

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2019/2020

Agenda

March 2, 2020, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of February 10, 2020
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President of the University
- IV. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
EC Minutes of February 3, 2020
EC Minutes of February 17, 2020
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of March 2, 2020
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
Approval of the Senate Calendar for 2020-2021
- V. **Unfinished Business:**
 - A. *AS 1761, Policy Recommendation, Amendment I to University Policy S15-7, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures Concerning Small Colleges (Final Reading)*
 - B. *AS 1763, Senate Management Resolution, Update to Senate Standing Rules (Final Reading)*
- VI. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1748, Policy Recommendation, Adding General Unit Seats to the Student Evaluation Review Board, Student Fairness Committee, University Library Board, and University Writing Committee [Amendment B to F10-2, Amendment B to S14-3, Amendment B to S15-10, Amendment A to S19-3] (Final Reading)
 - B. University Library Board (ULB):
 - C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1764, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F70-12, F70-13, and S73-21 (Final Reading)

AS 1765, Policy Recommendation, Instructor Drop Policy (First Reading)

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

VII. Special Committee Reports:

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

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

X. Adjournment

2019-2020 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 10, 2020

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

Ex Officio:

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

CHHS Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Day, Faas
Absent: Papazian, Del Casino,
Wong(Lau)

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Khavul
Absent: None

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Kaur, Gallo, Trang
Birrerr, Roque, Delgadillo
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:

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

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Riley, Kitajima, McKee, Coelho, Khan
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: McClory

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Hart, Lombardi, Sasikumar, Wilson
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Masegian, Monday,
Higgins
Absent: None

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

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Mathur announced the President, Provost, and CDO are unable to attend the meeting today. The President is in Washington D.C. The Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) is at the CSU System CDO's meeting, and the Provost is in Sacramento, CA.

There were two GE Summits that were very well attended. There were 70 to 80 faculty in attendance at each summit. In the January GE Summit there were some

administrators as well as students. The summit attendees gave a lot of feedback to the Curriculum and Research Committee to help them move forward with their review of the GE guidelines and also to the Undergraduate Education Office so they can begin to think about updates and revisions to how GE assessment is done. The Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee is here today and would be happy to take any additional feedback you might have.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Mathur invited CSU Statewide Senator Mark Van Selst to provide further

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

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

Questions:

Q: You mentioned that transfer students have to have a uniform requirement across the CSU system, so how is this possible if transfer students don't have to meet campus specific requirements?

A: This is defined by ASCSU recommendation as part of lower division GE so it has to be done as part of lower division GE transfer courses. All transfer students will have to meet these requirements.

Q: For those Senators who don't understand how the CSU Statewide Senate works, which is different from how our Senate works, would you describe what this actually means and how would this become reality? What has to happen for this to go into effect? How does this interface with the board, the legislature, and the Chancellor?

A: There are two ways in which it could become a requirement for the system. One way is by board (Board of Trustees) action and the other way is by state legislative action. The intent is that this will become a board action item since that is the appropriate home for curricular change. In the CSU, the Chancellor can interpret policy, but board action would generate new curriculum. The process we are going through now is advisory to future board action.

Q: Is there a time frame for that?

A: The other shoe is AS 1460 from Assemblywoman Weber. AB 1460 is a very narrow definition of ethnic studies with a 3-unit course that would become a system requirement for the CSU with a prohibition on exceeding 120 units attached to it. The intention is that it is way better off as a normal curricular process. What we did as a Senate was recommend a longer implementation timeframe of 2023/24.

Q: It is the hope that the board will implement it before AB 1460 is voted on?

A: Move towards, yes. I can't imagine this going before the board at its next meeting. It will probably occur sometime in the summer.

Q: Is the ASCSU continuing to push against AB 1460 in the meantime?

A: Yes, there is a letter being put together right now by Chair Nelson.

Q: Are there any negative impacts to graduation rates?

A: Any time you introduce a change to graduation standards you will impact somebody's time to graduation, but by overlaying it with GE and by giving flexibility, the ASCSU recommendation is far less impactful than the Weber bill would be.

C: Some people are very concerned about what is going to happen at the community college level to address this. That is where another potential slow down can occur and we can't control this.

Q: For upper division requirements, is it envisioned that potentially we would reduce some of the learning outcomes in one of the existing areas in order to add in this additional responsibility?

A: Yes, this would be up to a campus. In the ASCSU recommendation, we left it up to campuses.

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

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

Q: You reminded us to get feedback on President Papazian to the Chancellor. Could you resend that email to faculty with the link to the Chancellor's website and the deadline?

A: There is no actual link. The interesting thing is that there is just a button that you push that says submit your comments and then that actually takes you to an email address or a mailing address.

Q: Could you resend that to all faculty?

A: All faculty on campus?

Q: Yes.

Q: Can you just share with us what you are thinking as far as ethnic studies feedback from the campus?

A: The ASCSU Chair forwarded us a survey we could potentially use. The team looked at it last Friday and think the survey idea is the best thing to use, but this survey has some bias in it (we felt) so we are going through and editing it and then will be sending it out to get campus feedback.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of December 9, 2019- No Questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of January 27, 2020- No Questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

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

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

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

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. University Library Board (ULB):

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

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

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

Questions:

Q: Is that stateside FTES or total FTES?

A: This is everything, but doesn't include the lights and electricity. VP Faas pays for that. That's the FTES that we reported in IPED.

Q: We have about 8,100 graduate students on this campus, that is probably the stateside FTES?

A: We used the same number those other campuses reported in IPED for 2018 per headcount per graduate student. The numbers might not be exactly accurate, but that's the comparison based on what we are reporting out to the federal government. I agree with you. When I saw that number, I thought it was extremely low, because we work really hard to support our graduate students in the library. We know there are a

lot more than 5,000 of them.

Q: Who are the aspirational research peers?

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

C: The yellow is FY 2000 and the blue is FY 2018, and this is looking at how much money we spend per student on library materials. Again, you can see SJSU and the large CSU campuses funding went down by about 18%.

Q: Is that adjusted for inflation?

A: It is the amount of money we spend to the amount of full-time equivalent students we have.

Q: So if it is not adjusted for inflation, it has actually gone up a lot more than that?

A: Yes. They actually put that in the original report, but we just didn't have the time to put it in our report. Twenty years ago they said it represented about a 25% loss. It has got to be somewhere around 50% now. We see about a 10% increase in the cost of publications annually, particularly books.

C: I also think it is important to note that with our aspirational research peers expenditures per student have gone up by 27%. That is also not adjusted for inflation.

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

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

Questions:

Q: Does the ULB have an opinion about the ethics of using lottery funds which are supposed to be supplemental under the Lottery Act for the acquisition of annual library material?

A: The ULB has not taken a formal vote on this, but the ULB had a very long conversation about this. One thing we have noticed is that as the library loses funds, in order to maintain the research expectations and the collection necessary for students. We are accepting money from whomever will give it to us. It is our understanding this wasn't a decision that was made at the library level.

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

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

SJSU had 7 librarians per 10,000 student FTE in 2018, whereas the large CSUs had 8, and our aspirational research peers had 14.

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

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

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

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

Questions:

Q: The lottery dollars are meant to supplement not supplant. My recollection the last time we got a budget report was that something along the lines of \$8 million out of \$9 million of Instructionally Related Activity (IRA) dollars went to Athletics. Wouldn't you love to have those dollars since they are called IRA dollars. It is time for students, faculty, deans, and the Provost to have a discussion about IRA dollars and where they are going. (applause)

Q: Congratulations to Dean Elliott on her new job. We will miss her. Can you elaborate a little more on the drop in staffing over the years, because I'm assuming that means actual librarians as well as other support staff? What can you attribute that to?

A: Two things happened. First, the numbers we reported are based on student FTE. Our student FTE numbers have grown significantly while our librarian staffing has decreased. Dean Elliott wasn't here during the furlough years, but she hears about it at least once every week even 3 ½ years later. The university as a whole had a drop in faculty and staff and we have just never recovered. Also, there have been lines

removed from the library during Dean Elliott's time here.

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

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

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

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

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

A: My parting thoughts for the university are that we are going to need more resources and those resources will go up in price as our research level changes such as with the doctoral programs. The good news is that they have commissioned a consulting group of former library deans that will be looking at the funding, the staffing, the way the library is organized, etc. They will give us a recommendation of what we need to complete the vision for 2030.

Q: Although moving to all electronic materials is good in some ways, some research has shown a diminishment in learning if the materials aren't printed out for some faculty and students. There is also some value of going into the stacks and looking for your book and finding something next to it you didn't expect. This is a philosophical question, but do those type of questions come up?

A: All the time. I just had lunch with the librarians and we talked about this for about an hour. We probably should have these conversations on a more regular basis. The ULB is sponsoring a forum on section 7 of the library policy. That is about evaluating the collection, especially the print collection. The forum is on February 18, 2020 from noon to 1:30 p.m., come and give us your opinion. We have some interesting data that shows students in some months using way more e-books. More e-books were checked out than print books were ever checked out. We never had access to 371,000 titles in print copy. This is phenomenal that we can do this now. My recommendation is that if you do need to read it, then print it out. There is no way we could have ever housed that many titles. The number one checked out titles are U.S. History and Government and then Math.

Q: Could you talk a little about the negotiations with Elsevier?

A: Those are supposed to be confidential, but I can tell you they are going very well. We have been working with the UC. We have a deal we think we can accept.

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

Senator White presented *AS 1760, Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Students Earning Graduate Credit (First Reading)*.

C&R is bringing AS 1760 back as a first reading because of all the questions received after the last meeting. Most of the wordsmithing we did was to the whereas clauses. The big problem is that when an undergraduate student takes a class for graduate credit, there is no way of knowing that class was taken for graduate credit on the transcript. The registrar has to manually go in and make reference to how that class is used, but they would only do that through a petitioning process. The whole purpose of this policy is to bring clarity to this process.

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

Questions:

Q: It looks like the only time you would take a graduate level course is in your major or minor, except it can't be a required course. Could it be used for your major or minor if it isn't a required course?

A: The policy doesn't really address that. However, the question is 'can a student use a graduate level course for their degree program', and again that would be up to the degree program adviser whether they would allow that in.

Q: Would C&R consider saying "except as an elective in the major or minor or something like that?"

A: That isn't the purpose of this policy. I think we have another policy that talks

about this.

Q: I think, "petition through their major adviser," needs to be looked at, because I'm trying to figure out how a major adviser would sign off on a minor graduate course?

A: The whole reason for using the major adviser is that the major adviser interacts the most with the undergraduate student. We did discuss this with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and there are other mechanisms besides what is outlined in this policy that would have to go through her office.

Q: With just using the language, "of a graduate course," many of our programs allow for undergraduate upper division electives to be used in both the undergraduate and graduate programs, not at the same time, and many students want to take those 100 level courses with this intent, but you say graduate course. If you said specifically that it was 200 level courses, or that it could be either, that would be useful to have it spelled out explicitly.

A: I would have to pull the policy and look at this, but we already have procedures in place for graduate students that take 100 level courses.

Q: You are correct, but for this policy it would probably be better to say it was 200 level courses so there is no question.

A: If we say 200 level that could potentially hurt students who were applying for some of the doctoral programs.

Q: Then say, "200 level or higher," something that explicitly says that the 100 level courses used in a graduate program are not permitted under this policy? From my students' perspective, they are going to argue that those courses can be graduate level, because they are allowed to be used towards their graduate program.

A: C&R will discuss.

Q: In the second whereas it says that, "any undergraduate student may take a graduate level course provided they meet the course prerequisites," does that mean that all our graduate courses are supposed to include everything that is listed in number 2 on the second page, because they don't?

A: That's correct. That is a tricky one. Some graduate courses don't have any prerequisites. If the student identified a graduate-level course, the student would have to figure out if they could take the course at the undergraduate level. The course prerequisite could be set by the department.

Q: They don't have to have any of the information in number 2?

A: They would have to first meet the prerequisites, then number 2 would kick in.

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

A: The 30% applies to everyone.

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

Senator White presented an amendment to sections 2B and 2E that was friendly to the

body to insert at the beginning, “Normally,”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1741, Policy Recommendation, English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU Applicants (Final Reading)*.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “EO 975” to “EO 1082: International Students <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6591473/latest/>” in the 7th whereas clause.

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

The Senate voted and AS 1741 passed with 1 Abstention.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1759, Policy Recommendation, Student’s*

Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (Final Reading).

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

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

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

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

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

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

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

The Senate voted and AS 1756 passed with 1 Abstention.

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

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

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

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

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

The Senate voted and AS 1762 was approved as amended.

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

time.]

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are structural issues when you try to diversity faculty. There is an interesting trend among non-White faculty in that non-White hiring has outpaced White hiring over the last three years. However, our applicant groups are constrained by our applicant pools. How do we get applicants to apply and how do we make the university attractive to faculty? We are very popular among men. Our male applicants way outnumber our female applicants. In

terms of how we hire, there is more of a balance. When we look at how we've changed our applicant pools over time, in 2016 a large majority of our applicants were White, but by fall 2019 less than half of the applicants were White. We must be doing something right in terms of how we write our job ads and how we attract the people that are coming to the university. If we look at how we've changed our applicant pools in 2019, we don't have a problem getting more men to apply, but how do we get more women to apply? However, this is not all our fault. When we look at other institutions across the U.S., the proportion of faculty who is White is 70. We must be doing something different if our rates are better than across the U.S. We might be doing a better job than we give ourselves credit for. We are getting there in terms of hiring a diverse workforce.

Questions:

Q: Are we starting to trend towards our T/TT faculty representing our student population more? Does this apply to a specific college?

A: Yes, if Engineering Departments are trending towards more non-White faculty than other disciplines will follow.

Q: What improvements are being made to fix the diversity gap?

A: There is a lot. However, in Faculty Affairs, we are focusing on recruitment training programs for faculty.

Q: I was surprised to hear that two-thirds of the candidates going through the RTP process were female over the last five years which suggests these ratios are going to change a lot in the future, but I was just as surprised to find that two-thirds of the applicants were male. How do we get from an overwhelmingly male pool to what is becoming a predominantly female probationary faculty?

A: That is a great question. One of the things we can do is to message out to our applicants and include more gender inclusive language. There are lots of people who have a stake in what you just asked.

Q: In a best case scenario, how quickly could we get to a situation in which the ratios are different and where the faculty are more matched to our student population?

A: Unfortunately, no, but if you have anyone who can do that for us it would be great.

Q: I'd be happy to work on it if you give me the data.

Q: Thank you for the presentation and the training you have been doing. Do we have any data on the reasons faculty are resigning, because I was thinking that might be something to look into to see if there is a difference between Whites and non-Whites?

A: I know that the Provost Office has permission to begin studying this. The Faculty Affairs Office is working on the exit process, because we need more detailed data.

Q: Looking at these things in isolation doesn't take into account multiple factors? Without knowing the proportions coming in from the field it's really difficult. The second point on our hiring is that I would be interested in seeing our offers rather than our hiring, because our salaries are below market and more women tend to accept those. That could skew that data significantly. It works in our favor in terms of diversifying the campus, but without that

middle gap of what the offers look like, it is hard to know why this is happening. There is also a dynamic that is happening in rural campus communities vs. high-cost areas and no campus hires.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance: Moved to next meeting.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs: Moved to next meeting.

- C. Chief Diversity Officer:** Moved to next meeting.
- D. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation):** Distributed by email.
- E. Statewide Academic Senators:** Moved to next meeting.
- F. Provost:** Moved to next meeting.
- G. Associated Students President:** Moved to next meeting.

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

Executive Committee Minutes
February 3, 2020
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

1. Chair Mathur thanked Vice Chair Alison McKee and the Senate Administrator for their work on the Senate Retreat. It was a very wonderful and productive event.
2. Chair Mathur reminded the policy committee chairs that their materials for the Senate meeting on Monday, February 10, 2020 need to be in the Senate Office by Wednesday morning. The University Library Board (ULB) and the Senior Director of Faculty Affairs will be giving reports on library funding, acquisitions, services and staffing for the past year and faculty diversity in hiring respectively.
3. The committee discussed and unanimously approved the Executive Committee minutes of January 27, 2020 (13-0-0).
4. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of January 27, 2020.

5. Updates from the President:

The President hosted a meeting with the EAB Collaborative and over 100 campus presidents during a very powerful two-day event in January. The first day was held at LinkedIn. The discussion centered around ways of using LinkedIn data to address Student Success. The LinkedIn data shows the percentage of advantage you receive if you go to certain schools in certain zip codes. There can be as much as a 12% benefit.

We need to focus on how we can fix this network gap, and how can we get our students to showcase their skills. A lot of it is debunking myths associated with going to particular schools. We also need to assist students to translate the programs they study into the competencies and skills needed for a job. The data shows the strongest link for a liberal arts university in skills is in the performing arts. The lifetime of a skill acquired today is now five years. Over the course of their lifetime, students will need to upskill due to the changing nature of their work. At SJSU we will need to advise students in particular ways.

On the second day at SJSU, we discussed how we are using data to address student success. Professor Ron Rogers spoke about the work being done in Social Sciences. Humanities and Arts/Social Sciences people don't always see the data. The work being done in Career Services is phenomenal in connecting what we are doing with jobs. The Career Center also works very closely with the Student Success Centers in the colleges. Their ways of partnering are very innovative. This is an excellent way for SJSU to showcase leadership, because

it is not being done everywhere. When students see where the pathways can lead they will pursue them.

We are also one of two universities who are partnered with LinkedIn in compassionate leadership. What is compassionate leadership?
Compassionate leadership is empathy in action, utilizing compassionate perspectives in the workplace.

Questions:

Q: The data presented to the EAB collaborative could be very valuable if it were sent to faculty. Is that a possibility?

A: President Papazian will pass it on to the Provost. Don't forget the Career Center and the Centers for Student Success are both there as well.

Q: The information would be very helpful for the Internship programs as well. They have used LinkedIn also. Is that a possibility?

A: The two-day event is not the end. These are questions for us all as we begin work in pilots. Our goal is how to scale up for all students.

Q: With these big projects, it is important not to just tell stories of students that made it. We need to capture all and not just norms.

A: We can play a role there. SJSU is much more attentive to these issues.

Q: In LinkedIn there are tiers of membership. Will students (and faculty) have access to higher tiers (e.g., where they can see who is searching their LinkedIn profiles).

A: The leadership is out of the Deans' Offices and they are not tiering our students.

Q: Do our students have access to higher level tiers within LinkedIn?

A: LinkedIn is available to all students and faculty. Not sure about the higher tiers.

Q: Are alumni able to access?

A: We are looking into this. We are in the early stages and are looking at pathways now, such as where do you work and for how long. We are just taking our first steps. I am a big believer in being open to all students. Right now all students have access to all levels, but alumni do not.

Q: What are we doing to educate students on how to be safe in their online interactions?

A: LinkedIn is a public app. They don't sell any of the data, but you are putting your profile out there to all employers.

P: The Trustees made a decision to put off the vote on quantitative reasoning for two years. There is a lot of work to understand and address the needs. There have been a lot of comments from our partners in the community and

they are very happy to work with us. This will impact us directly. We will be in still on the same timeline as noted earlier.

Q: The O&G Committee has five (5) items that the President is working her way through. BOGS and GU Seats policies are critical since we will be putting out a call for people to serve on committees soon. Will you be reviewing these soon?

A: The President will go back and go over them with the Chief of Staff. There are some substantive issues to address. What is the firm deadline?

A: March 1st.

Q: Is there any discussion on the COACHE Survey?

A: You will have to ask the Provost about that.

Q: The Coronavirus is in the county. Are we prepared to address this at SJSU?

A: Our medical director has a direct line to the Health Department and the Center for Disease Control (CDC). The case in Santa Clara County was a person who came home and self-quarantined until seen by a doctor. No cases have been reported related to our campus. We have protocols in place in the Student Health Center to deal with these cases should this occur. Encourage students to reach out if they are not feeling well. We will have updates on the website under "News." Also, the Chancellor has restricted all travel to China.

Q: What are we doing about faculty and students studying abroad?

A: We've had students who were supposed to go through our programs that we've addressed. We have ensured that they have options for alternative placements.

C: This morning one of my professors cancelled class because she was sick. Students did not want to go back to her class because they didn't know what she was sick with and didn't want to risk it.

C: It is important to recognize that in the United States 60,000 to 70,000 people die each year with the regular flu. The people most at risk are young adults who don't have sufficient immunity built up. Handwashing is very important. Also, people with asthma should be especially careful.

6. Chair Mathur noted that Melinda Jackson has moved into an MPP administrative position. This has impacted the ratio of faculty on the Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA) search committee. The committee discussed whether another faculty member should be appointed at this late date. It was decided that dropping an administrator was a better solution than adding another faculty member in order to keep the faculty to administrator balance called for in University policy. The President will decide who to drop by the end of the week.

7. Updates:

- a. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
At the Board of Trustee (BOT) meeting, three (3) of our police officers as well as one (1) of our students were awarded the Lifesaver Medal for providing life-

saving procedures to a guest lecturer who had a heart attack during a class. Students and several officers did CPR. The guest lecturer underwent a triple bypass operation and survived.

Questions:

Q: The VTA buses are no longer coming close to campus. With DASH no longer operating, how are we providing a better transportation solution to campus? Is there a way to work with VTA to reinstate to a closer stop to campus?

A: It is a long process. The VTA sees a block or block and a half as close. They are receptive to hearing our complaints though. There are no good answers but the VPAF will continue to bring updates.

Q: I thought routes were supposed to be realigned and not cancelled? People were supposed to have access who didn't have access. That doesn't seem to be the case?

A: Overall most people are neutral on this. The Rapid 500 has less stops but only runs every 10 minutes.

Q: There are no lights at 5th Street and E. Santa Clara and no crosswalk for students. Are there any plans to look at this?

A: VTA will probably say go to the light to cross, but we will ask.

Q: Can you give me a summary of the gender-neutral bathrooms on campus?

A: We have 60 on campus. We are making our way building-by-building-by-building, and we are making good progress. Over 85% of the buildings on campus are 30 to 40 years old, so we are working on different solutions for each building.

Q: What is the ETA on the Engineering Bathrooms?

A: They are working as fast as they can. The VPAF will have dates at the next meeting.

Q: The comprehensive housing plan has been very well received by the community. Will open forums or townhall events be held?

A: We did introduce the idea of partnership with the community colleges. There are lots of chances to share as we move along. The Alquist building has at least a year of planning and design ahead before building can start.

Q: If emergency housing is already available, have faculty been notified?

A: VP Day will address.

b. From the Associated Students President (AS):

At the CSSA meeting, a big topic was the potential tuition increase and what action they will take if announced by the CSU. Another topic was Cal Grants and getting better estimates of financial needs as well how to get a more simplified application process.

The CSSA made their own fact sheet about timelines and rules. Lots of campuses wanted to know where this data came from. This will be discussed further on February 15, 2020.

The AS House opens in February 2020. AS is very happy about it.

Applications for the AS Board are out and the deadline to apply is March 1, 2020.

The AS budget and operating agreement has been signed.

AS gave out 140 book vouchers and they have more students on the wait list. They did not expect this high level of a response. They did increase book voucher funding by \$100 this year and were providing \$450 vouchers.

AS gave out \$15,000 last year for food insecurities and \$15,000 for housing insecurities. AS will be working with Student Affairs to determine where to put funds for this year.

New fences are being put up around the community garden at the CDC as items are being stolen.

Questions:

Q: How is AS involved in promoting the census?

A: Some campuses are very involved, and others are not. All campuses are doing something.

Q: I was an advocate for Cal Grant reform in the 70's. Can you tell us what changes you are advocating for today?

A: We would like them to get an estimate of student financial needs. CSSA would like stipends to be given to the lowest income students, and other non-traditional ways of helping needy students.

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

Total enrollment is up 576 students. There is some decline in the number of graduate and first year students.

SA is beginning to talk about models of student enrollment 5 to 10 years out.

SJSU Cares has opened on the first floor of the Clark building. SA received three grants from the CSU to work on student housing and homelessness. Right now there are 12 beds available on campus for emergency use.

The Spartan Speaker series will be starting soon and the first presentation will be on prison reform.

SA is continuing Greek life chapter reviews and discussions. Over 1,400 students participate in Greek life here at SJSU.

Questions:

Q: What does it mean when you say some Greek life are tapped out?

A: Some of them did not get enough student involvement to continue and they tapped out.

Q: When you speak about grants, is that information communicated at Admitted Spartans Day Events?

A: Yes. SA will also have housing grants of up to \$2,000 for the most needy students. Right now we are looking at administration of the grant. However, this will be a fundamental part of the orientation.

Q: What is the mental health partnership about? Is it better access for students?

A: No campus can give long term mental health care to students. It is about the possible development of partnerships with community health centers.

d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

The Campus Climate Survey will launch on February 25, 2020. Launch event on the 25th from 12-1pm. There will be pizza parties, etc. as incentives to complete the survey. We would like a 30% response rate to get a robust set of data. We want our campus to participate as we will own the data and it will live with us.

Vice Chair McKee and CDO Wong(Lau) are co-chairs of the Committee on Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations. We will have our second meeting this Thursday and Friday.

There are 16 members of our Student Success team who went last Friday to get their Student Success Data Analytics Certificate. The CSU continues to add complexity for questions and functionality in analytics.

CDO's will be going to Fullerton for a 2-day meeting on Faculty Diversity this month.

Muslim students have been given prayer space in the Spartan Memorial every Thursday evening for prayer meetings.

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

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on February 3, 2020. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on February 6, 2020. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on February 12, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 17, 2020.

Executive Committee Minutes
February 17, 2020
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Curry, Parent, Sullivan-Green, McKee, Frazier, Peter, Wong(Lau) (12:51 p.m.), Day, White, Faas, Del Casino, Marachi, Papazian (12:51 p.m.)

Absent: None

1. The Executive Committee minutes of February 3, 2020 were approved as written (13-0-0).
2. Chair Mathur gave a shout out to CDO Kathy Wong(Lau) for her efforts to help a student that was so unhappy he/she was ready to drop out over the weekend.
3. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of February 17, 2020 (13-0-0).
4. The Executive Committee discussed and approved the appointment of Silke Higgins as a General Unit representative to the Exceptional Assigned Time Committee (EATC) (13-0-0).
5. Updates from the Policy Committee Chairs:
 - a. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
I&SA is working on resolutions including an update to the Student Fairness Committee, and rescinding three old registration policies. I&SA will also be looking at the instructor drop and approved absences for students policies.

The Executive Committee discussed issues that I&SA is having with committee member absences. I&SA has over 20 members and it is very difficult to get everyone to attend. I&SA will work with O&G on a possible reduction in the membership. I&SA has six student members compared to one student on each of the other policy committees.

I&SA needs feedback from Student Affairs on policies that have been vetoed by the President, so that they might modify and resubmit these policies. Chair Sullivan-Green will reach out to VP Day.

- b. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
PS is working on RTP for small colleges; improvement of the implementation of RTP policies; possible creation of a template for RTP letters; and establishing a lecturer RTP policy.
 - c. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R has two new minors they are reviewing as well as lots of curriculum. C&R is also reviewing the GE Guidelines and trying to reduce 13 Planned Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to 9 or less by the end of the semester.

- d. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing a final reading of the standing rules to the next Senate meeting. O&G is also reviewing the bylaws. However, they will not come before the Senate until the April meeting.

6. Updates from the President:

The President announced the opening of a Voting Center on campus. The event will be attended by the Secretary of State, Alex Padilla, Congresswomen Zoe Lofgren, and Anna Eshoo this Thursday.

AB 1460 on Ethnic Studies will be up for a vote this coming Thursday.

The Government and Board of Trustees are far apart on the budget. The Governor continues to heavily supply the rainy day fund. We will have to wait and see what the May revise will bring. Students are lobbying for support for student homelessness and changes to financial aid.

Questions:

Q: How quick will AB 1460 be pushed?

A: There is external pressure for people to support AB 1460. The Provost has asked for more faculty support. Faculty need to push back and be passionate about the defense of our right to determine the curriculum where Ethnic Studies is concerned. People feel if you are not for AB 1460 then you are against Ethnic Studies. Some people on campus feel this is our one shot.

C: CFA has been discussing this and many faculty feel CFA shouldn't be discussing curriculum.

Q: The President vetoed the Athletics policy amendment. However, O&G did not make any contextual changes. Could you explain the reason?

A: President Papazian explained she does not look at policies with a Band Aid approach. If a policy is sent to her she is going to review the entire policy and wants everything in that policy fixed. There is an implicit understanding if the President approves an amendment that she agrees with the whole policy. There are parts of the policy that need to be addressed.

7. Updates from the AS President and Administrators:

- a. From the Provost:

The Provost noted that there is a potential for a General Studies degree. The committee discussed issues with partial and complete online degrees.

- b. From the AS President:

AS President Parent attended the California State Student Association (CSSA) Plenary.

AS has had the same discussions as the faculty have had regarding Ethnic Studies and students are split on the issue as well.

AS passed a resolution on investigation practices they don't like. The Executive Committee discussed possible changes to Title IX requiring more support and treatment for respondents.

AS passed a resolution on fixing financial aid that includes expanding access, having a summer Cal Grant, and basing financial aid on the actual total cost of attendance.

c. From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):

We must keep threats of the coronavirus in perspective. There have been only eight fatal cases of the coronavirus in California, whereas the regular flu has taken the lives of a significantly higher number of people.

Enrollment is up by 650 Undergraduate students. Stateside, Graduate Student enrollment is down by 90 students, and International student enrollment is down by 142.

Student Affairs will host a new student convocation on August 17, 2020.

Questions:

Q: Is anything being done as far as outreach to students regarding financial aid?

A: There is a lot being done behind the scenes. VP Day will be happy to discuss with anyone offline. Over 11,000 students turned down financial aid. This is a national trend. Students don't want to take out loans. Our students incur \$10,000 less debt than the national average for student loans.

C: There will be new training available this year on financial literacy communication.

C: Folks are pushing badges and certificates and not degrees and using cost and time to graduation in their outreach.

C: Don't throw the baby out with the bath water. Some certificate programs in addition to a degree can be a good thing since research now shows that a class is only current for about 5 years. The certificate can make the degree far more marketable.

C: SJSU has disbursement problems getting the funds from financial aid. Some students are turning down scholarships, because if they take it they will lose their Cal Grant eligibility the next year.

- d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):
The Campus Climate Survey kickoff is February 25, 2020 from noon to 1 p.m.
There will be lots of events and prizes.

CDO Wong(Lau) gave a shout out to Vice Chair McKee who co-chairs the Committee on Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations with CDO Wong(Lau) for all her hard work.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on February 17, 2020. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on February 19, 2020. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on February 19, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 24, 2020.

**Consent Calendar
Academic Senate Meeting
March 2nd, 2020**

Add to Committee:	Last/First Name	Zip	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Campus Planning Board	Alexander, Serena	0185	2021	45882	Seat N – Social Science
Accreditation Review Committee	Abousalem, Mohamed	0022	2020	43318	Seat F – Member of the Cabinet

Remove from Committee:	Last/First Name	Zip	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Campus Planning Board	Agrawal, Asha	0185	2021	45691	Seat N – Social Science
Accreditation Review Committee	Elliott, Tracy	0028	2022	82022	Seat J – Dean

Academic Senate
2020-2021 Calendar of Meetings
Senate, Executive Committee,
and Policy Committees

Office of the Academic Senate
Administration Building 176, 0024
Office: 4-2440 Fax: 4-2451
<http://www.sjsu.edu/senate>
eva.joice@sjsu.edu

Fall 2020		Spring 2021	
Aug. 24	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Feb. 1	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
Aug. 31	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Feb. 8	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)
Sept. 14	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)	Feb. 15	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
Sept. 21	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Feb. 22	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
Oct. 5	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Mar. 1	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)
Oct. 12	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)	Mar. 8	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
Oct. 19	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Mar. 15	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
Oct. 26	Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m.) (AA and University Budget)	Mar. 22	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)
Nov. 2	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Apr. 5	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
Nov. 9	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)	Apr. 12	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
Nov. 16	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Apr. 19	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)
Nov. 23	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	Apr. 26	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
Nov. 30	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	May 3	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
Dec. 7	Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)	May 10	Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m.) Last of 2020-2021 Senate Meeting (4-5 p.m.) First of 2021-2022

Meeting Locations: All Senate meetings held in Engr. 285/287; Senate Executive Meetings held in Provost Conference Room; Policy Committees – check with Senate Office

Notes: Campus closed Sept. 7 (Labor Day), Nov. 11 (Veteran’s Day), Nov. 25 non-instructional day, Nov. 26-27 (Thanksgiving); Dec. 7 last day of classes. Dec. 9— Finals begin.

Senate Retreat: February 5, 2020
Notes: Campus closed Jan. 1 (New Year’s Day), Jan. 18 (MLK Jr. Day), Mar. 31 (Cesar Chavez Day), May 31 (Memorial Day); Mar. 29 – Apr. 2- Spring Recess; May 17- Last day classes. May 19 – Finals begin.

[Additional meetings are scheduled as needed.]

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment I to University Policy S15-7**
9 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
10 **Procedures Concerning Small Colleges**

11
12
13 **Resolved:** That S15-7 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline of the
14 excerpted policy, effective for the 2020-2021 Academic Year.

15
16 **Rationale:** The existing RTP policy explicitly excludes the College of International and
17 Extended Studies (CIES) from the RTP process, since at the time of the
18 creation of that policy, CIES lacked any faculty. In 2019 that college was
19 renamed College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE), and the
20 faculty of the School of Information were moved into the renamed college.
21 The RTP policy consequently needs to be revised to provide CPGE normal
22 representation and participation in the RTP system.

23
24 CPGE is at present very small, with two academic departments and 16 /tt
25 faculty listed on the IEA website. To assure that the faculty of this college
26 receive comparable reviews to the faculty of all other colleges, this
27 amendment establishes that all college RTP committees represent a
28 minimum of three academic departments, electing representatives from
29 related disciplines outside the college if necessary to augment their
30 membership.

31
32 By deleting the exclusionary language presently in the policy regarding
33 CIES, CPGE becomes entitled to elect a representative to the University
34 RTP committee.

35
36 **Approved:** February 17, 2020.

37 **Vote:** 9-0-0.

38 **Present:** He, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Riley, Birrer, Chin.

39 **Absent:** Kemnitz.

40
41 **Financial Impact:** Giving CPGE an elected representative on the University RTP
42 committee will require additional assigned time to support this
43 member.

44
45 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact.

47
48 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
49 **Amendment I to University Policy S15-7**
50 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
51 **Procedures Concerning Small Colleges**
52

53
54

55
56 1.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those colleges that administer
57 departments which are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure track faculty. ~~This excludes the College~~
58 ~~of International and Extended Studies.~~
59

60

61 3.3 College Level Review

62 3.3.1 The college retention, tenure, and promotion committee shall be composed of
63 tenured full professors ~~from departments within the college or, if augmentation~~
64 ~~is required, from related disciplines outside the college,~~ and shall be elected.
65 College committees shall provide the opportunity for representation from each
66 department in the college, and will represent a minimum of three departments.
67 Colleges with fewer than three departments, or otherwise in need of
68 augmenting their committee, will elect faculty from related disciplines outside
69 the college. Election shall be by the probationary and tenured faculty unit
70 employees of each department. Each college shall determine the number to be
71 elected from each department and the minimum size required for department
72 representation on the college committee. Department chairs and faculty serving
73 on a college committee may not serve on a departmental committee in that
74 college or on the university committee. The college committee shall elect its
75 own chair and prepare its own report.

76

1 **San José State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **March 2, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**
6

AS 1763

7 **Senate Management Resolution**
8 **Update of Senate Standing Rules**
9

10
11 **Whereas:** The Organization and Government Committee has completed its review of
12 Senate Standing Rules; and
13

14 **Whereas:** Areas in need of update were found; therefore be it
15

16 **Resolved:** That the attached updates be adopted once passed by the Senate.
17
18
19

20 **Rationale:** The updates proposed address areas where issues related to compliance
21 had been noted and where the work of the Senate could be facilitated.
22
23
24
25

26 **Approved:** 2/17/20

27 **Vote:** 12-0-0

28 **Present:** Altura, Grosvenor, Okamoto, Shifflett, Gallo, McClory,
29 Higgins, French, Kao, Skinnell, Sasikumar, Millora

30 **Absent:**

31 **Financial Impact:** Potentially a reduction in costs with predominantly electronic
32 communications.
33

34 **Workload Impact:** Additional coordination between the Senate Chair and policy
35 committee chairs to facilitate communication on outstanding items.
36
37
38

Recommended Updates to Senate Standing Rules

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84

4. Senate communications to all individuals and groups will typically be electronic unless an accommodation is requested. Communications addressed to the Academic Senate will be channeled through the Senate office. As appropriate, the Executive Committee or chair shall determine proper referral and notify originators of action taken.

Section 5: Whenever possible, each member of the Academic Senate shall be supplied with an electronic copy of any item presented to the Senate for action. On each such item, the date and source shall be indicated.

Section 6: Submission of agenda items:

- a) Items for inclusion on the agenda should ~~must~~ be presented ~~in writing~~ to the Academic Senate office ~~at least one week~~ by the Tuesday prior to a scheduled meeting.
- b) During Senate meetings, senators are encouraged to submit particularly lengthy amendments ~~in writing~~ electronically to the AVC. ~~The Academic Senate office shall make a form available for this purpose at each meeting.~~

Section 7, a, I: Call to Order and Roll Call (as needed)

Section 7, a, IX: State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation. ~~(Detailed Reports/announcements, if necessary, are encouraged to be submitted in writing or by email~~ electronically and included with the agenda when possible.)

- A. Provost
- B. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- C. Vice President for Student Affairs
- D. Chief Diversity Officer
- E. ~~CSU Senators~~ Senate Liaison
- F. Associated Students President

Section 10, b: Recommendations from policy ~~standing~~ committees, whether or not they affect any university policy, may be acted upon at the meeting of the Academic Senate at which they are introduced, provided they have been distributed to members of the Senate at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the meeting. However, a recommendation which a committee considers of unusual importance or complexity may be designated by the committee as a "first reading" item, for final action at the meeting following that at which it was first reported by the committee.

Section 12: Minutes

- a) Draft minutes of the Academic Senate should ~~will~~ be distributed to senators for review within one week following a Senate meeting. ~~are available to anyone in the academic community upon request.~~ Official minutes of the Academic Senate should

85 will be posted electronically within one week of the Senate meeting during which
86 they were approved.

87
88 Section 17, f: When possible, voting in Senate committees should be done in person
89 during committee meetings. However, at the discretion of the chair, Senate committees
90 shall be permitted to conduct votes electronically ~~via electronic mail~~, unless at least one
91 committee member objects to ~~email-electronic~~ voting on a particular issue. ~~Email~~
92 Electronic voting shall not be used as a substitute for in-person deliberation and debate,
93 and shall only be conducted after a proposal has been discussed in committee. If no
94 member objects to ~~email-electronic~~ voting, the committee chair shall be responsible for
95 transmitting the proposal to be voted on and for establishing a reasonable voting
96 deadline. The committee chair must also tabulate and report the results of voting to the
97 committee members in a timely fashion. ~~indicating the votes of individual members.~~
98 ~~Committee members who do not have access to email shall be notified of all votes and~~
99 ~~shall be permitted to cast a vote in some other fashion.~~ At least a majority of the entire
100 committee membership must vote before a vote can be considered valid. If a vote is
101 taken electronically ~~via email~~, that fact should be noted in any committee documentation
102 that results from the vote (e.g. meeting minutes, annual reports, policy
103 recommendations, etc.).

104
105 Section 17, g, 4: ~~Operating Committees, Special Committees, All Other committees:~~
106 Members of all other operating committees, special agencies, 'other,' and special
107 committees are expected to attend meetings in person. At the discretion of the
108 committee chair, remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable
109 resources are available and the work of the committee will not be compromised. The
110 individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary
111 arrangement needed to facilitate remote attendance.

112
113 Section 18, a: The Chair shall oversee the Senate's policy formulation process; shall
114 ensure that Senate policies are periodically reviewed and that appropriate revisions are
115 initiated; shall, prior to the conclusion of the academic year, provide each policy
116 committee chair with a record of all outstanding items to facilitate preparation of
117 committee year-end reports; shall cooperate with the incoming Chair to assure an
118 orderly transition; shall be the Senate's principal spokesperson; and, shall supervise the
119 operations and activities of the Senate office.

1 **San José State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **March 2, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1748

6
7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Adding General Unit Seats to the Student Evaluation Review**
9 **Board, Student Fairness Committee, University Library**
10 **Board, and University Writing Committee**
11 **Amendment B to F10-2, Amendment B to S14-3,**
12 **Amendment B to S15-10, Amendment A to S19-3**

13
14 **Legislative History:** The membership information for the Student Evaluation Review
15 Board resides in F10-2 (charge updated with S19-2); The membership information for
16 the Student Fairness Committee resides in S14-3 (which was amended by S19-2); The
17 membership information for the University Writing Committee resides in S19-3. The
18 membership information for the University Library Board resides in S15-10 (charge
19 updated with S19-2). In fall of 2019 this recommendation to add a General Unit Seat to
20 these committees was passed by the Senate. This spring the recommendation was
21 returned unsigned by President Papazian. This revised proposal clarifies that the focus
22 is on seats for the general unit and not specifically related to the College of Professional
23 and Global Education.

24
25 **Whereas:** A comprehensive review of seats on all Senate committees was
26 completed; and

27
28 **Whereas:** It was noticed that faculty members of the General Unit did not have an
29 opportunity to serve on the Student Evaluation Review Board, Student
30 Fairness Committee, University Library Board, and University Writing
31 Committee; therefore be it

32
33 **Resolved:** That F10-2, S14-3, S15-10, and S19-3 be amended by adding a general
34 unit seat to the Student Evaluation Review Board, Student Fairness
35 Committee, University Library Board, and University Writing Committee as
36 noted on the following pages.

37
38 **Rationale:** A review of the membership for all committees was conducted and it was
39 determined that faculty from the general unit needed an opportunity to serve on the
40 Student Evaluation Review Board, Student Fairness Committee, Library Board, and
41 University Writing Committee.

42
43 **Approved:** 2/24/20

44 **Vote:** 11-0-0

45 Present: Altura, French, Gallo, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory,
46 Okamoto, Shifflett, Kao, Skinnell, Sasikumar
47 Absent: Millora

48
49 Financial Impact: None
50 Workload Impact: None

51
52 Proposed changes

53
54 For F10-2; Amendment B; update information on SERB membership to read:

55
56 Membership ~~and Terms~~:

57 Director, Center for Faculty Development or designee [EXO]

58 Vice Provost Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics or designee [EXO]

59 1 Faculty, College of Business

60 1 Faculty, College of Education

61 1 Faculty, College of Engineering

62 1 Member, General Unit

63 1 Faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences

64 1 Faculty, College of Humanities & Arts

65 1 Faculty, College of Science

66 1 Faculty, College of Social Science

67 1 Student

68
69 Note: F10-2 language to be included under the membership list: ~~The Board shall consist~~
70 ~~of one faculty member from each college, one student, the Director of the Center for~~
71 ~~Faculty Development and Support or designee, ex officio, and the Associate Vice~~
72 ~~President for Institutional Research or designee, ex officio.~~ To the extent possible, the
73 Committee on Committees shall recruit faculty who are familiar with assessment, survey
74 research, and/or statistical analysis.

75
76
77 For S14-3; Amendment B; Update information on membership for Student Fairness
78 Committee to read:

79
80 Ombudsperson [EXO]

81 2 University administrators (management)

82 1 Faculty, College of Business

83 1 Faculty, College of Education

84 1 Faculty, College of Engineering

85 1 Member, General Unit

86 1 Faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences

87 1 Faculty, College of Humanities & Arts

88 1 Faculty, College of Science

89 1 Faculty, College of Social Science

90 2 Staff (non-management)

91 7 Students

92

93

94 For S19-3; Amendment A; Update information for the University Writing Committee to
95 read:

96

97 The University Writing Committee shall be a ~~special agency~~ university
98 committee reporting to the Curriculum & Research Committee and be composed of the
99 following ~~49~~ members:

100 College dean (EXO; UWC Chair; Appointed by the Provost)

101 SJSU Writing Programs Administrator (WPA) (EXO)

102 SJSU Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Director (EXO)

103 Writing Center director (EXO)

104 Coordinator of Multilingual Writing Support Services (EXO)

105 ~~AVP, Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Studies~~ or designee (EXO)

106 Director of Testing (EXO; non voting)

107 Dean, College of Graduate Studies or designee (EXO)

108 2 faculty, Humanities & the Arts, with one from the

109 Department of Linguistics and Language Development

110 ~~4 faculty each from all other colleges.~~

111 1 Faculty, College of Business

112 1 Faculty, College of Education

113 1 Faculty, College of Engineering

114 1 Member, General Unit

115 1 Faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences

116 1 Faculty, College of Humanities & Arts

117 1 Faculty, College of Science

118 1 Faculty, College of Social Science

119 1 Faculty, University Library

120 2 students, one undergraduate that has satisfied University Written Communication II,

121 one graduate student that has satisfied graduate writing requirements.

122

123 For S15-10; Amendment B; Update information for University Library Board to read:

124

125 The University Library Board is a ~~special agency~~ committee of the Senate authorized
126 both to formulate and recommend policy related to the Library, and also to advise the
127 Dean of the University Library on the implementation of University policies and generally
128 on Library operations, combining the traditionally separate roles of policy and operating
129 committees. When the Board formulates new policies or modifies the existing policy for
130 consideration, it shall report directly to the Academic Senate. The chair of the University
131 Library Board shall present policy recommendations to the Senate.

132

133 Membership

134 Library Dean, ex officio, non-voting

135 Past Chair of the Academic Senate or FAL to the Executive Committee,

- 136 3 regular university library faculty (tenured or tenure-track) who represent different
- 137 professional specializations.
- 138 1 Faculty, Business
- 139 1 Faculty, Education
- 140 1 Faculty, Engineering
- 141 1 Member, General Unit
- 142 1 Faculty, Health and Human Sciences
- 143 1 Faculty, Humanities and the Arts
- 144 1 Faculty, Science
- 145 1 Faculty, Social Science
- 146 1 Faculty member from the School of Information
- 147 AS President or designee [EXO]
- 148 1 undergraduate student
- 149 1 graduate student

1 **San Jose State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Instruction and Student Affairs**
4 **March 2, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1764

6 **Policy Recommendation:**

7 **Rescinds University Policies: F70-12, F70-13, and S73-21**

8 **Effective Date: Immediately**

9 **Legislative History:** A string of policies, dating back through the 1970s, were related to
10 Priority Registration. Most recently, Policy S18-11 was passed by the Academic Senate
11 on April 9, 2018 and approved by President Papazian on April 27, 2018. Policies F70-
12 12, F70-13, and S73-21 were never rescinded and are no longer relevant.
13

14 **Whereas:** Priority Registration has changed significantly over the years; and

15 **Whereas:** Numerous policies related to priority registration have been passed,
16 most recently in 2018; therefore be it

17 **Resolved:** That F70-12, F7013, and S73-21 be rescinded.

18 **Approved:** February 17, 2020.

19 **Vote:** 10-0-0.

20 **Present:** Delgadillo, Honda (non-voting), Jackson (non-voting), Khan, Kim,
21 Parent, Roque, Sen, Sullivan-Green, Trang, Wilson, Yao
22

23 **Absent:** Hill, Kitajima, Rollerson, Sorkhabi, Walters, Wolcott

24 **Financial Impact:** None.

25 **Workload Impact:** None.
26

6 **Policy Recommendation:**
7 **Instructor Drop Policy**

8
9 **Effective Date: Fall 2020**

10 **Legislative History:** A number of policies, dating back through the 1990s, were related
11 to dropping courses after Advanced Registration. Most recently, F04-
12 2, which was predated by F01-2, S99-12, S99-7, S93-13, and S93-
13 10, focused mainly on the administrative consequences, i.e. refunds,
14 census calendar, and late drops, and not on the circumstances
15 leading to the instructor drop. Policy S93-5 made reference to the
16 rights of an instructor to drop students from a course, though did not
17 clarify the responsibilities of an instructor who does so.

18 **Whereas:** Situations have arisen in which questionable decisions were made
19 by faculty who dropped students from courses, including dropping
20 students without their knowledge and without clear rationale; and

21 **Whereas:** There exists no dedicated university policy regarding instructor
22 drops; therefore be it

23 **Resolved:** That the following policy be adopted.

24 **Approved:** February 24, 2020.

25 **Vote:** 14-0-0.

26 **Present:** Jackson (non-voting), Khan, Kim, Kitajima, Parent, Rollerson,
27 Roque, Sen, Sorkhabi, Sullivan-Green, Trang, Walters, Wilson,
28 Wolcott, Yao.

29 **Absent:** Delgadillo, Hill, Honda (non-voting).

30 **Financial Impact:** None.

31 **Workload Impact:** None.

32

33

34

Instructor Drop Policy

While instructors are not required to drop students, they are permitted to do so if a student:

1. Fails to establish a committed presence in the class, as per F15-3. This policy defines committed presence as:

- In-person classes. Attending the first class meeting or informing the instructor of the intention to continue in the class within 48 hours after the first official class meeting.
- Online classes. Logging on to the Learning Management System class shell on the first scheduled day of class or informing the instructor of the intention to continue in the class within 48 hours after the first day of instruction.

Or

2. Does not meet the stated prerequisites.

All instructor drops must be communicated directly to the student in writing by the instructor through MySJSU (student's email on record). Instructors must state the reason for the drop, as defined above. Documentation of the written notification to the student should be kept on file. All Instructor Drop Requests are due by the date posted on the Registrar's Calendar, available at www.sjsu.edu/registrar/calendar.

Students have the responsibility to ensure they establish a committed presence, as defined above and in F15-3, and to meet the stated course prerequisites. If a student does not drop prior to the drop deadline, they must petition to drop a course with a "W" (Withdrawal). Otherwise, the student will receive either a "WU" (Withdrawal Unauthorized) or a "F" at the end of the semester. See the Academic Advising and Retention Services (AARS) website for details, available at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/aars/>.