

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2020/2021
Agenda

March 1, 2021, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/81676110749>

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 February 8, 2021
- 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 February 1, 2021
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of March 1, 2021
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
Senate Calendar of 2021-2022
Election Calendar of 2022
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1806, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy S15-10, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy (Final Reading)
 - B. University Library Board (ULB):
 - C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
 - D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
 - E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1805, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion

***for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards, To
Provide for the Scholarship of Engagement (First Reading)***

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

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

XI. Adjournment

2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes
February 8, 2021

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

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Mathur, Delgadillo Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn 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, Birrer Absent: None	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, Buzanski	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 Kitajima read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of December 7, 2020 were approved (44-0-2).

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Mathur announced that nominating petitions and seat information for our Senate Elections have been sent to faculty. The deadline to submit a nominating petition is February 19, 2021. If your seat term is up and you are not interested in running for another term, please let the Senate Administrator or Senate Chair know. Please also encourage your colleagues to run for the Senate.

The faculty award committees have been doing their work diligently. They will be submitting their nominations to President Papazian by this coming Wednesday, if they have not already done so.

Vice Provost Anagnos has sent out a message to request campus feedback on the Draft GE Guidelines, please review and provide any comments. C&R will review these feedback and utilize it to update the guidelines.

Chair Mathur reminded the Senate that the Senate Retreat (SJSU and the Post Pandemic University) is this coming Friday, February 12, 2021 from 9 a.m. to noon. Please plan on attending and RSVP to the calendar invite.

B. From the President:

President Papazian announced that she has been involved in budget advocacy meetings in Sacramento. Our students have also been involved in an active way. The governor came out with a budget that recognized the importance of the CSU and provided some funding for us to address some critical needs and mandatory costs. In addition, it includes some one-time funds for professional development and deferred maintenance. The CSU and Board of Trustees (BOT) have asked for an increase of not only the \$144.5 million in recurring funding the governor proposed, but an additional \$365,299,000 to make-up for what was cut in last year's budget, and another \$65.5 million to address graduation initiatives. Also, it includes a much more robust request in one-time dollars for deferred maintenance. We are also asking for some emergency short-time grants for our undocumented students because of the critical need there as well. The president cannot say where this will land, but the legislature is certainly very supportive. It really depends on what the money coming in looks like and what some of the needs are in terms of health and safety as well as the infrastructure around the economic downturn and COVID-19. Nevertheless, this is a much better place to start than last year.

When the first wave of CARES dollars came through about \$14 million went out in direct aid to students. The second round of funding, which has a total nationally of \$23 billion, passed congress at the beginning of this year and has the requirement to disburse to students the equivalent amount that we disbursed the last time as well as an additional \$30 million to us to address

COVID-related challenges at SJSU. We are waiting for some guidance from the federal government regarding funding for undocumented students as well as international students. These students were not eligible in the last go around. It is not clear that that was the only way to read the statute. We are hoping we will be able to extend some of those dollars to these populations.

Robust negotiations continue in congress right now on a third CARES package. This would be part of President Biden's \$1.9 trillion relief/rescue package. This is looking to be just under \$40 billion nationally which is significantly more than we have seen before. What we are hearing is that we would be expected to receive about 50% of those dollars. What that amount is we don't know yet. These funds would be a direct pass through to our students to provide emergency financial support for them. We have good systems in place and we were able to distribute those funds the first time pretty quickly. We are hoping and pushing hard for our undocumented and international student populations. As we learn more we will get the word out. This would really help us. We were able to use CARES dollars to invest in the faculty workshops over the summer and we are looking at ways to continue to do that to provide support for students. We are also looking at things like our advising structure and how we can augment that with additional coaches and support in both academic and non-academic areas. In addition, we want to be able to provide both faculty and staff with the tools they need to do the really hard work.

We are very much aware and are tracking issues around enrollment and retention and those kinds of challenges. There are some critical courses that need to be taught in person, and with the lifting of the stay at home order, we fully anticipate we will be able to move to the schedule as it was originally set starting February 15, 2021. The Provost will be sending a notice soon. We are planning for fall and the Provost will answer those questions. The guidance we got from the Chancellor's Office is that we should try and plan as much in person as we can. We are trying to anticipate what fall will look like. It all depends on the vaccine rollout, whether the one-dose vaccine from Johnson and Johnson gets rolled out in time, whether it is made available, and whether our population takes it. There are a lot of unknowns there. The very large courses where we might have trouble spreading out may be more online whereas the smaller courses may be more in person. We will let you know as we know more. We appreciate everyone's flexibility.

We (President Papazian and the CDO) have reviewed the nominees for the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (CDEI) and made selections. We were very encouraged by the number of nominations. Those invitation letters will be going out this week. There is a lot of work to do. I (President Papazian) will be asking the committee to be tough minded and very engaged in the findings. To strongly engage with the feedback from the surveys and that were done and the fora, both in the positives, but more importantly in the

challenges/concerns for us in order to improve the climate for everyone on campus. This committee is a very large and diverse group, especially excited about the number of students on the committee, seven students. I (President Papazian) appreciate the CDO's leadership in this group. Many thanks to all nominees for their interest. We still keep the list to utilize as individuals rotate off this committee.

The insurrection on the capitol on December 6, 2020 brought challenges to our democracy. This feeds into our work on systemic racism and bias on campus. We will continue to work on this going forward. The committee on Community Safety and Policing is writing its report right now and preparing to submit their recommendations. Once that is done we will review and begin a process of implementing change.

Questions:

Q: Recently there was a newspaper article about how the Athletics Director is under investigation due to complaints from employees about working conditions. Can you share any information about this with us?

A: Sure, we haven't received any notice of an investigation. It's a newspaper article. There is a process in place that we are working through as we begin to open up the campus. There will be many questions around repopulation and what that looks like. This is something we are working through with University Personnel, FD&O, etc. to ensure we have a consistent and equitable approach. That process is underway. We read that, but we haven't actually heard that or gotten any notice from the county. That is where that stands right now. We are in active and deep conversations with the county right now about the vaccine. The county is very interested in using our site as a vaccination site. They like our spaces. We would like to be able to make this service available. It would be a public site for the downtown community. It is a way for us to give back. There are no other vaccination sites downtown. We are just in deep conversations right now, but are optimistic this might happen.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of November 30, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of January 11, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of January 25, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of February 8, 2021—AVC Marachi amended the consent calendar to add a member to the Campus Planning Board (Junelyn Peoples). There was no dissent to the consent calendar as presented and amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Chair Mathur presented University Policy, S21-1, Time-Limited Amendment of Research Oversight. With the retirement of AVP Stacks in December 2020, it was noted that there were three policies that named the AVP Research as the designated institutional officer for research oversight or as the institutional officer for research misconduct. The Senate Office received a referral to update the three policies from the Vice President of Research and Innovation (VPRI), Mohammad Abousalem, in the last week before the winter break due to AVP Stacks retirement. The Organization and Government Committee Chair, Karthika Sasikumar, worked closely with the VPRI to develop a temporary measure to put into place to ensure continuity in research oversight. The Executive Committee acting on behalf of the Senate was asked to provide coverage temporarily until permanent amendments could be brought to the full Senate by O&G. Those three amendments will be heard later today. It is very rare for the Executive Committee to take this action on behalf of the Senate. This was a time-sensitive issue. On January 11, 2021, the Executive Committee approved this policy amendment in accordance with bylaw 4.2.1. The President signed and approved the policy amendment on January 12, 2021. What we are asking for you to do today is take a look at the policy and then for the full Senate to endorse it and the action of the Executive Committee.

Questions:

Q: Are there any qualifications required for this individual, or certifications?

A: I believe that training and certification is required by the federal government to be the institutional officer for research. However, the person we are designating as backup is the VPRI.

Q: So, is the expectation that as part of that role that person will have that training and certifications ahead of time so they can step into that role when needed?

A: Right.

The Senate voted on endorsing University Policy S21-1 and it passed (47-0-2).

VI. Unfinished Business:

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1797, Amendment D to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees, Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters (Final Reading)***. On our campus, there is a long history of controversies of whether joint appointments are a wise or an unwise idea. In 2015, we were told that there was no need to provide for the possibility of joint appointments in the RTP policies as the university was phasing them out. For one reason or another, we now have some joint appointments and so the Director of Faculty Affairs James Lee asked my committee to take a look at providing for joint committees for joint appointments. The collective bargaining agreement requires that joint

appointments be evaluated in both departments separately in unless there is a campus policy, which provides for a joint committee. And, rather than making our dozen or so joint appointments jumped from two different hoops the idea was to create a single committee so they would be treated more or less like everyone else, a committee that would be composed of numbers from both of their departments. In order to do that we needed define what a joint appointment was, and then we secondly needed to set up a simple procedure for creating these joint committees. So, these two policy recommendations have to come separately, one has an amendment to the appointments policy which you're looking at right now and which is simple paragraphs asking to note that it is a joint appointment within the appointment letter. The other is an amendment to the procedures policy which simply describes how do you set up one of these committees to avoid the need to send this evaluation is to separate department committees.

Q: I'm just curious what's the definition of an equivalent unit, so it would be in more than one department or equivalent unit is that are there, joint appointments between departments, for example in programs or departments and some other unit.

A: That's the standard phrase that is in all of our policies to take in schools, so we talk about chairs and directors, departments and schools, the school is the equivalent unit of a department. Under our policy and so that's what we use that now, if you are in two separate programs, but the programs are in the same department, then this would not pertain it wouldn't apply and it wouldn't be needed, since departments have their own committees.

Q: Would account for a department and a program?

A: If the program is within the department, then it's within a department that would not be a joint appointment, what counts is if it's across two departments and that's basically what the collective bargaining agreement talks about when it requires that each department conduct a separate review. That's the only basis for a joint review that we have and is what the collective bargaining agreement gives us, and that would be shared between two different departments.

Q: So my question is when is this triggered. We have a department, that is, we have affiliated faculty with the human factors masters programs. So, now that they're hired by psychology and the word joint certainly doesn't appear, but it "may" participate in. And so, basically, the question would be for not necessarily the appointment letter, so does the word joint have to appear, but for the next policy as well, what is this triggered and does the Faculty Member have a choice of doing this or not.

A: It is not a choice, it is triggered if, and only if, the appointment letter specifies, as it says in 5.6. That a faculty member will have duties in more than one department or unit and the letter has to indicate what the home department is.

A motion was made to approve AS 1797. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and AS 1797 passed as written (47-0-0).**

Senator Peter presented ***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).***

Under Section 3 of the procedures policy, which talks about how we set up committees, we've added a new section 3.7 entitled modified procedures for joint appointments. Four sections, the first section simply says the candidates who hold these joint appointments, as indicated in their appointment letters, shall be evaluated at the department level by committee with representation from each relevant department and this representation shall be roughly proportional to the assignment of the candidate so it depends on how the parameters get set up within the appointment letter. We also specify that the committee should be chaired by a committee member from the home department as identified in the appointment letter. You can see why we insisted that the appointment letter identify the home department, so now we have somebody who's responsible for sharing this committee and helping to organize it. In the remaining sections we try to clarify certain other issues and 3.7.2, we indicate that Members on joint committee shall be elected as they are for all other RTP committee save only that a current department committee may simply designate some of its already elected members for simultaneous service on the joint committee. Each of those two department committees could just pick two members to send to a joint committee for the purposes of evaluating this joint appointment, no new elections would be needed, no additional organization would be needed, we wanted to make this as simple as possible. We also clarify the Chair of the home department shall hold the normal functions of chair for the evaluation of the joint appointment, so there isn't conflict between the chair's role and the two separate departments. Finally, and this is somewhat important, we indicate that 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, there will not be joint committees at the College level.

Q: Clearly the department and guidelines from the home department would apply what is the fate of the departmental guidelines from the joint department.

A: That would have to be discussed in the appointment letter, that is the kind of parameter would need to be specified there.

Q: I was wondering whether the process of designation from the individual department committees is subject to the same provisions for seniority that would normally apply (e.g., for promotion no junior faculty should serve).

A: The same qualifications of seniority would have to apply.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "are eligible" in line 69 to "may be eligible." Senator Rodan presented

an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “procedures” in line 63 to “provisions.” **The Senate voted and AS 1795 passed as amended (44-0-3).**

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1790, Amendment to Standing Rule 7a, Inclusion of Land Acknowledgement in Academic Senate Agenda (First Reading)***.

Q: I had a question about whether we need to include anything regarding the provenance of such a land acknowledgement, whether we should be working with members of the local tribal leadership that sort of thing so.

A: We did actually discuss that in the committee at some length and, as you know, there is a number of land acknowledgments that are currently being used, even at San José State. We did discuss this with the Council of the Muwekma Ohlone. We’re merely including the fact that there will be a land acknowledgement in the agenda and my understanding is that the senate chair in consultation with the person who is reading the acknowledgement will select an appropriate one each time.

Senator Schultz-Krohn made a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1790 a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed (41-3-3). **The Senate voted and AS 1790 passed as written (46-0-1).** Senator Sasikumar acknowledged O&G member Soma de Bourbon for her work on the Land Acknowledgement and for educating the members of O&G on the issues that are involved with Land Acknowledgement. O&G is working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution that we hope to bring to the Senate soon that will address the issue of Land Acknowledgement and that sometimes that they are viewed as merely symbolic.

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

Senator White presented ***AS 1791, Policy Recommendation, Accessibility in Curricular Materials (First Reading)***.

Questions:

Q: My question concerns the 2nd and 3rd Resolved Clauses and the tone of them. Has the committee discussed the tone of these and by that I mean the second Resolved Clause says, “The faculty shall select or create accessible versions of all curricular materials.” This puts the responsibility completely on the faculty as opposed to indicating it is the university’s responsibility and faculty by themselves might not be able to do it without a lot of help from the university. Then in the 3rd Resolved Clause it says, “If materials cannot be made accessible due to technological limitations then an equally effective alternative must be created or provided.” Now that Resolved Clause does not say by the faculty, it is a more neutral statement. It could be the university that provides it on behalf of the faculty or not. Why put the onus completely on the

faculty for solving the problem in the second Resolved Clause and not something more like the tone of the 3rd Resolved Clause?

A: I don't think we actually talked about the tone of these clauses when we were putting them together. We can definitely take that under advisement. So you are looking for something more like the 4th Resolved Clause so that the task is not completely on faculty. Ultimately the faculty are developing the pedagogy and materials for the class so they should always check to make sure those materials are accessible. We are not saying they would have to go about doing this alone. We did talk to the Center for Faculty Development, etc. I will take this back to the committee to look at the tone of the first three Resolved Clauses for sure.

Q: It should be everyone's responsibility at the university and not just the faculty.

A: We do talk about that in the Resolved Clauses.

Q: My question has to do with line 46, where it talks about all faculty and staff having to go through accessibility training. Does this mean it would be mandatory? If so, when would faculty undergo this training? Would it be the first semester of teaching? Would it be on an ongoing basis?

A: We did not really discuss when faculty would undergo the training. I can take that back to the committee and we can put in some details on something like this. We will also speak to the Center for Faculty Development about to get more information.

Q: In your 3rd Whereas you say the Executive Order requires all campuses to create and implement plans and also provide funding, resources and training. Do we have any information on that within our budget and how much the campus is able and willing to provide funding for this type of work?

A: You mean do we as a campus have a budget line? I would probably defer to our VP for Administration and Finance for that. I don't recall seeing that in the budget presentation, but we can ask that question.

Q: That's what I'm asking, did you ask that question?

A: No we did not.

Q: This is going to take a lot of time to get all our class materials accessible. Is there a time frame for this?

A: If you go back and look at the policy we already have, we have already passed the time when we were supposed to have all our classes accessible. We intentionally did not put a timeline in this policy because of various things we discussed in committee. We would envision that as this goes through program planning they will look at which classes are accessible and which need tweaking. We did not put a timeline in here, because everything should be accessible at this point.

Q: Would the committee consider separating out a separate Resolved Clause to the Learning Management System, because we know there are issues

there and other policies where you must have a minimum presence on campus, etc. Another Resolved Clause would be around testing, proctoring, software, etc? These are two heavily loaded areas that might benefit from separate Resolves Clauses.

A: Sure, I will definitely take that back to the committee.

C: I'm totally in support of this Executive Order. I'm not sure I'm asking the committee to do anything, because I don't think anything can be done. I want to point out that in teaching classes, like Contemporary World Arts, we are automatically excluding a lot of work like "Women of Color," and a number of other films that we can't get captioned. We are silencing large groups of people. You can't show things hot off the press at least in the arts, more grassroots stuff. I had a student who was hard of hearing and they watched the film anyway and then read additional material about it, because there is no supplement. The idea that there is a replacement isn't always the case. There may be a need for massive funding.

A: We did talk about this in C&R. We did talk to the e-Campus group about captioning and providing transcripts. We can definitely work on this language a little more, but I would encourage you to reach out to e-campus for transcript alternatives.

C: I did, but they can't do it with material that is copyrighted. They just said flat out that they can't do it and I had to contact the filmmaker. I did and they wrote back and they can't do it with stuff that is copyrighted. Just to let you know, there are limits to what they can do as well.

A: Thank you.

Q: I face a very similar problem. I teach about contemporary issues. There was a documentary about COVID in China that does not have captions and cannot be captioned legally by our team here at SJSU. I could not use the film for this reason. This is shaping our instruction. I agree with my colleague that there is no solution to this problem. It is important to get it on the record that it does affect different disciplines and different educational experiences as well. I wanted to ask a question about a needs assessment. In the current situation, where we are completely online, I have found myself trying to transform some of my print materials into accessible materials. I was able to do it, but only because I do own a scanner and have the software to do it. I doubt that all faculty have access to the resources to do this. The needs assessment has to be constantly changing with new technology and new circumstances of instruction come into play.

A: So, are you asking us to look at the Resolved about the needs assessment and maybe consider looking at technology changes? I'm not sure what the definition of needs assessment is, but maybe you could share that with the group. However, I think the term ongoing is important because it signals this is an evolving and changing set of needs.

Q: On line 37, where it says simultaneous, the unintended consequence of this seems to me that we would have to delay textbook adoption or anything else until it is available in all modalities. I don't think that is what is intended, but I wonder how you take the legal standard?

A: Definitely, we can talk about that, but that is the legal standard. The federal law says it must be simultaneously.

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

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

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

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***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)***.

The chancellor's office reviewed the work that we did in December and raised concern that we were automatically changing a WU grade to a W grade; they noted that this is not permissible. There were also issue regarding failing grades as related to Academic Integrity concerns. Students have been notified, that if they did receive a failing grade due to an academic integrity violation that the failing grade does still stand and that this policy and F20-2 do not affect those grades.

Q: I had a question regarding changing it to no credit. Will there be a petition process to change the no credit to a W or would that student then be stuck with the no credit for a class?

A: This amendment does not affect the student's ability to request a withdrawal from a class or the Semester, this is just changing the automatic process, but the student still absolutely has the right to petition to take any grades and turn them to an actual withdraw or a W.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add another Resolved Clause before the existing Resolved Clause to read, "*Resolved: That F20-2 be amended to remove the language as shown: That SJSU should, so far as is legally possible, convert all WU grades in Fall 2020 to W grades.*" Senator Masegian presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the last Resolved Clause to read, "*Resolved: That SJSU should consider, so far as legally possible, converting all grades of Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) to No Credit (NC) for Spring 2021.*" Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to change line 31 of the last Resolved Clause to add, "*...for Winter and Spring 2021.*" Senator Riley presented an amendment to the Van Selst Amendment to change it to read, "*...for Winter, Spring, and Summer 2021.*" The Senate voted on the Riley Amendment to the Van Selst Amendment and it passed (34-13-1). The Senate voted on the Van

Selst/Riley Amendment and it passed (37-9-0). **The Senate voted and AS 1802 passed as amended (45-1-1).**

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented ***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).***

In 2015, we separated “Service” into its own category for RTP evaluation. It used to be combined with another category and then specified four different descriptions of service. Somewhere we dropped all of the old language about educational equity activities from the previous policy. This will restore educational equity in service to students (both definition and descriptors).

Questions:

Q: When we do a change to the RTP policy, what happens to people currently in the pipeline? Is this a policy that then takes effect for Fall 2021 documents/dossiers? On the implementation side, what does that look like?

A: Under the terms of the CBA you cannot change the criteria and standards while the process is going on. Anything that we might adopt during this year would not be implemented until the beginning of the next RTP cycle.

However, you are correct. Unless we were to adopt some phased in implementation these changes would apply beginning in the fall. Phasing in these changes was appropriate when we had a wholesale revision in 2015. This is relatively limited and opens up options rather than imposing requirements other than that one sentence in baseline. I think it would be pretty hard to argue that faculty documenting they had some service to students would be over the top.

Q: I don't think this policy pushes us far enough, particularly in the way it is framed. I'm concerned it doesn't show up at the highest level. We have a massive educational equity gap on the campus. I appreciate the context of the cultural taxation, but it is more than just accounting for that. It is suggesting that for being a part of our community, educational equity and service to students is essential to the work. As I read this I felt that this language doesn't do that. It doesn't push us as a campus to say that educational equity and service to our students is an essential criteria that needs baseline good and exceptional particular ways. We almost make this like an option in the language we have now.

A: In the baseline, we call out educational equity where it wasn't before. We indicate that there must be some documented service to students that we didn't have before. The issue at the highest level of excellence is that we don't really call out any of the other forms of service at that level. What I'm reading from you is that you'd like to have something more specific at the highest level of excellence as well and then I'm not sure what language you'd suggest at the baseline level. The PS Committee would certainly be willing to

look at something you drafted and consider it in committee.

Q: I think it is a larger issue. I think we need to have conversations with our colleagues beyond the Senate. It almost rests at the question of the social justice mission of the institution. If that is a core value of the institution then I don't know why we would say "some" or "may" in a policy that elevates the question. I think there is an opportunity to have a larger campus conversation about this very question and how it aligns with our overall strategic plan and our ethics for how we want the campus to run. I appreciate the effort and the work.

A: We would appreciate suggestions, which is why this is a first reading and why we asked the administration to chime in. Please send us your ideas.

C: I totally agree with the points just brought up regarding the language and the strength and centrality of closing equity gaps in service. However, there is another important issue for me. There is an implied algorithm about what constitutes the difference between baseline good and excellent. I want to challenge you to think about when we say that if you get appointed to a committee for example, candidates of color or other marginalized candidates have very little control over who appoints them in some ways. I have an assumption that people are working in systemically inequitable situations. I think it is possible for someone to do excellent service within their own department or program that may not stretch to the rest of the university. The standards that differentiate between baseline good and excellent have to have within them some value laden understandings about privilege that go unrecognized. I wouldn't want someone to be punished because they were not appointed to committees because the pipeline is not directly known. Then sometimes we have the opposite problem of the cultural tax. This is the problem of gatekeeping so that we don't have people ending up in positions that they are the most qualified to be in on campus simply because they are over-serviced. The rubric is then that it is not going to be regarded as excellent, because I'm only working with undocumented students in my major for example. This is even though we know that these populations take a good amount of time and there is little research and literature on how to do it. People may be doing highly effective and innovative work that goes unrecognized. That is my concern, the distinction and the hidden algorithm of privilege and power within baseline to good to excellent. This is particularly problematic for highly tokenized communities, Native Americans for example.

A: Thank you and again, this committee would appreciate some sample language from you. If you could look through the categories and make some suggestions the committee will take them up.

Q: In line 76, it talks about student organizations beyond the home department. I'd like to suggest that beyond the home department shouldn't be attached to student organizations. If beyond the home department were moved somewhere else in that sentence it might work.

A: The committee will consider this. Basically, when the policy was written, it

was thought that it should parallel the scholarship that is the impact or scope of the service so the baseline was generally considered apart from the department and considered to be the most basic level. The service activities out to the college, or the community, or your professional organizations were considered a higher level of achievement. What I'm hearing is that basic rubric for service is itself problematic.

C: I would like to remind the committee that there is a wealth of activity happening at the university on the staff side trying to address some of the educational equity issues, and it would be nice if that was also listed as a possible way faculty could satisfy their service requirement by working with campus partners on the staff side to try and address these issues.

Q: Thank you for all the comments, and especially the last comment. That is a wonderful idea. Also I'd like to thank the PS Committee for continuously working to move the needle towards a more equitable RTP process. One real quick question, was the intention behind adding specific language around educational equity to deal with cultural taxation for faculty of color? Is there something we can do about implementation issues (a consistent problem)? I continue to hear about this all the time.

A: I don't think the PS Committee believes that a policy could end something as endemic as the cultural tax, but at least we could make sure that faculty get full credit. They are not getting full credit for the work they are doing for educational equity. I think our aim was a little more limited than that. To end the cultural tax would require changing the composition of the faculty which we are working on, and changing the society which we are working on too. I wish PS could do that, but this is what we can do. We can come and ask you and the Senate and other groups how to go about shifting our policies. We are a policy committee. With regard to implementation issues, we hear you. If you look at the report that PS issued about a year ago, "*Thirteen ways to improve RTP implementation.*" We hear you. I'm happy to say that the administration has been helping us with a number of these issues. The training is getting better and more extensive and will continue to do so as we move forward. It isn't enough yet, but it is a start. Up until a few years ago, there was no start. The needle is moving, but how quickly we can move that needle is yet to be seen.

Q: On line 69 it says that service to students will be required. My question is how will that be defined? For example, say someone is an assessment coordinator for their department, that can provide a lot of benefits for the students but they are more indirect. I can see potentially a lot of questions in the RTP Committee about how that would be defined.

A: Very good question. We do give a definition in 2.4.2.1., but maybe it isn't good enough. It says, "Advising, mentoring, and participating in activities to enhance learning and success that go beyond the curriculum. Of particular importance are activities that achieve educational equity...". If that language

is not inclusive enough or is lacking in some way, please send us language to consider.

Q: At the last Faculty Diversity Committee meeting, we had a discussion about the RTP training and the composition of the committee, one item that I found interesting and maybe it could be included in a future policy, was a request by faculty to have an advocate or ally on the committee while they are going through this process. Will the committee consider this?

A: That is an interesting suggestion and Magdalena Barrera has brought it to the PS Committee and I've also heard it from a meeting Walt Jacobs hosted for our Black Assistant Professors on campus. This is a suggestion the PS Committee is now considering.

C: On the educational equity activities, I think that having it clearer that this is both student impact but that could be via faculty training would be helpful. I would hope that the various centers would reach out to whoever their college level RTP chair was for the RTP review. I think they would be best able to catch whatever is missing while this policy is being opened.

A: I agree. I'd love to get that feedback, but we don't want the perfect to be the enemy of the good. We want to get something approved in time for the next cycle. All of this feedback needs to get to us promptly or we will have to wait another year.

Q: Can the PS Committee call in some units supporting this such as the Center for Faculty Development, the CDO Office, or Faculty Affairs to see how we could assist? I think we have this assumption that this will benefit automatically all marginalized faculty who are underrepresented. I'm imagining for example, a faculty member who is underrepresented in the sciences that may do very good work with BIPOC students in their labs, but maybe they haven't documented it well or thought about how they do this great onboarding in their labs. They may not know the standards and maybe how unique it is for their discipline. I would imagine coaches could work with these individuals. I believe the details of rolling it out and providing adequate support will be critical for success.

A: Agreed.

Senator Peter presented, ***AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (First Reading)***.

Questions:

Q: We are currently renegotiating a CBA that might be in place as soon as Fall 2021, is it worth it to bring our policy in line with a CBA that might be out of date soon?

A: We have deliberately tried in this policy to remove as many direct quotes from the CBA as possible. There are some places you can't do it, but we tried

to make our reference to general sections that tend not to have changed over the years. One of the problems with the 2010 policy is that it was filled with quotations from the CBA two or three agreements ago. We have tried to craft a policy that will stand the test of time a little better than that. However, all of these policies are in constant need of revision as the CBA changes. We may have to amend this again. As I said before, let's not let perfect be the enemy of the good. Let's fix as many problems as we can now.

Q: This very clearly pertains to appointment, evaluation and promotion so I assume that recruitment and that sort of stuff is not included in this policy. Is that correct?

A: Yes, this is not called promotion it is called range elevation and lecturer faculty would want us to be very careful with that language. As they go up in range that is not a promotion. This is not the equivalent of RTP and they think it would be very destructive to make that kind of parallel given that they do not acquire the privileges acquired by probationary faculty like tenure for example. In regard to appointment, this is not about the procedure for doing so. I think the policy most equivalent would be the procedures policy for RTP which also does not get at the recruitment side of appointing tenure/tenure track faculty.

Q: The Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Faculty Affairs Committee had a very interesting discussion with visiting lecturers who came to tell us a lot of the issues they have encountered. We intend on having an ASCSU meeting of lecturers to bring more of that experience and issues that need to be addressed. One of the areas that has been worked on since before I was an ASCSU Senator was to have lecturer representation on the ASCSU. This past meeting, we failed to pass a resolution that would have made it mandatory to have lecturer representation on the ASCSU by one vote. We are hopeful but we recognize the great deal of problems that arise when equity is addressed among peers. I would very much like to continue this conversation about how addressing all faculty is the best thing to do. If we can improve things for those that experience the worst conditions, it will improve conditions for everyone.

A: You did remind me there was one element of the policy I should call people's attention to including the administration. The old policy gave a very long list of titles that this university uses for lecturer faculty. We put it all into an appendix. The policy gives procedures for changing those titles, mainly through the Provost in consultation with the PS Committee. These titles have built up over the years, are rarely used, and are poorly defined. One new title we are suggesting in that list is Senior Lecturer. This is to be given to lecturers with multi-year contracts and six years of seniority in hopes that this will establish them with their tenure/tenure track faculty as anything but temporary, but long-term and as committed to the university. This will give them standing in addressing other members of the faculty. We put that in the index as one title we think is really called for.

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1800, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S14-6, Policy and Assurance for Humane Care and Use of Animals (Final Reading).***

As you heard from Chair Mathur at the start of this session, these are the three policy recommendations that are amending three specific policies that are on the books already. These policies name the AVP of the Office of Research as the person who is responsible for oversight or research (designations determined/derived from federal regulations). We received a referral from VP Abousalem asking us to designate his role as the backup for the AVP of Office of Research.

Q: Can you offer a blanket explanation for the 2 abstentions listed?

A: The reasons for those absentions is that we are unable to find a legal document that draws a straight line from federal law to creation of these policies which have been on the books for many years. But this does allow the senate to create such policies and designations.

Q: Is there a reason for the multiple whereas statements vs. rationale?

A: No specific reason.

C: These three policies are subject to a high-level of federal regulations. Approve O&G jumping on top of this and bringing this in line.

The Senate voted and AS 1800 passed as written (44-1-0).

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1801, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy F17-1, Protection of Human Research Subjects (Final Reading).*** **The Senate voted and AS 1801 passed as written (44-1-0).**

Q: Did the group consider at some point that we might want three different people to hold these different roles and that by writing exact titles, in that we limit our ability, administratively to make decisions in the space?

A: We did consider something similar to that and we considered the possibility of allowing for the VPRI to designate another official, but my understanding from speaking with him was that that would not be appropriate, with these policies, that it is actually preferable to have a specific position be designated.

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1799, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F12-5, Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (Final Reading).*** **The Senate voted and AS 1799 passed as written (45-1-0).**

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

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Statewide Academic Senators:

At our last ASCSU meeting we had some interesting discussions around equity. We also welcomed Chancellor Castro and bid farewell to Executive Vice Chancellor Blanchard who is leaving to become the President of the University of Houston downtown campus. There was a report from former chair Nelson who is chairing the BOT Faculty Trustee Recommendations Committee. I'm pleased to report that there are seven candidates including our own Romey Sabalius. With respect to resolutions, we had eight resolutions that were approved. Among those were resolutions protecting fair workload for faculty, two resolutions regarding technology (one regarding disparate impact of technology on underserved students and one regarding internet bandwidth expansion for students, faculty, and everybody else), a resolution regarding the condemnation of the events of January 6, 2021, and another resolution that asked for the compassionate treatment of CSU employees during COVID-19. In addition to that, we had one returned resolution that had to do with Emeritus Faculty status revocation and appeal. We contributed to this resolution by providing our own campus resolution and we will be bringing that back again. We had two first readings. One had to do with a moratorium on campus facial recognition software in the CSU. The second was an endorsement and adoption of general education B4/Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning course guidelines and principles. As usual even on zoom, we try very hard listening to reports from our colleagues such as Senator Van Selst and Senator Rodan who are heavily engaged in work around community college transfer work surrounding AB 1460 for Senator Van Selst and for Senator Rodan who is involved in questions around technology.

B. Provost:

Announcement out shortly, next week is February 15, 2021, we talked about face-to-face classes that were already in the schedule. We are going to let those resume as planned. With dropping COVID rates and the procedures we've implemented, we feel pretty safe. Obviously there are a lot of things going on in planning Fall 2021 with a lot of unknowns. We've created a planning document that has been distributed to leadership and those that make schedules. This gives them guidelines and guideposts for how to build a schedule of classes for the Fall right now. We have to maintain a variety of classes for both our students and our colleagues with maintaining flexibility while meeting density requirements. Other things going on relate to it becoming a high season in the Provost Office for reading files, making decisions, and moving things forward to the President. We are working on those things as well. We have a couple of searches going forward. We have a search for the Vice Provost of Faculty Success as well as a relaunching of the search for the Dean of the Library, because we were not able to land a Dean in the last cycle.

Q: We are in the process of fall planning right now and people are asking about modalities, so up to what point can a modality be changed if we need to?

A: They can be changed all the way up to the first day of classes, and they can be changed as we did in Spring of 2020 in the middle of the semester if need be. We are planning based on what we know today. Things could change in 2 months, 4 months, 6 months. There is absolutely the potential that things will change. We might have to have more online classes, or less online classes. We might have different configurations for using classrooms. This will obviously be driven by health and safety questions. Great question.

C. Associated Students President:

AS President Delgado reported that AS is still waiting for the university to approve their AS Board approved budget for 2021-2022. At the end of Fall 2020, the Cesar Chavez Community Action Center was approved by the AS Board of Directors for a universal design renovation at the campus community garden. We will be the first CSU to implement a universal design project on our campus and our community garden. The hope for the universal design concept is to allow the garden to be accessed, understood, and used to the greatest extent possible by all people regardless of their age, size, ability, or disability and more importantly to bring light to the intersectionality of ableism and environmental justice. The universal design project is moving fast with their anticipated completion date by the end of February or early March. The universal design renovation will include an ADA accessible entrance and an open air welcome space, an ADA Ramp, an ADA porta potty, the front half of the garden will be paved for universal design accessibility, there are raised beds, an ADA compliant sink and kitchen, and so much more. AS is very excited about this project. AS election applications are underway and they are due February 26, 2021. If any of you know any student that would be a great fit, please encourage them to apply.

D. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF): No report.

E. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA): No report.

F. Chief Diversity Officer:

We had two Campus Climate Survey Forums for our students, two for our staff, and two for our faculty. I will just give you some highlights. Not only were some of the findings from the survey reinforced by those that attended the forums, but we had a chance to break out into groups and really highlight more in depth some of the findings from the survey. I'd just like to encourage this group to go to the slidedeck online. Some of the highlights from the student forums included recognition from graduate students about how important it was for them to see the results of the Campus Climate Survey from the graduate students. This made them feel seen. They have reported

feeling as if they are an afterthought in just about every department or place they encounter on campus. They feel invisible and that they are not supported at all. This is not through purposeful exclusion, but really through neglect. The other finding that was said in both sessions is the surprise that students have similar patterns of care that they need to provide for either children, elders, or other people in the family. One in five of our undergraduate students have responsibility for the care of children under the age of 10 as well as elders and other people. Some have their own children, but for others it is the primary care of siblings. For graduate students the numbers are slightly higher. We need to recognize that for many of these students they are first generation and these are responsibilities that they have. Lecturer faculty had strong support for the Campus Climate Survey feeling that again their issues were being seen and heard. Lastly, staff are very concerned about high turnover, no clear career progression pathways, redistribution of work when there is turnover of staff that is not recognized and they are doing a lot more work. Most of our staff have been working nonstop since March. They didn't get summer off or vacations and they continue to work long hours, and alternate hours, to support our faculty and students. These are just some highlights from our fora, I think are important for this group to hear.

G. CSU Faculty Trustee:

Two weeks ago, the Board of Trustees met and it was Chancellor Castro's first meeting. He started out very positively. He announced there will be no tuition increases for the next academic year. He announced he will not support any furloughs. He also announced if state and federal budget outlooks remain the same, we will do our best not to have any additional layoffs of permanent CSU faculty. The budget so far is good. This upcoming year will also be okay. We haven't felt the pain yet. This is because of federal stimulus funds we received last year and that we are receiving this year. However, the following two years will probably be difficult. I apologize that I will not be able to attend the next SJSU Senate meeting on March 1, 2021. I sent out my report via the Senate listserv last week, so that is my report. If you have any questions let me know.

IX. Special Committee Reports:

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

**Executive Committee Minutes
February 1, 2021
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: None
Guest: Barrera

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur announced that Senate Election materials went out last Thursday in accordance with our scheduled Election Calendar. You may use the Adobe signature fields and pass along the petition or upload to DocuSign. If anyone needs help, please contact Chair Mathur or the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice.

The Senate Retreat is Friday, February 12, 2021 from 9 a.m. to Noon. There will be robust discussion around the post-pandemic university as well as games, such as Jeopardy, and door prizes. Please be sure and RSVP to Vice Chair McKee's calendar invite.

The first spring 2021 Senate meeting is next Monday, February 8, 2021. Please be sure and get any policy recommendations and resolutions to the Senate Administrator by Tuesday or Wednesday this week at the very latest.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of February 1, 2021, Executive Committee Minutes of January 25, 2021, and the Consent Calendar of February 1, 2021) (15-0-0).

3. From the President:

The effort is ongoing to prepare for as much in person instruction for fall 2021 as possible, but the reality is that we just don't know exactly what it will look like in fall. The vaccine rollout has been uneven. There are some interesting things to watch and consider as this unfolds. The Johnson & Johnson vaccine has the capacity to produce much more than current vaccines and is a one dose application. It does require refrigeration but not freezing, which is a very important piece when it comes to reaching rural and hard to reach areas. How quickly these can be rolled out, particularly to our most vulnerable communities, is really a race against the mutant variants of the vaccine. It does look like the COVID relief package that is in front of congress right now, does have funding for the rollout as well as the training of a workforce to administer and help with that process. We should know more in about a month. We are working on the planning. We will have to remain agile and flexible while making our best guess in partnership with the county. Some of you asked whether we have the chance to become a vaccine site that is a real possibility now. There are a lot of details still to be answered including if the vaccine will be available to our campus community and in what capacity and in what way. Hopefully we will know more about this in another week or so. We are pursuing that. I think it will happen, but probably not for several weeks. We will let the campus know more as we know.

Today is the launch of CSU Budget Advocacy Week. We have a series of meetings setup throughout the week with our local delegates and with the various caucuses as well. The AS President and student leadership are involved as well through the California State Student Association (CSSA). It is a big ax this year not only to recover the \$299 million we lost in the last budget cycle, but also to continue to support things like basic needs for students and the Graduation Initiative, mandatory costs, and one time deferred maintenance costs. It is a \$500 billion request. There seems to be a recognition in the legislature that the CSU and UC took a disproportionate cut in the last budget cycle last year and that we are key to the economic recovery of the state. This is part of the argument we are making. Thus far, the budget environment of the state has been positive. This is all relative to an economic crisis and pandemic, but the tax returns and budget thus far is better than was anticipated

in their projections. And, again the COVID-19 \$1.9 trillion package does have dollars for state and local government as well. This could also provide some support. Part of the mandatory cost is for implementation of AB 1460, the Ethnic Studies requirement. This is to continue to hire Ethnic Studies faculty and to continue to support the program in the way and spirit behind the legislation.

Questions:

Q: I know it has been crazy over the last few months, but can you give us any idea when and if you might sign the Student Honors Policy Amendment that was passed by the Senate in November and sent to you?

A: [President] I don't remember having that on my list. There were a number of emergency policies in December and Chair Mathur and I have not met to discuss this particular amendment yet. We will do so right away.

Q: We are getting a lot of concern about what is known about the COVID vaccine and will the campus be getting it. SFSU is holding seminars for their employees. Will SJSU be having anything similar?

A: [Provost] We don't have anything planned right now. If we think there is demand for answers about the differences in vaccines we could set something up, but it will precipitate a lot of questions about when we will have access and we don't know right now. The counties are all different and getting the vaccine at different rates. We are still working on planning. There are still even questions about what tier the education system is in. Those guidelines have not come down from the state yet. That is where we are right now.

[President] Also, depending on where people get the vaccine, you get whatever vaccine they have. You don't get a choice and there is no rhyme or reason to it except the Pfizer vaccine needs deep freezing and that tends to be in the hospitals.

[VP Day] There is no new information and pretty much what you hear on TV is what we know. As we move into the fall and become a vaccination site, we will roll out a substantial campaign to students explaining all their options. We will have to spend some time looking at our population and signs they are affected differently.

C: Just to be clear, that is not what they are talking about at SFSU right now. They are talking about how vaccines work and addressing the fears and mistrust people may have about vaccines. They are setting the stage to make people aware of how vaccines work and what they are.

A: [VP Day] We would include that as well. Right now we are trying to decide where this is heading. We will take a look and see when and if we can do something like this.

[President] Provost Del Casino maybe you can reach out to Audrey and our folks in public health. They may want to do a town hall for faculty and staff, and maybe we might want to do something else for students. It is important to start this now, because when people come back we are not going to be able to require that they get the vaccine. We want to encourage it and make sure they have information about it. We will follow-up on this. Thanks for the question.

Q: My understanding is that we are in Tier 1B, because there is already coordination between the employer and the health care provider such as Kaiser. Is that correct?

A: [President] No, as I understand it, you have to register with Kaiser and then when they get to your category they will send you an invitation to schedule an appointment.

Q: Okay, I was wrong but I don't think I'm the only one wrong. It would be good if that information was more available. My suggestion is that if we want to prioritize limited vaccine and are having face-to-face classes in the fall, perhaps there could be some coordination between SJSU and health care providers to place those faculty and staff that will be coming into direct face-to-face contact with students in a separate priority category? This way it wouldn't become about who registered first at what time and who knew about it.

A: [President] I don't honestly know what is possible in that area, but August is a long way off and depending on how this plays out there could be fairly wide access by July. We don't really have control over the rollout in terms of criteria. That comes from the health care providers and county. We are hearing we will be in Tier 1B which means that all employees would be eligible relatively soon. Most employees 65 and older are already eligible for the vaccine. Each provider is different. Students will probably not be able to get the vaccine until this summer, but we are going to keep our eye on it. We won't be calling the shots on that.

Q: I wanted to add to the encouragement to rollout information. People are asking questions. I really thought we would hear something on January 4, 2021 when we came back. There wasn't any information and that is okay I understand, but I did hear reputable news that there was a poll taken and 25% of those polled did not intend on getting the vaccine even when available. I'm very concerned because people are asking questions and it would be the responsible thing for us to get this information out to our students so they can pass it on to their folks as well. As far as the insurance thing, I started asking my insurance provider as well. I actually have an appointment now for March. I think it is important to give out updates on a weekly basis as to where we are.

A; [President] Thank you. We will get together with our staff and put together something. You are right it is a moving target and it is hard to know where to go.

C: [CDO] We know that vaccine hesitancy is a real cultural, community-based, and equity problem. By getting information out early, hopefully by the time the CDC gets to all of us for vaccinations in late summer, people have had time to think about all the information. We have heard from several different faculty members that have said they will not be getting the vaccine when it comes out because of their concerns about the speed it was produced and its safety. We have been trying to speak with them about it and they are in the age group the CDC says have a high vaccine hesitancy rate. California is actually doing fairly well. We only have a 20% vaccine hesitancy rate, whereas across the country the rate is 56%. We are doing better than other states.

4. Policy Committee Updates:

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA):

I&SA will be bringing a resolution to the Senate to amend F20-2 to change the WU grade to NC in compliance with the Chancellor's Office instruction on February 8, 2021. I&SA will be talking today about whether we should bring the Credit/No Credit resolution. I will bring to I&SA the discussions we had in Executive Committee and EO 1037. I will explain that all those limits will still apply. We will see what everyone says and if in agreement, we will bring it to the Senate on February 8, 2021. If not, we will send the referral back explaining the reasons. This would not be my preference.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS will bring the two policy amendments to the Senate on February 8, 2021 that we did not get to at the last Senate meeting in December dealing with the issue of joint appointments. In addition, there could be as many as three additional policy amendments. PS spent much of January meeting with subcommittees working on the Lecturer policy. We hope to bring this as a first reading at the February 8, 2021 Senate meeting. Two other policy amendments have to do with making our RTP policies more inclusive than they are. One will be called "*The Enhancement to Service Amendment*". This puts a little more beef behind the descriptions of service to students and calls out educational equity issues in the criteria for the RTP policy. The second amendment is "*The Scholarship of Engagement or Professional Engagement*". We have had a third category under scholarship of "Professional Activities" that has hardly been used. The intention of that category all along was for faculty to use their expertise in the community around them. We are rewriting that section to be clearer that this is to be included under the category of "Scholarship". We hope to bring this as a first reading at the February 8, 2021 Senate meeting as well. Other items PS is working on are a Sense of the Senate Resolution, *Endorsing the University of Chicago Statement on Academic Freedom* and the 140 mentions of Faculty Affairs in all the old policies. PS will prepare a spreadsheet for the two VPs to look at allocating the rolls where they should now fall.

Questions:

Q: [From the President] Speaking as a faculty member, I remember joint appointments were always tricky for the junior faculty member, because you had to do 100% in both places. Faculty that had say a 75%/25% split basically became like an adjunct in the 25% department. They weren't as engaged. I appreciate you taking this on. However, institutionally we have never been able to do this in a way that supports the faculty

member and gains the benefit of it. I'm very interested in how you will go about this. It is a very hard issue to resolve.

A: I agree with you entirely. I have disagreed in principle with the notion of joint appointments as long as I have been on PS, except at the senior level for that very reason. I think a joint appointment once you are done with RTP is a very different kind of thing. Under previous administrations there had been a few of them, but the decision had been made not to do any more. Under Elna Green we were counting them down. When we revised the RTP policy I asked if we needed to include them and Elna said no we are trying to get rid of them. That is where I thought it was going to go, but over the last couple years there have been some joint appointments and now we need to do something with them, because they have been appointed across departments and colleges in lines. I'm just trying to do the best I can to provide a simplified evaluation system given that other people have made the decision to continue them.

Q: [President Papazian] I appreciate that. I haven't had this conversation with the Provost so he is probably wondering what I'm talking about. There are some reasons for having it, but we must protect the faculty member. I'm going to step out of this conversation now, because this is really an academic issue for the Provost.

[Provost] I held a joint appointment at Cal State Long Beach. Intellectually the benefits are there. The question really is the letter that governs the work. Some of the ways we got around that is that I had to serve on two department committees and we counted that as service. There was less of a service requirement in other areas. I had a 51%/49% appointment and it was done this way so I didn't have a home department. They are complicated but when you think of something like Ethnic Studies, there could be a good reason to hire someone say jointly in Public Health and Chicano/Chicanx Studies. They are a little challenging to evaluate.

C: [Provost] The scholarship and engagement piece is critical. However, it does need to be linked to peer review. It needs to be acknowledged that peer review is still a component of that. It is critical that we ensure peer review is still the standard. There are multiple ways you can get peer review.

C: In the definition of scholarship, we will have a phrase which adds external review to the various ways of reviewing this kind of work, so there will be various ways available to faculty to ensure their professional engagement is reviewed appropriately.

Q: What happens when there isn't a member of the department on the review committee?

A: I will double check the language with the committee today, I think we are making reference to the department committees.

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

C&R will be spending most of this semester wrapping up the General Education Guidelines. The American Institutions Review Panel has been formed and emails went out today. The Ethnic Studies Review Panel closed on Friday and they should be appointed soon. One discipline is missing and Chair Mathur will be working with the Ethnic Studies Department. C&R should be bringing the guidelines to the Senate in March 2021 and hopefully wrapping this up in April 2021. We don't want to have to finish this at the May meeting.

C&R also has a large amount of curriculum that has come forward this semester. There are about 12 programs in Occupational Therapy. There are also a lot of new degree programs coming forward. I want to ask this group about these right now. These new programs are degree completion programs. Essentially what they are doing is targeting people in the community that never finished their Baccalaureate degree. In order to get into these programs, the student would have had to have completed all their lower division classes. There are several of these coming through the pipeline and many are offered in Special Sessions. There isn't much guidance from the Chancellor's Office about why programs should be offered Special Session. The one we are looking at today is a degree completion program in the College of Education and the target audience is people working

in the K-12 system who got their jobs without having a Baccalaureate degree. It makes sense, but doesn't make sense having it in special session. That creates what I believe is a socioeconomic gap, because these students work for minimum wage and the tuition rate in special session is very high. These students may have to take out student loans and it is not clear what their job prospects will be when they complete the degree. These classes could easily be in regular session for less cost. This may be an equity issue to consider.

C: [Provost] I'm not sure the purview of the C&R committee is to get into the financial efficacy of programs for students. I'm not really sure that is a curriculum and research question, but I will address it in the sense that special session is not necessarily more expensive and there are a number of reasons for that. These students are Pell eligible and the rates are probably higher for special session than our regular session students. The second thing I would say is that because we have complete pricing control, we can do a lot of things including discounting should we need to with partnerships with various school districts, etc. The sticker price you see on the program, might not be what it ends up being for various students. However, I'm conflicted on what role C&R has in asking these questions.

C: C&R is allowed to ask these questions for new degree programs under University Policy S93-14.

C: [Provost] I still don't think it is fair. If this becomes a big issue, we can walk through what it actually costs someone.

Q: Doesn't special session make them pay the full tuition as opposed to the regular session where it is discounted and also has state support?

Q: What is the rate per unit right now on the state side?

A: That I don't know. They provided the rate for special session per unit, but not stateside.

C: [Provost] Remember there are no fees in self-support, so if you take the total cost of instruction and divide it by 12, which is how they develop the credit hour, what do you get? Then compare that. Pell eligibility is higher and tuition is higher, but people are going to be eligible for more resources. The other thing is our average student does not finish in four years. So, take the average graduation rate of let's say five and take their total tuition package and multiply by five years and then see what the cost is. If you are paying by credit hour and only take 60 units, you are going to pay less than paying the total tuition for the year for five years. This is clearly a complicated process.

C: I think they should definitely do that calculation. That should at least be provided at this point to show if it is the same or cheaper.

Q: So, what was the per unit price they gave?

A: I can't remember

C: We did pass a Sense of the Senate Resolution requiring every policy committee to take an equity lens to every policy they pass and in their activities. It is our responsibility to ensure students are not being price gouged and to take that equity lens. Equity is the responsibility for every person on this campus.

C: [Provost] I calculated \$125 a unit.

Q: Are the classes available during regular session? Many of the courses in the College of Education are available in the evening so it isn't an access issue. From an equity lens and quality of education, who would be teaching these courses in special session?

A: According to the application, they are saying they would have to hire lecturers to teach these courses, because there are not enough faculty in the college. Most of these courses are in the College of Education. The department would ultimately be responsible for hiring the lecturers. Most of these courses are from CHAD and some from EDEL. If it was EDEL 102, that no longer exists. It is now EDTE 224, Educational Psychology, which is the course I teach and I was not consulted about this at all.

C: As far as the quality, the length of time in Special Session is going to be more of an indicator of the quality. It is one of the factors I should say. If it is a short period of time that could be a quality issue. The total cost is \$25,500 to do 60 units in special session. They don't have to pay all the other fees, but they don't have access to things like the student wellness center and things like that.

C: [Provost] It is totally an online program as I understand it. You are looking at about \$24,000 on the main campus. Again, the Pell eligibility rate is likely to be higher in this program which will reduce the cost. From a planning perspective, it is very simple. Every class and every unit cost x number of dollars. The other thing I said is we can negotiate with various school districts to create discounts ourselves in special session.

Q: Wouldn't that be an equity issue then if we are doing that for certain people in the program and not for others? They are saying this could involve school districts, but would involve other audiences as well. I think that makes it even more problematic.

A: [Provost] If you want to get into an equity question, what is equity in this context? Is it everyone paying the same price, because everyone that goes to SJSU now doesn't pay the same price? The other question is do we differentiate the cost of the instruction? If you want to look through an equity lens, then you should be paying a lot more for an Engineering degree than for a Humanities degree at SJSU, a lot more. We don't do that right now. The costs are complicated. The question of equity also ties to access. Are we going to create programs that are fully online and accessible to adult learners with a fixed price model that allows them to pace out their courses over a period of time without having to worry about things like fee increases and other kinds of things like that, or are you going to allow an online space to emerge where adult learners can have access to an education they never had before. Is that the equity? If it's just in a pricing model then we need to have a much larger conversation. We would have to blow up the entire pricing model of the CSU to produce equity relative to cost of instruction.

C: The concern that I have is based on the target audience. These are people who work in K-12. They don't have degrees and probably have families and they are not making that much. If they are Pell eligible then that is great, but I just think if you are going to promote this everything needs to be on the table so the students getting into this know what they are getting into. If they have to take out excessive student loans, they need to know they aren't going to come out of this with a teaching credential. If they drop out and have student loans, they need to know they are going to have to pay them.

C: [Provost] I agree, but I would much rather have them advised by our student financial aid counselors than National University or Ashford and that is where many of these students end up going to. They go into space in for profit education that gouge them and take in federal dollars at huge rates. We provide no opportunity to address this at all in the CSU right now so for me where equity and access are brought into this conversation, we are providing them access and affordability. We need to have special session financial aid counselors dedicated to degree completion students. Maybe what we need is a larger infrastructure conversation about how we support adult learners at this university. I think there is a lot of value and equity here. If those are questions that need to be answered we can work on this.

C: There are plenty of students who have dropped out for a long time and whose courses they took at that time don't meet the requirements any longer in the CSU. So we will need dedicated counselors to work with these people who can make a good analysis as to how long it will take them to be eligible for these programs.

Q: If special session students aren't paying fees for access to our infrastructure, then they would have to have their own infrastructure correct?

A: [Provost] No, we tax back the campus out of special session to pay for the components we are talking about. It is tax embedded in special session. There is support. The price per unit is significantly lower than market if you look at ASU, National, and Arizona. They are charging \$525 per unit and even one of our CSU's is charging \$625 per unit. We are just trying to get to a sustainable place. This is an expansion of access issue, which in my opinion needs to be tied into the equity conversation.

C: That is missing from this application.

C: [Provost] Maybe it isn't missing from the application, but that we haven't explained better the overall context of how we will do this work as a campus. Maybe I need to put this down on paper, then every program won't have to answer this themselves. These are

really institutional questions not College of Education issues. My team and I need to clarify what this infrastructure looks like to drive this and then you can frame each program in it. Would that be helpful? In the meantime, I'm more than happy to talk to the C&R crew.

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

As you may remember at the January 11, 2021 meeting, O&G brought some temporary amendments to the research policies. Today, O&G will be considering permanent amendments to those policies to bring to the full Senate on February 8, 2021.

5. Presentation by Dr. Magdalena Barrera, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success:

I wanted to come today and provide you with BIPOC faculty feedback on the RTP process and let you know some of the things my office has going on to address this feedback and then ask some critical questions about how we support our policies. I shared with you a handout that summarizes the feedback that we got from a special session with about 30 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) faculty members. We asked them questions about their racial and ethnic identities and how it relates to them and their professional lives and then what their experience has been at SJSU. Key issues and themes that emerged from our meetings:

1. A concern that evaluators are minimizing contributions across areas of achievement.
2. In terms of RSCA, there is a feeling that diversity-related RSCA is not perceived as real research.
3. In terms of academic assignment, there is a concern about the overreliance on SOTEs, especially question 13.
4. A concern that Peer Evaluation is the only way to access someone's achievement in academic assignment.
5. A concern that nontraditional forms of service are overlooked and undervalued.

The second theme is that evaluator feedback is inconsistent across the levels of review. There is vague feedback without clear guidance about ways to fix it.

The third theme is that faculty would really like to know they have advocates at the table. Even though these are private and confidential conversations is it possible for the faculty member to have an advocate there to help explain their file and defend them in a way.

The fourth theme is ongoing frustration with e-Faculty.

The fifth theme is that despite these challenges there was a deep desire to continue building community and engaging in discussions about RTP.

These five themes reflect what decades of scholarship already have told us about the experiences of women of color faculty in different university processes whether that is hiring, teaching, service, etc. You can see that outlined on these handouts. There is the issue of presumed incompetence, isolation and exclusion, cultural taxation and labor, less sponsorship and mentorship, and epidemic exclusion among multiple axes. The area where all of these themes meet across the board is in RTP.

Some things that my office is doing in response to this feedback is:

1. We have organized a series of monthly BIPOC faculty gatherings that will take place this semester. Each is a mix of ongoing community building, RTP Topics, career advice, and also time to share and discuss experiences and insights.
2. Sharing this information with the Executive and Professional Standards Committees, the Deans and the UCCD.
3. The PS Committee is working to revise the RTP policies to reflect educational equity.
4. Develop a campaign to encourage departments to develop and file RTP guidelines

that can provide support and guidance for evaluators who are looking at their colleague's materials.

In reviewing this feedback there are questions we need to ask ourselves:

1. What can and should be addressed immediately, and what may require more thorough discussions and planning over time?
2. What are ways of partnering with my colleagues so that their voices, experiences, and ideas are integrated into the work of making RTP more transparent and equitable?
3. What can we do to enable a social shift on campus especially when it comes to evaluators serving on these committees, so they really embrace the honor and responsibility of their role?

Questions/Comments:

Q: Thank you so much for your presentation and the work that you've done. In the event that you have described, I'm interested in process and outreach. I wonder if there are faculty who are BIPOC who are not aware of these events? I'm involved in the Senate and very active in RTP, and I had never heard about this before today. In terms of representation of voices, you said it went out to faculty of color but how do we identify who was included in the sample? Also, are the folks that participated aware that their input is being shared?

A: Thanks for those questions. As far as the people invited, we tried to piece together a list of folks that we knew were BIPOC and in the invitations that went out we asked people to spread the information by word of mouth. That is one answer. As far as the representation of voices, the people who attended the sessions were different ranks and identities. They are aware their feedback would be shared. They want to see what happens after they share this feedback.

Q: I find number 4, in terms of encouraging departments to develop guidelines, very interesting. However, there is some inequity in that process as well. We've had some issues in my own department, in terms of developing those guidelines, and voices were silenced in that process as well. That needs to be accounted for and a cultural shift has to occur in everyone utilizing those guidelines in review. What I have heard people saying is that there are guidelines, but I'll rely on my own good judgment. There is inequity in developing those guidelines, pressure on people to vote in those guidelines, and differences in how evaluators utilize those guidelines.

A: That is an important point. For my upcoming presentation to the UCCD next week, I'd like to develop a version of this handout with a checklist and list of questions about critical things we need to think about to make this process more equitable and to address some of the feedback that has been shared.

C: Crafting a policy and making it equitable is only the first step. The next step is bringing equity and inclusion into the RTP evaluations.

C: Yes, the question is how do we help BIPOC faculty in preparing for RTP as well as preparing the evaluators? In addition, this year we have to address how the impacts of COVID will fit into RTP.

C: Many years ago we focused on making materials accessible for those students who needed it. What we found was that all students benefited from it. I think if we create a better culture to support BIPOC faculty, all faculty will benefit as well.

C: We all stand to benefit from this effort.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on February 1, 2021. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator on February 17, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on February 17, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 22, 2021.

**SJSU Academic Senate
March 1st, 2021 Consent Calendar**

Add					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Alcohol & Drug Abuse Prevention	Sofia Moede	0065	43394	EXO	Seat N – Staff-at-Large (non-MPP from Academic Affairs)
Curriculum and Research Committee	Mohamed Abousalem	0022	43318	EXO	Seat A – AVP Research*
Program Planning Committee	Mohamed Abousalem	0022	43318	EXO	Seat C – AVP, Office of Research*

Remove					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Curriculum and Research Committee	Pam Stacks	0022	42488	EXO	Seat A – AVP Research
Program Planning Committee	Pam Stacks	0022	42488	EXO	Seat C – AVP, Office of Research
International Programs & Students	Xiaojing Liu	0054	46514	2021	Seat J – Health and Human Sciences
Institutional Review Board	Leslye Tinson	0108	45871	2022	Seat L – College of Social Sciences
General Education Advisory Committee	Leslye Tinson	0108	45871	2022	Seat K – Faculty At Large (2) GE Area Representative
Student Evaluation Review Board	Anh-Tuyet Tran	0101	44966	2022	Seat I – College of Science

*Interim placement until hire of new AVP of Office of Research

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **March 1, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**
6

AS 1806

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Amendment D to S15-10, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy

10

11 **Amends:** University Policy S15-10

12

13 **Effective:** Immediately

14

15 **Whereas:** The University Library Board (ULB) “serves as liaison between faculty and
16 students and the Library administration, faculty, and staff; examines the
17 relationships between the Library and the general faculty, the various
18 colleges and the programs of the University, for the purpose of
19 recommending improvements in Library services and policy, as well as the
20 stature of the Library,” as per 2.5.2 of the Library Policy; and

21

22 **Whereas:** The Board has representation for Library faculty, graduate and
23 undergraduate students, as well as faculty representing the various
24 colleges of the University; and

25

26 **Whereas:** The Library staff play an increasing and integral role in the delivery of
27 services and the formulation of Library policy; and

28

29 **Whereas:** The current membership of the ULB unanimously voted to recommend the
30 addition of staff to the board; therefore be it

31

32 **Resolved:** That a sentence be added amending 2.6.2.3, “Three regular (tenured or
33 tenure-track) university library faculty who represent different professional
34 specializations, **and two members of the Library staff**. These faculty
35 members will serve for staggered three-year terms.”

36

37

38 **Approved:** February 22, 2021

39 **Vote:** 12-0-0

40 **Present:** Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, Maciejewski,
41 McClory, Millora, Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson

42 **Absent:** None

43 **Financial impact:** None anticipated

44 **Workload impact:** None anticipated

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

AS 1805

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

9
10 **Amendment E to University Policy, S15-8**
11 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and**
12 **Standards**

13 **To provide for “The Scholarship of Engagement”**

14
15 **Resolved:** That S15-8 be amended as indicated by the ~~strikeout~~ and underline in the
16 following excerpt of the policy, renumbering existing paragraphs as
17 appropriate; be it further

18
19 **Resolved:** That these changes become effective for the 2021-2022 academic year
20 and not before.

21
22 **Rationale:** Beginning with the influential Boyer model of scholarship in the 1990s an
23 increasing number of universities have expanded the range of
24 achievements that can be considered as “scholarship.” One area, referred
25 to by Boyer initially as “the scholarship of application” was renamed in a
26 later edition as “the scholarship of engagement.” This category
27 acknowledges the important role played when faculty expertise is
28 “engaged” in the community. In this amendment we add the category of
29 “The Scholarship of Engagement” based upon descriptions used at a
30 number of other universities (Purdue, Oregon State, and Michigan State in
31 part) to make clear that SJSU values and will reward this kind of activity.
32 Professional Standards holds that engaged scholarship is particularly
33 appropriate for SJSU, which seeks to deploy a diverse faculty with
34 expertise that can benefit the many professional and local communities of
35 which we are an integral part.

42 **Approved:** February 22, 2021
43 **Vote:** 10-0-0
44 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli,, Quok, Mahendra, Barrera,
45 Monday
46 **Absent:** Riley
47 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact
48 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
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
75
76
77
78
79
80
81

82 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
83 **Amendment E to University Policy, S15-8**
84 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and**
85 **Standards**
86 **To provide for “The Scholarship of Engagement”**
87

88 2.3 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement
89

90 2.3.1 The second basic category for evaluation is scholarly/artistic/professional
91 achievement. Such contributions to a faculty member's discipline or professional
92 community, or application of scholarly expertise to improve the community, are
93 expected for continuation and advancement in the university. This category is
94 subdivided into several areas for ease of description and reference. ~~three areas:~~
95 ~~scholarly, artistic, and professional; this division is for ease of reference only.~~—These
96 ~~three~~ areas are not perfectly distinct and some candidates will demonstrate their
97 disciplinary expertise within two or more ~~all three~~ of the areas. Some achievements
98 may have characteristics of more than one area. The overarching principle should be to
99 reward significant scholarly/artistic/professional achievement regardless of the form it
100 may take.

101
102 2.3.1.2 The nature of the expected contributions will vary according to the discipline,
103 and may be more specifically defined in each department's guidelines.
104

105 2.3.1.3 The nature of contributions will also vary according to the faculty member's
106 professional interests. Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievements may include original
107 research that advances knowledge; or the synthesis of information across disciplines,
108 topics, or time; or the engaged application of disciplinary expertise within or outside the
109 University; or the systematic study of teaching and learning within the discipline; or a
110 combination of these forms of achievement.
111

112 2.3.1.4 Evaluation must be made by disciplinary peers. Acceptance of scholarly or
113 artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes an evaluation of that
114 work. Professional contributions should be evaluated by persons in a position to assess
115 the quality and significance of the contributions. Candidates may request that
116 disciplinary experts provide evaluations of any of their work to be included in the
117 dossier. Significant contributions that would not otherwise be peer reviewed should be
118 evaluated in this manner. External reviewers must be objective, and any relationships
119 that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the evaluation.
120

121 2.3.1.5 Published or otherwise completed works that are peer-reviewed, evaluated by
122 an objective disciplinary expert, or juried will normally receive the greatest weight. Work

123 in progress and unpublished work should be assessed whenever possible. In cases
124 where there is no external evaluation of an achievement the department committee will
125 review the work and indicate the extent of its quality and significance.
126

127 2.3.2 Scholarly achievement includes work based on research and entailing theory,
128 analysis, discovery, interpretation, explanation, or demonstration. Examples: books,
129 articles, reviews, technical reports, computer software and hardware development,
130 positively reviewed grant proposals, papers read to scholarly associations,
131 documentaries, works of journalism, patents, translations, etc.
132

133 2.3.3 Artistic achievement includes, but is not limited to, the creation of original work in
134 poetry, fiction, drama, dance, the aural, visual and computationally generated arts; or
135 performances or direction in music, theatre and dance often requiring interpretation,
136 mastery of a skill, formal experimentation, or the curatorial arrangement of such works
137 in an original and interpretive manner.
138

139 2.3.3 Professional achievements involve the application of disciplinary expertise
140 whether within or outside the University. Professional achievements will usually be
141 evaluated within the category of service, except when department guidelines establish
142 that professional activities are the primary method of demonstrating expertise within the
143 discipline. Such disciplines shall adopt department guidelines that explain appropriate
144 standards for evaluating these activities and distinguishing them from the service
145 category of achievement. Examples of achievements that could qualify when explicated
146 by guidelines are listed under “Service to the Profession/Discipline” below but may also
147 include ongoing professional requirements for currency in an applied discipline, such as
148 licensure.
149

150 2.3.3 Scholarship of Engagement. Similar to professional achievements, the
151 scholarship of engagement requires the application of disciplinary expertise but the
152 expertise is used to engage with significant problems, issues, and reforms in the
153 professional, local, or broader public communities. This form of achievement often
154 exhibits a reciprocal, collaborative relationship between the profession and the public.
155 Examples: the enactment of legislation, patents and adoption of innovations, delivery of
156 products/services, promulgation of significant changes in professional practice,
157 widespread dissemination of expertise to the general public (sometimes known as
158 “public scholarship”), the integration of expertise into university-community partnerships
159 and collaborations, community-based participatory research, participatory action
160 research, intervention research, applied developmental science, knowledge
161 mobilization, and translational scholarship.