 reappointment, and evaluation (including range elevation) of Unit
88 3 faculty members serving a full-time or part-time Lecturer
89 appointment. This policy also specifies and defines appropriate
90 titles to be assigned to lecturer faculty.

91
92 1.1.2. There are two valued professional career pathways for faculty at
93 SJSU. The appointment, evaluation, and promotion of
94 tenure/tenure track faculty are dealt with in other policies. This
95 policy concerns the appointment, evaluation, and range elevation
96 of lecturer faculty.

97
98 1.1.3. Lecturer appointments meet a variety of needs within the
99 University. Lecturer faculty are most typically appointed to
100 teaching roles. More rarely, lecturer faculty are appointed to
101 service and research roles.

102
103 1.1.4. All types of lecturer faculty appointments are distinct from
104 probationary (tenure-track) faculty appointments. Lecturer faculty
105 appointments do not guarantee or imply the right to tenure or the
106 eventuality of a tenure-track appointment, but qualified lecturer
107 faculty who apply for a tenure track appointment shall be given
108 fair consideration.

109
110 1.1.5. Evaluations for Unit 3 coaching faculty shall meet all standards of
111 the CBA and shall include an opportunity for peer input and
112 evaluation by appropriate administrators but are not otherwise
113 covered under this policy.

114
115
116 1.2. Relationship to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)

117
118 The procedures provided in this policy are based on the terms of the
119 current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California

120 State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA). To
121 apply this policy requires frequent reference to the CBA, which covers
122 pay, length of appointment, and numerous other matters that are closely
123 related to the provisions of this policy.
124

125 1.3. Guidance

126
127 The University provides web-based resources of interest to lecturer
128 faculty, and lecturer faculty are also strongly encouraged to seek
129 guidance from their Department Chair for clarification of items covered
130 by this policy, as well as other University policies and department
131 practices.
132

133 1.4. Confidentiality

134
135 All deliberations in the appointment and evaluation process are to be
136 confidential. Confidentiality shall be maintained as per the CBA (15.11)
137 and applicable law.
138

139 2. Titles

140
141 2.1 While the CBA distinguishes between temporary faculty and
142 probationary/tenured faculty, SJSU typically designates all part-time and
143 full-time temporary instructional faculty as "Lecturer Faculty" (in all its
144 variants) and designates all tenured or tenure-track faculty as
145 "Professors" (in all its variants.)
146

147 2.2 SJSU maintains a list of other titles and variations of titles that are
148 appropriate for defined categories of lecturer faculty who meet certain
149 specified qualifications.
150

151 2.3 Appointment letters, personnel documents, business cards, university
152 websites, etc. must use titles from the approved list.
153

154 2.4 Within the tradition described in 2.1, the list may be expanded or revised
155 by the Provost, in consultation with the Professional Standards
156 Committee. Creating titles outside the tradition described in 2.1 requires
157 a policy recommendation of the Academic Senate, signed by the
158 President.
159

160 2.5 The initial list of approved titles is included in Appendix B, but may be
161 revised and updated as per 2.4.

162
163 **3. Initial and Subsequent Appointments**

164
165 3.1. Appointment Letters and Timing

166
167 3.1.1. Offers of appointment are to be made in writing by the Dean or the
168 Provost on behalf of the President. Oral offers or offers made by
169 persons other than those listed in the previous sentence are neither
170 valid nor binding upon the University. Official notification of
171 appointment shall follow the requirements as outlined by the CBA
172 (12.2). The notification shall also state that the appointment
173 automatically expires as outlined by the CBA (12.4).

174
175 3.1.2. Generally, lecturer faculty appointments (both full- and part-
176 time) should be made sufficiently in advance of the beginning
177 of instruction to allow adequate time for course preparation
178 and the acquisition of appropriate texts and instructional
179 materials.

180
181
182 3.2. Nature of Work Assignments

183
184 The nature of the work performed by lecturer faculty—the proportions of
185 teaching, service, or research—is stated in the work assignment.
186 Historically, most lecturer faculty have been assigned primarily to teach,
187 but other configurations are possible. Lecturer faculty are not expected to
188 do work that is outside of their assignments. For example, lecturer faculty
189 whose work assignment does not include service cannot be required to do
190 service activities except those directly related to their teaching
191 assignment. They may, if willing, take on additional service assignments
192 and be compensated appropriately. Lecturer faculty may attend most
193 university, college, and department functions as a matter of professional
194 responsibility associated with their assignment, or otherwise on a
195 volunteer basis. Lecturer faculty may not be excluded from meetings
196 except when necessary for confidential or personnel matters.

197
198 3.3. Establishing the Appropriate Range at Appointment.

199

200 The following explanations of each range (LA, LB, LC, and LD) are
201 meant to be general. The official listing of minimum requirements,
202 including minimum degrees and/or minimum relevant experience, shall
203 be established by the President after recommendation by the
204 departments, college deans, and the Provost; and the listing may be
205 amended after similar consultation. Lecturer faculty shall be appointed
206 at a level commensurate with their qualifications.

207
208 3.3.1. LA: Initial appointment at this range is for an entry-level lecturer
209 faculty rank. A candidate for this range would typically possess
210 at least a Master's degree and/or equivalent specialized
211 professional expertise or experience.

212
213 3.3.2. LB: Initial appointment at this range is for a person with a
214 terminal degree or a lower degree with additional specialized
215 professional expertise or experience.

216
217 3.3.3. LC: Initial appointment at this advanced range would require the
218 appropriate terminal degree or specialized professional expertise
219 or experience that generally includes the ability to teach
220 advanced upper division and/or graduate courses.

221
222 3.3.4. LD: Initial appointment at this advanced range would be for a
223 candidate that has the equivalent degree, experience, and
224 expertise of a senior academic scholar and teacher.

225 226 3.4. Careful Consideration for Reappointment

227
228 Lecturer faculty shall receive careful consideration in the appropriate
229 situations, as per the CBA (12.7) and current case law. Chairs and
230 Administrators should consult UP Faculty Affairs regarding the meaning
231 of "careful consideration" prior to making reappointment decisions for
232 lecturer faculty. At a minimum, careful consideration means that a
233 department must carefully review all the information available in a
234 candidate's personnel file. This will in most cases include student and
235 peer evaluations and the annual summaries of achievements.

236 237 4. Evaluation

238 239 4.1. General Process

240

241 4.1.1. Notification. Lecturer faculty should be notified of evaluation criteria
242 and procedures as per the CBA 15.3. Decision makers should be
243 aware that the current CBA requires notification “no later than the
244 14 days after the first day of instruction in the academic term.”
245

246 4.1.2. Purpose: The performance of lecturer faculty should be carefully
247 evaluated in order to provide students with the best instruction
248 possible and to assist in the careful consideration of lecturer faculty
249 for any future Lecturer or probationary positions for which they may
250 be candidates.
251

252 4.1.3. Multiple Assignments: lecturer faculty are to be evaluated
253 separately within each department for which they have an
254 assignment.
255

256 4.1.4. The Working Personnel Action File shall be defined and include all
257 material as outlined in the CBA (15.8).
258

259 4.1.5. Periodic Evaluation: The CBA (15.30) calls for periodic evaluation
260 of lecturer faculty which results in written statements to be placed in
261 the lecturer's Personnel Action File. The specifics of the periodic
262 evaluation are explained below.
263

264 4.1.6. Rebuttal: lecturer faculty shall be issued recommendations at each
265 level of review and have an opportunity for rebuttal as per CBA
266 (15.5).
267

268 4.2. Review Process

269
270 4.2.1. Frequency of Evaluations
271

272 4.2.1.1. Lecturer faculty holding three (3) year appointments
273 pursuant to Article 12 of the CBA, shall be evaluated at least
274 once during the term of their appointment.
275

276 4.2.1.2. Lecturer faculty appointed for two or more semesters,
277 regardless of a break in service, shall be evaluated annually.
278

279 4.2.1.3. Lecturer faculty appointed for one semester or less
280 shall be evaluated at the discretion of the Department Chair,

281 appropriate administrator, or the department. In addition, the
282 lecturer may request that an evaluation be performed.

283
284 4.2.1.4. Volunteer and visiting lecturer faculty: volunteer and
285 visiting lecturer faculty with an appointment of one academic
286 year or less need only be evaluated if the appropriate
287 Department Chair or the lecturer requests such evaluation.

288 289 4.2.2. Role of Chairs and Committees

290
291 4.2.2.1. Full-time lecturer faculty and lecturer faculty
292 undergoing a three year cumulative review shall be evaluated
293 by a department committee of tenured faculty.

294
295 4.2.2.2. All other lecturer faculty shall be evaluated by the
296 Department Chair, who may choose to consult with a
297 department committee of tenured faculty. If the Department
298 Chair suspects that a rating of “needs improvement” or
299 “unsatisfactory” may be indicated, the Chair is advised to
300 consult with a department personnel committee before
301 concluding the evaluation.

302
303 4.2.2.3. The Department Chair may make a separate
304 recommendation as part of the evaluation process.

305 306 4.2.3 Documentation for Evaluation

307
308 4.2.3.1 In accordance with the CBA (15.23, 15.24), documentation
309 for evaluation shall include:

310
311 4.2.3.1.1 All available data from student opinions of teaching
312 effectiveness (SOTEs) in accordance with university policy on
313 teaching evaluation

314
315 4.2.3.1.2 All available direct observation(s) by peers

316
317 4.2.3.1.3 Information provided by the lecturer on an “Annual
318 Summary of Achievements” form

319
320 4.2.3.1.4 Evidence of performance in academic
321 assignment including course materials such as syllabi.

322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363

4.2.3.1.5 Unsolicited materials. In addition to materials required by policy and/or provided by the candidate, the CBA (15.2 and 15.8) permits the inclusion of additional information provided by faculty unit employees, students, external reviewers, and academic administrators. For such materials to be inserted into the working personnel action file without the consent of the candidate, they must be submitted to the Department Chair or Dean before the closing date, and they must subsequently be inspected by the Senior Director, Faculty Affairs to determine a) if the insertion is allowed under the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and b) that the insertion is both germane to the criteria of this policy and neither prejudicial nor defamatory. If the insertion is allowed, it will be withheld from the working personnel action file until the candidate has been given at least seven days to include a response to the material.

4.2.3.1.6 If the lecturer under review does not submit any material, evaluation will be based on information available within the electronic evaluation portal.

4.2.4 The Lecturer's documentation and the evaluations of the committee and Chair, if applicable, shall be forwarded to the Dean. Following the review, the Dean shall forward copies of the completed evaluation and Summary of Achievements to the official Personnel Action File and to the faculty member and the department.

4.2.6 The evaluation process must be completed by the date indicated in the annual calendar established by UP-FA. Careful consideration of evaluations is required before appointments may be made (addenda or revisions may be submitted later if necessary).

4.3. Criteria for Evaluation

4.3.1. The most fundamental principle of the evaluation of lecturer faculty is that they be evaluated in terms of their particular assignment and the criteria appropriate to that assignment. For example, if a Lecturer Faculty is appointed to teach .8 and do service at .2, then 80% of the evaluation should focus on criteria appropriate to teaching and 20% on criteria appropriate to service. Such a Lecturer Faculty may not be evaluated directly on scholarship.

- 364 4.3.2. Many lecturer faculty have substantial accomplishments in areas
365 that are not directly covered by their assignment—i.e., scholarship
366 in the case of instructional lecturers. Such lecturer faculty should
367 be encouraged to explain how these achievements have a bearing
368 on teaching and thus could be considered as an enhancing factor in
369 the evaluation of the actual assignment. Similarly, lecturers who
370 contribute service should be encouraged to show how this activity
371 enhances student success, campus climate, and/or their assigned
372 activities. Asking for consideration of activities that may indirectly
373 enhance the actual assignment will be at the option of lecturer
374 faculty.
- 375
- 376 4.3.3. The evaluation of teaching must be holistic and in accordance with
377 the University policy on the evaluation of teaching (F12-6.) “When
378 evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and
379 administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. This
380 means that teaching must be considered in context and must be
381 evaluated using multiple sources of information.” (F12-6). Such
382 sources of information include the candidate’s own statements via
383 the annual summary of achievements, course materials such as
384 syllabi, direct observations, and student opinion surveys.
- 385
- 386 4.3.4. Certain teaching assignments require continued currency in a field
387 and/or the maintenance of professional credentials, e.g., licensure
388 in a professional field for accreditation requirements. Such
389 requirements should be delineated in an appointment letter, and
390 then may be evaluated as part of the teaching assignment.
- 391
- 392 4.3.5. Changes to any supplementary department or college based
393 criteria for evaluating lecturer faculty may not be applied to any
394 lecturer faculty until after their current academic year has
395 concluded.
- 396
- 397 4.3.6. Lecturer evaluations will be characterized using the following scale:
- 398
- 399 4.3.6.1. Unsatisfactory. The documentation does not establish that
400 the performance in the assignment has been fully met and
401 completed.
- 402
- 403 4.3.6.2. Needs improvement. The documentation does not
404 establish that the performance in the assignment has been

405 fully met and completed, but modest improvements as
406 indicated in the review—if promptly implemented—would
407 result in a satisfactory performance.

408
409 4.3.6.3. Satisfactory. The documentation establishes that the
410 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
411 completed.

412
413 4.3.6.4. Good. The documentation establishes that the
414 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
415 completed, and with a level of experience and quality that
416 goes beyond the minimum.

417
418 4.3.6.5. Excellent. The documentation establishes that the
419 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
420 completed, and with a level of experience and quality that
421 goes significantly beyond the minimum.

422

423 **5. Range Elevation**

424

425 5.1. Definition and Principles

426

427 5.1.1. Definition: Range elevation refers to movement on the salary
428 schedule for lecturer faculty to the next range (e.g. LA to LB, LB to
429 LC, or LC to LD). Range elevation represents a form of
430 advancement in salary and classification based on evaluation of
431 performance in assignment.

432 5.1.2. Eligibility: lecturer faculty become eligible to apply for a range
433 elevation when they meet the requirements stipulated in the CBA
434 and ancillary documents. They shall be informed of their eligibility
435 by UP-FA.

436

437 5.1.3. Range elevation does not imply any guarantee of future
438 employment nor does it affect the conditional nature of the
439 temporary appointment

440

441 5.2. Process

442

- 443 5.2.1. At the beginning of each academic year, UP-FA will establish a
444 timeline for applications for range elevation and provide this
445 information to Chairs and Deans and eligible lecturer faculty.
446
- 447 5.2.2. Lecturer faculty who are eligible for range elevation in more than
448 one department or unit must apply separately in each department or
449 unit in which they are eligible.
450
- 451 5.2.3. Application Process: lecturer faculty seeking range elevation must
452 submit their application with the appropriate documentation via the
453 current electronic process.
454
- 455 5.2.4. Documentation. Material supporting a lecturer's request for range
456 elevation should include:
- 457
- 458 5.2.4.1 Description and Evidence of Professional Growth and
459 Development. This section should include a narrative and
460 should present evidence, and examples, of professional
461 growth and development and an explanation as to why
462 range elevation is warranted. The narrative should be limited
463 to 2000 words and should explain how the evidence
464 supports the evaluation of the particular assignment of the
465 lecturer as outlined in the letter(s) of appointment. For
466 example, if the assignment is to teach, then the evidence
467 should be related to teaching—even indirectly, such as if
468 research or service activities can be shown to promote
469 currency in the discipline needed for effective teaching.
- 470 5.2.4.2. A current vitae.
- 471 5.2.4.3. Copies of all periodic evaluations, SOTEs received during all
472 years of the assignment in accordance with university
473 policies on teaching evaluation, and periodic peer reviews, if
474 available. If the assignment was for greater than six years,
475 then only materials from the most recent six years are
476 required.
- 477 5.2.4.4. A comprehensive index of all materials shall be prepared by
478 the faculty member and submitted with the range elevation
479 materials.
480
- 481 5.2.5. Criteria
482

483 To be recommended for range elevation, a lecturer must
484 demonstrate professional growth and development appropriate to
485 the lecturer's work assignment and the mission of the university
486 during the period between the date of initial appointment or, where
487 applicable, the date of the last range elevation and the time of the
488 current request. This is the only review period in which candidates'
489 professional achievements shall be evaluated. Appendix A lists
490 examples of activities that may be used to demonstrate appropriate
491 professional growth and development. Accumulated teaching
492 experience alone is not a criterion for range elevation.
493

494 5.2.6. Levels of achievement

495
496 Higher level of advancement (such as from C to D) require higher
497 levels of professional growth and development than do lower levels
498 (such as from A to B.) While sustained satisfactory performance in
499 the work assignment may be sufficient for elevation to LB,
500 performance evaluated as good or excellent is required for range
501 elevation to LC and LD, respectively. Applicants should document
502 their professional growth and development as appropriate for the
503 nature of their assignment as outlined in the letter(s) of appointment,
504 their academic discipline, and the particular range for which they are
505 applying.
506

507 5.2.7. Review Process—Department or Equivalent Unit: requesting range
508 elevation shall be evaluated by the personnel (RTP) committee
509 within the department or equivalent unit. The Department Chair may
510 provide a separate review if he or she did not serve on the
511 personnel committee. The committee shall write an evaluation and
512 make a written recommendation to the Dean. The Department
513 Chair, if performing a separate review, shall do the same. The
514 recommendations will be forwarded to the candidate and the Dean
515 at the same time and the applicant will have a ten-day period to
516 submit a written rebuttal to the Dean, if desired.
517

518 5.2.8. Review Process—Dean: The Dean will review the recommendations
519 of the department and make a recommendation. A copy of the
520 recommendation will be sent to the candidate who will have ten days
521 to respond in writing. The recommendations and candidate

522 responses (if any) will then be forwarded to UP-FA and the Provost
523 for final review and action.

524
525 5.2.9. Role of Provost as the designee of the President: The result of the
526 reviews by the department and Dean is to make a recommendation
527 to the Provost who shall make the final decision with respect to the
528 request for range elevation.

529
530 5.2.10. Effective date of range elevation: Range elevation salary increases
531 shall be effective as indicated in the CBA (12.16).

532
533 5.2.11. Peer Review Process: Denial of a range elevation is subject to a
534 peer review process. UP-FA shall establish a panel consisting of all
535 full-time tenured faculty (not including faculty in the FERP program)
536 who have served on committees in the preceding academic year
537 that made recommendations on matters of retention, tenure and
538 promotion and who have attained the rank of full professor or
539 equivalent. Faculty Affairs, in conjunction with a representative from
540 CFA, shall select at random from the panel three (3) members and
541 one (1) alternate for service on the Peer Review Committee in
542 conjunction with a representative from the CFA. No faculty member
543 may serve on the Peer Review Committee if he/she has been
544 directly involved with or a party to matters related to a complaint
545 submitted by the lecturer for peer review. Relevant dates and steps
546 in the peer review process are explained below.

547
548 5.2.11.2. A lecturer who wishes to request peer review for
549 denial of range elevation shall request peer review no later
550 than 21 days after the receipt of the denial.

551
552 5.2.11.3. The Peer Review Committee shall follow the timeline
553 outline by the CBA (12.20). The Peer Review Committee
554 shall notify the candidate and Provost of its findings and
555 decision. The Peer Review Committee shall forward to the
556 Provost all written materials it considered. The decision of
557 the Peer Review Committee shall be final and binding.

558
559 5.3. Range Elevation Amount
560

561 5.3.4. Range elevation for lecturer faculty shall be accompanied by an
562 advancement in salary in accordance with the CBA and related documents.

563
564 5.3.5. In their reviews, if the department and/or Dean recommend an increase
565 greater than the minimum called for in the CBA and its ancillary documents,
566 the reasons shall be stated in the recommendation sent to the Provost. The
567 decision to award a range elevation greater than the contracted amount is at
568 the final discretion of the Provost.

569 **Appendix A**

570

571 This section lists examples of activities that may be used to demonstrate and document
572 appropriate professional growth and development. It is neither exhaustive nor minimal,
573 but simply a listing of the typical professional activities engaged in by lecturer faculty in
574 a wide range of disciplines. In all cases quality of performance and appropriateness of
575 the activity shall be the primary consideration when evaluating the merit of a specific
576 activity.

577

578 **Note regarding synergies between the categories:** Please see 4.3 2 “It may be that
579 a Lecturer has substantial accomplishments in areas that are not directly covered by
580 their assignment—i.e., scholarship in the case of an instructional Lecturer. Such a
581 Lecturer should be encouraged to make the case that these achievements have a
582 bearing on teaching and thus could be considered as an enhancing factor in the
583 evaluation of the actual assignment. This would be at the option of the Lecturer.”

584

585 1. Teaching related.

- 586 ● activities enhancing the effective teaching of the discipline
- 587 ● collaborative teaching
- 588 ● creative activities in support of effective teaching
- 589 ● development of instructional materials
- 590 ● increased mastery of knowledge in fields relevant to the teaching
- 591 assignment.
- 592 ● enhanced mastery of knowledge in relevant fields via scholarly activity,
- 593 ● involvement of students in the research and creative processes

594

595 2. Service related

- 596 ● advising and mentoring student associations
- 597 ● development of standards and/or outcomes assessment
- 598 ● curriculum and program development
- 599 ● contributions to improving the campus climate: the promotion of mutual
600 respect and acceptance of diversity in all its forms
- 601 ● grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support
602 pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University
- 603 ● leadership and participation in service activities of professional
604 associations
- 605 ● external fundraising and resource development related to the mission of
606 the university
- 607 ● leadership and special contributions to the basic instructional mission of
608 the university

- 609 ● leadership in faculty governance and campus life at the department,
610 college, university, or CSU system level
- 611 ● maintenance and technical support of university labs, equipment,
612 materials, supplies, safety standards and any other support of
613 environments that require advanced professional attention
- 614 ● mentoring of colleagues
- 615 ● organizing events and activities for the sharing of ideas and knowledge
- 616 ● recruitment and retention of students
- 617 ● research and/or creative activity in the discipline thesis research and
618 supervision
- 619

620 3. Research related

- 621 ● collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the
622 community
- 623 ● editing of publications
- 624 ● participation at professional meetings and conferences presentations at
625 conferences
- 626 ● contributions to the community, including professional efforts which bring
627 the community and the campus together
- 628 ● publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- 629 ● research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy

630

631 Appendix B

632

633 Per the Agreement and past practices at SJSU, the following terminology should be
634 used in letters of appointment and other documents describing lecturer faculty
635 employed at SJSU. These are the approved titles for lecturer faculty as of the time of
636 the initial implementation of this policy. This list will be updated as necessary
637 according to the procedures described in section 2 of this policy, and published by
638 Faculty Affairs.

- 639 ● Lecturer—Describes all part-time and full-time temporary instructional
640 faculty.
- 641 ● Senior Lecturer—A lecturer faculty member with a three year
642 appointment and six consecutive years of experience in a single
643 department at SJSU.
- 644 ● Lecturer faculty with Assignments in Athletics, Library and Student
645 Services Professional Academic-Related (SSP-AR)—Employees in
646 these areas will have designations appropriate to their field, while
647 differentiated from their tenure/tenure track faculty colleagues.
- 648 ● Visiting Faculty—A full-time lecturer instructional faculty member for up
649 to one academic year, and is a category defined by the CBA (12.324).
- 650 ● Visiting Lecturer – A part-time or full-time Lecturer instructional faculty
651 member who is not a professor at any other institution, who will be at
652 SJSU for just one or two semesters, and does not plan to request
653 subsequent appointment.
- 654 ● Visiting Professor—A part-time or full-time Lecturer instructional faculty
655 member who has achieved the title of professor at another institution,
656 will be at SJSU for just one or two semesters, and does not plan to
657 request subsequent appointment.
- 658 ● Distinguished Visiting Lecturer or Distinguished Visiting Professor—A
659 person described in (4) or (5) above for whom the appropriate college
660 Dean has received approval for use of this title from the Provost after
661 submitting a request that describes the person's qualifications and
662 contributions that warrant this title.
- 663 ● Visiting Scholar – A full-time or part-time lecturer hired or volunteering
664 for academic work other than teaching and without the expectation of
665 seeking subsequent appointment shall generally be referred to as a
666 *visiting scholar*. Such designation shall be granted by the Dean of the
667 appropriate college. The term *distinguished visiting scholar* may only be
668 used when the appropriate college dean has received approval from the
669 Provost after submitting a request that describes the person's
670 qualifications and contributions that warrant the title.

671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698

Volunteer Employees—Included Adjunct Professor and other instructional volunteers.

Adjunct Professor—Under CSU guidelines, this title designates a "volunteer employee" who has demonstrated scholarly, creative, or professional achievement and who has a continuing relationship with at least one department at SJSU through lecturing, supervision of students, directing of research, or advising on academic matters.

- Normally, the level of achievement demonstrated shall be comparable to standards required for appointment to the rank of associate or full professor, and the responsibilities assumed shall represent some or all of those normally performed by faculty. Exceptions may be made if an individual possesses specific skills or expertise of value to a given department that may not be reflected in a typical appointment process.
- When a department wishes to request the status of "adjunct associate or professor" for an individual, the Chair (or equivalent person for the unit) shall forward the request, with a description of the person's qualifications and contributions, to the Dean for review. The Dean's recommendation and that of the department shall then be submitted to the Provost, who, upon determining that the appropriate level of professional distinction has been demonstrated and that actual and potential contributions to the University warrant special recognition, shall formally issue appointment to the status of "adjunct associate or professor" for a maximum of three years.

Other—A volunteer instructional employee who is not designated as an adjunct professor, shall be designated as a lecturer, visiting lecturer, or visiting assistant, associate or professor, within the guidelines stated above.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **February 8, 2021**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1804

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment E to University Policy, S15-8**
10 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
11 **Criteria and Standards**
12 **To enhance service to students**

13
14 **Resolved:** That S15-8 be amended as indicated in the following underline and
15 **strikeout**, effective for the AY 2021-22 RTP cycle.

16
17 **Rationale:** Some have observed that although the revision of S98-8 to S15-8
18 enhanced the category of service for faculty retention, tenure, and
19 promotion decisions, the revisions may have (inadvertently) diminished
20 the specific importance of service to students. Service to students should
21 be acknowledged as of central importance at our institution and should
22 occupy a role that cannot simply be replaced by other kinds of service,
23 and yet this service is not identified as clearly as other forms of service.
24 This amendment corrects this. S98-8 also explicitly referenced
25 educational equity activities—but this reference that was removed in the
26 2015 revisions. This amendment restores definition of service to explicitly
27 include educational equity activities.

28
29 **Approved:** February 1, 2021

30
31 **Vote:** (9-0-0)

32
33 **Present:** Peter, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli, Quock, Mahendra, Barrera,
34 Monday

35
36 **Absent:** Wang, Riley

37
38 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

39
40 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact

41

42 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

43 **Amending S15-8**

44 **University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty**
45 **Employees: Criteria and Standards**
46 **To enhance service to students**

47
48

49 2.4.2 Types of Service. For ease of reference only, service may be divided into several
50 areas. Examples:

51
52 2.4.2.1 Service to students. Advising, mentoring, and participating in activities to
53 enhance student learning and success that are not subsumed in teaching or the primary
54 academic assignment, that go beyond the curriculum. Of particular importance are
55 activities to achieve educational equity such as providing support to historically
56 underserved students, helping to shrink the achievement gap, increasing student
57 retention, and helping students transition to work or to further education.

58

59
60 3.3 Criteria to be used when evaluating candidates for Promotion and Tenure

61

62 3.3.3 Service

63

64 3.3.3.3 Baseline. The candidate has undertaken a fair share of the workload required to
65 keep the Department functioning well. This includes activities such as work on
66 department committees, educational equity activities, the creation or revision of
67 curricula, the assessment of student learning outcomes, or participating in department
68 planning, accreditation, outreach, and advising. This level of achievement must include
69 some documented service to students. A baseline level of achievement for promotion
70 to Professor will also include at least some service at the University level.

71
72 3.3.3.4 Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has also
73 participated in significant service activities beyond the department. This will usually
74 include college-level service and may include University level service, service in the
75 community, or significant activities in a professional organization. It may also include
76 extensive and effective engagement with students and student organizations beyond
77 the home department, or extensive and effective educational equity activities. In at
78 least one facet of service, the candidate will have demonstrated leadership resulting in
79 tangible, documented achievements.

80
81 3.3.3.5 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate
82 has documented significant influence at a high level, whether it be service to students,
83 the University, the community, or the profession. Candidates who achieve an evaluation

84 of "excellent" in service will generally have occupied several elected or appointed
85 positions of leadership and will document multiple specific accomplishments that have
86 significance for people beyond the candidate's department or college.

**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
ONE WASHINGTON SQUARE
SAN JOSÉ, CA 95192**

**S21-1, University Policy, Time-Limited Amendment of
Research Oversight**

Temporarily Amends: F12-5, S14-6, F17-1

Effective: Immediately until such time when individual policy amendments are permanent within university policies (see Resolved).

Legislative History:

At its meeting of January 11, 2021, the Academic Senate Executive Committee approved the following policy recommendation on the behalf of the full senate body, as outlined in Bylaw 4.2.1, presented by Chair Mathur and Senator Sasikumar. Prior to Executive Committee review, the Organization and Government Committee reviewed and provided feedback on this policy. This policy is intended to be a measure put in place to ensure continuity in the oversight of research on animal and human subject populations and research misconduct.

ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

**Signed and approved by Mary A.
Papazian, President, San José State
University on January 12, 2021.**

Whereas: Federal and state regulations require continuity in university oversight of research by an Institutional Officer or Institutional Official (IO); and

Whereas: The Associate Vice President in the Office of Research (AVPR) position is named in several policies to act as the IO, and the current AVPR retired at the end of December 2020; and

Whereas: The search for a new AVPR is expected to take several months, during which time research will continue, creating the need for a replacement or a backup for the AVPR in the protection of human subjects (F17-1, *University Policy, Protection of Human Research Subjects*), the humane care and use of animals (S14-6, *University Policy, Policy and Assurance for Humane Care and Use of Animals at San José State University*), and responding to allegations of research misconduct (F12-5, *University Policy, Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct*); and

Whereas: A backup for the AVPR should be created in policy to maintain continuity in the future; and

Whereas: The SJSU Academic Senate reconvenes on February 8, 2021, at which time it can consider permanent amendments creating backups for the AVPR, to the relevant policies, namely F17-1, S14-6, and F12-5; therefore, be it

Resolved: That until such date as the Senate holds final votes on amendments to the policies named here and those amendments become permanent within those aforementioned university policies, the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) be designated as the Institutional Officer in F17-1 and S14-6; and as the Research Integrity Officer in F12-5.

Rationale: In order to provide continuity in the oversight of research on animal and human subject populations, the retiring AVPR must be replaced on a temporary basis until the appointment of a new AVPR. The Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI) is the most appropriate administrator to serve as the Institutional Officer or Institutional Official. These amendments to the policies related to the oversight of research will sunset after the Senate votes on policy resolutions that will add the VPRI as a backup for the AVPR, and these resolutions become permanent within these university policies.

Approved: January 11, 2021

Vote: 14-0-0

Present: Mathur (Chair), Curry, Day, Del Casino, Delgadillo, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, McKee, Papazian, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White

Absent: Wong(Lau)

Financial Impact: None anticipated.

Workload Impact: Additional workload for the Vice President for Research and Innovation, at times when the Associate Vice President for Research is unable to carry out their duties.