

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2020/2021

Agenda

March 22, 2021, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/85739342725>

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 March 1, 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 15, 2021
EC Minutes of February 22, 2021
EC Minutes of March 8, 2021
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of March 22, 2021
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**
 - A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (Final Reading)

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 (Final Reading)
 - B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1809, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Requesting the Appointment of a Presidential Task Force on the Needs of Native Students, Staff, and Faculty (Final Reading)

- C. University Library Board (ULB):
- D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1807, Policy Recommendation, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading)
- E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1808, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes after Advance Registration (Final Reading)

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m.

Campus Master Plan

Traci Ferdolage, Senior Associate Vice President, Facilities Development and Operations, and Jane Lin, Architect, Urban Studio

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

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

XI. Adjournment

2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes
March 1, 2021

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

| | |
|---|--|
| Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Mathur, McKee, 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, 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 Absent: Raman |
| 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 Masegian read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of February 8, 2021 were approved (42-0-0).

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Mathur announced the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes. Only the Senate Chair and Senate Administrator will have access. Please keep yourself muted unless speaking. Only Senators may speak and vote in the Senate meetings. Roll call will be taken by the Senate Administrator using the participant list, so be sure your full name shows. Please type "SL" to speak to a resolution in the chat. If you wish to speak to an amendment please type "SL Amendment" into the chat. If you have a longer amendment please type it into the chat and send to Senator Marachi.

Chair Mathur asked for a moment of silence for the over 500,000 people in the U.S. who have lost their lives due to COVID including our colleagues from the College of Humanities and the Arts and the Valley Foundation of Nursing and our colleague Debbie Hennessy, Senator Administrator, at CSU Long Beach. Our sympathies go out to members of our community who have lost family, friends and colleagues

This month is Global Spartan Month. We celebrate our international students at SJSU. The College of Professional and Global Education has planned a full month of events that can be found on the International Student and Scholar Services website.

Update on Senate Events:

We have been working with the Accessible Education Center and the Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success in re-forming the University Council on Accessibility and Compliance. Today is the last day for interested faculty to submit their nomination.

Chair Mathur has been working with Melanie Schlitzkus in the Provost Office on the 22nd Annual Faculty Service Recognition Event. Last year we had to cancel this event due to the Shelter-in-Place Order. This year the event will be virtual and will be held on April 15, 2021 so mark your calendars.

This week we will be celebrating our amazing staff with the 53rd Staff Service Celebration on Thursday. If interested go to the University Personnel webpage and register for the event. One of the winners is Erlinda Yanez, from Chicana and Chicano Studies, whose daughter Jade worked in the Senate office.

The Honors Convocation planning is underway. This event was cancelled last year as well due to the Shelter-in-Place Order. This year there will be a virtual event.

The Senate Office has been working with the web development team to update the website. Our Senate Administrator has been working with the team to ensure the new site contains the critical information we need and meets accessibility requirements.

We are also working with the President's Office regarding the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) review as outlined in university policy and you should be hearing more about this shortly.

Chair Mathur expressed her heartfelt thanks to Vice Chair McKee and the behind the scenes team (Stefan Frazier, Kimb Massey, Roxana Marachi, and Eva Joice) for a wonderful Senate Retreat. This was the first virtual retreat in our history and Chair Mathur has heard many positive comments.

As you know there has been a surge of Anti-Asian violence across the country, within our neighborhoods, and in our city. This has been brought on in many ways by COVID-19. Last spring our Senate passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution, SS-S20-6, that denounces racism and hate crimes against Asian, Asian-American, and Pacific Islanders. We also denounced jokes and terms that specifically target them. We also tasked our faculty, staff, and students with reporting these events whenever they see them especially those involving Asians, Asian-American, Pacific Islanders, who are being targeted during COVID-19. We agreed to stand in solidarity and in opposition to this violence.

Our SJSU Black Male Collective was also attacked during a racist zoom bombing this past Friday. I greatly appreciate the campus-wide message sent out by the CDO about how SJSU administration and staff have reached out to students and others who attended that event to offer counseling and other resources and how the administration will continue to work with the Black leadership and community members to provide support.

Chair Mathur noted that she would like to take a point of privilege as the Chair of the Senate to denounce what she believes is a failing at this university. This is a failure to provide clear Administration support to our Associated Students Board of Directors. This past Wednesday, February 24, 2021, during the AS Board meeting, our AS Board of Directors and campus student leaders were publicly attacked, humiliated, intimidated, and felt threatened by a group of students and community members during their zoom meeting. For nearly two hours these threats continued. These students were called horrific names, accused of wrongdoing, and generally humiliated throughout the course of the meeting. AS student leaders immediately reached out to Chair Mathur and Chair Mathur immediately contacted the Chief of Staff and the President's Office to get assistance. The AS leaders were also trying to contact some of the administration themselves to get someone to come into the meeting to provide some help. They tried to get any assistance they

could. Chair Mathur was told assistance would be provided, but no assistance was provided. In Chair Mathur's role as Senate Chair, she has had the honor to work with the AS Board of Directors and our student Senators. Over this past year, she has been witness to their leadership. Despite their own personal struggles related to COVID-19, they have advocated for students. It was heartbreaking to hear their cries for help and not be able to help them in that moment. In the days following this meeting, Chair Mathur has followed-up with these students and they continue to feel the trauma of being under attack. Social media posts continue to re-traumatize these students. Chair Mathur called upon the administration to provide tangible support beyond, "we hear you, or we are listening." These students had to go into their classrooms the very next day with some of the same students who had been attacking them the previous day. The students are not being asked to share their stories here today. They should not be traumatized again. We need to go beyond hearing them to supporting them. Where was the campus-wide support for our student leaders? It should have come out that day, or the next day. What message are you sending to our student leaders? What message are we sending to those students that have dedicated themselves to service to our campus? Chair Mathur loves SJSU and has always wanted SJSU to be number one in all we do. However, over the last few days, she has felt anger and powerless that SJSU has not done the right thing for these students. We are not number one. If Chair Mathur is feeling this way, then you can imagine how these students are feeling. We need to give them real support, when they are pleading for help. Chair Mathur urged the administration, the University, and Senators to provide tangible support to all our students. Chair Mathur thanked the Senate for listening.

B. From the President:

President Papazian thanked Chair Mathur for her comments. There is more to that story. This is the first that the President has heard from Chair Mathur about this. President Papazian appreciates the commitment to students. She is meeting tomorrow with the AS Board and there have been other kinds of conversations that have taken place. This is for another time and the President did not want to get into this today. However, this has not been ignored. The administration is working with students.

The President acknowledged that it has been a real pleasure to meet with the staff award winners and encouraged everyone to attend the Staff Awards Event this Thursday at 4 p.m. It is really important to recognize those staff members, and all our staff members who have done really extraordinary things.

We have word from the governor's office that they will be restoring the \$299 million that was reduced from the CSU budget last year. This is good news. The rest of the request from the Trustee's budget will move forward. We certainly think we will get some one-time dollars. The numbers coming into

the state office look robust. Whether or not we will see an increase in recurring dollars over the \$299 million only time will tell. Those dollars will be focused on basic needs like the Graduation Initiative and programs that lead to the success of our students.

We had hoped to be a vaccination site for the Santa Clara County, but they decided to go another route and we just learned that this week. We will continue to be available if that changes. Our team is in close contact with the Department of Health and the county.

We are actively engaged in developing the repopulation plan. The Chancellor's Office had hoped to be as in person as possible for Fall 2021. However, we think it will still be something of a transition semester. Certainly the approval of the Johnson and Johnson vaccine over this weekend was a big step. That is a positive step and with the distribution of the vaccine, the numbers are trending in the right direction. However, we still don't know what things will look like in the fall in terms of social distancing and what tier we will be in. We are planning on being somewhere between the yellow and the red tier and having a 75% occupancy rate. We recognize it could end up somewhere between the 50% and 75%. As we get closer and closer to fall we will be able to fine tune that. We are also trying to put together some criteria for what events will look like when the students come back together. We will continue to hold some Town Hall meetings on this so that we can tweak the plan with input from the campus community. We are trying to figure out what makes the most sense for the Commencement for Spring 2021. Different campuses are coming up with different solutions. We are still going to be primarily virtual, but we are going to have a short program that is live. The details are being worked out through Brian Bates and his team. We should have that done sometime this month to allow people to plan.

The Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CCDEI) is pretty much ready to go and the CDO will speak more to that. We have reached out to all the members of that committee. We do have seven students on that committee so that the student voice will be heard.

News from the Chancellor's Office, Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Blanchard will be leaving in a few weeks to take on the Presidency at the University of Houston, Downtown. A search will be launched for a new EVC soon.

Questions:

Q: This past AS Board meeting was very disturbing. Many students, alumni, community members and Mrs. Johnson were there to speak at the forum as it is the only public forum for people to speak at the university. People in the community and Mrs. Johnson have not been heard for 12 years. It is more than understandable that the students and Mrs. Johnson are angry. However,

the AS Board meetings are not the place to address the death of Gregory Johnson. As a community, we need to see more forms of accountability from the university. We also need places for the community to address SJSU. In a message to the campus community you said, "The circumstances surrounding Gregory's death are symptomatic of the longstanding systemic racism in our nation." Two questions. What about the systemic racism in our university? Can you address its presence?

To help your student body move forward, how will you heal what has happened in the past, and how will you prevent it from happening in the future?

A: [President] Thank you for the question. I will speak more with the AS Board tomorrow about this. It is clear that systemic racism is a challenge in our society and at the university. We have put together strategies, teams and committees in various areas to address this and we will continue to address this. The addition of Jahmal Williams and the Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are here to help us think beyond what is on the surface and come up with some solutions. This is something that doesn't get fixed overnight. We need to work with all of you on this. We will have many more conversations on this.

Q: Once you meet with the AS Board and think about some ways to move forward, can the Senate get a report on the next steps and how can we get involved in the process?

A: [President] That's a conversation for the students, and we will take it from there. However, I appreciate the interest here.

Q: My understanding is that the AS Board meetings are occurring every other Wednesday so the next meeting is March 10, 2021. There is reason to believe the same destruction that took place this past Wednesday will reoccur. Specific threats to that effect were made. What are we as a university doing about the format of the meetings to ensure that this does not reoccur?

A: [President] Absolutely, I will turn it over to VP Day who is working on this issue.

A: [VP Day] Obviously, it has been on my mind. Tomorrow when we meet with the students, we will talk with them about some strategies to manage the meetings. I say talk with the students, because it is their meeting. We will talk with them about putting some tools and strategies in place, depending on what they would like. This will allow them to limit some of the things that took place in that meeting, but will still allow them to have open meetings.

Q: My question revolves around the Title IX investigation into the Sports Medicine Director and the statement that the university remains committed to continuing to provide a safe learning environment and will continue to take the appropriate and necessary steps. What specifically has already been done to provide a safe learning environment, given that the Sports Medicine Director

has remained in his position for 10 years since the incident being investigated? My second question is about the allegation that Steve O'Brien was fired out of retaliation for bringing some of the case details to the public eye. Does the administration dispute that claim?

A: [President] As you recall, when this came to my attention I made the decision to refer this and open an investigation. When I looked at this I felt the women involved had not been heard and it was important to me that there be an objective process. A process where those involved were listened to and we would have an outcome and appropriate action would be taken whatever that was. I asked the Chancellor's Office to take this on, and that is how this investigation started. It is complicated and there are lots of players. It takes time. Mr. Shaw isn't with the university any longer. He left. That is just where that stands right now. Certainly, our Title IX Office is involved. Regarding the second part, I'm not going to speak one way or the other on a personnel matter.

There is a comment in the chat I think I need to clear up [about the AS Board Meeting]. Let me just be clear, this was a purely accidental kind of thing. I was sent the wrong agenda and the wrong link. When I tried to get in and log onto the meeting a few minutes before it started, I could not get in. The link was for a personnel meeting on March 22, 2021. I called my assistant and tech support, but by the time they were able to get me the correct link there was only five minutes left to the meeting. I had a hard stop and had to leave and didn't want to show up for only five minutes. There would have been no time to have a conversation, so I asked to be rescheduled for the next meeting. This is what happened.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of February 1, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of March 1, 2021 as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Approval of the Senate Calendar of 2021-2022—The Senate voted and the calendar was approved (46-0-1).

Approval of the Election Calendar of 2022—The Senate voted and the calendar was approved (47-0-0)

VI. Unfinished Business:

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

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1806, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy S15-10, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy (Final Reading).***

Senator McClory presented an amendment to add a new Resolved clause to read, “Resolved that 2.6.2.4. be added: Two members of the Library staff should be added to the membership. These members will serve for staggered three-year terms. All subsequent articles should be renumbered.” Senator Frazier presented an amendment to the McClory amendment that was friendly to the body to delete, “should be added to the membership.” The Senate voted and the McClory/Frazier amendment passed (41-0-5). Senator Marachi presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add, “Effective: Fall 2021.” **The Senate voted and AS 1806 passed as amended (38-0-5).**

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

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R): No report.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): No report.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter described the use of the Boyer model and ways it has been incorporated into the existing RTP policies. The current policy already provides a lot of flexibility, about the scholarship of engagement, but because it doesn't call it out explicitly by name, because it doesn't identify examples, this policy has not had the effect on shifting the university's culture as much as it should.

Senator Peter presented ***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 Scholarship of Engagement (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: Under 2.3.1, where it talks about disciplinary expert, who are we saying is a disciplinary expert? I'm in Social Work, so I'm assuming a disciplinary expert would be in Social Work, but my community engagement is with the HIV Planning Council. These people would probably be the better evaluator of how my research is helping them in the community.

A: It is a good question. Some of this needs to be worked out. The departments need to establish guidelines that will elaborate on that. There is a difference between service and scholarship of engagement. Scholarship of Engagement means using your expertise, so you need to have somebody who shares your expertise to evaluate the value of your expertise. It could be you are going to need to do two things. You may need a letter from the people in the community you are serving, and maybe an external reviewer

who shares your expertise to evaluate the significance and quality of that work.

Q: Might there be in the process of external review or disciplinary experts, suggestions by the candidate that would be taken into account?

A: I think there very well could be and I think that is where department guidelines would outline how an external review is setup. As you may recall we had a first reading of a policy on external review in the fall and what happened is what I feared would happen. There is so much variation on this campus from department to department that any kind of universal policy on external review is bound to fail. I do think that some of the guidelines that PS has already seen and made recommendations about do have provisions for external review in which the candidates nominate reviewers, and chairs and others choose them. That is one model that is being used on this campus.

Q: Applaud the inclusion of licensure. I wonder if we might want to put a note in the service component that may differentiate where service requires a particular level of disciplinary expertise and may also be considered scholarly, professional, artistic work?

A: We can reexamine that. Let me see if this helps though. If you look at the category, professional achievement, the second of the 2.3.3's, we had this issue with professional achievement. This is what we said for professional achievement. Professional achievement will usually be evaluated within the category of service, except when department guidelines establish that professional activities are the primary method of demonstrating expertise within the discipline. That is how we finessed it within the category of professional achievement. However, scholarship of engagement is a little bit different, because we wanted to make the argument that it is a form of scholarship and it is very likely that a person going up for tenure or promotion might have a piece of conventional scholarship in an empirical journal and might also have something that fits the scholarship of engagement and they are both different aspects of scholarship. We don't want to say to a candidate that unless your department has guidelines, scholarship of engagement won't count except in service. Trying to get the right dividing line between service and scholarship of engagement is always difficult. We can try and beef up that explanation, but the main distinction has to do with the application of expertise. If it is something you could do without your expertise or doctorate, just as a volunteer, that is service time. When you serve on the Academic Senate, for the most part we are serving as members of the academic community. You can serve on the Academic Senate regardless of what your academic expertise is so that clearly is service. However, if you are applying your expertise and that is something that can only be done because of your expertise that could become the scholarship of engagement.

Q: If there is any way the difference between scholarship of engagement and service could be added in here as a descriptor to guide candidates as to

when it is service and when it is scholarship of engagement, that could be critical. Would the committee consider this?

A: That has been the problem for 30 years. Many books have been published for 30 years on how to make that distinction. If you have any language, we would be happy to consider it.

Q: Thank you. I'm trying to jump the gun I know that. Is there a plan to bring this forward again soon as I'm thinking of candidates going up next year?

A: We shall see. Part of the first reading was to gauge. I think the questions and suggestions that have come up so far are doable. We'd like to get this done this year. The committee also got a lot of suggestions for equity reform. That one looks more substantial. That one is probably going to take a longer reform effort and come back next year, but if we can handle the suggestions that are coming in and have been coming in it would be nice to get this one adopted this year. As you know, because of the way the contract works, any changes have to be on the books before the next cycle begins. The President would have to sign this prior to August. The hope is to get the scholarship of engagement adopted this year. We will see what all of you think.

Q: Concern about value judgements. Here are two hypothetical situations. Someone from your department is approached by say Donald Trump to provide expertise on political strategies from winning elections, does that piece of work and gets a ringing endorsement. Let's say the advice provided was extremely rigorous and worthwhile, just towards an end we may not appreciate. How would an RTP committee deal with this type of conflict between what may be rigorous application of scholarly expertise, but has ends that are undesirable?

A: I'm stretching my imagination to think anyone in my department might be approached in such a way, but the answer goes like this. Obviously, a letter from former President Trump testifying to the expertise of a SJSU political scientist who gave him the winning strategy that would not be sufficient. You would need to have a disciplinary expert evaluate the work. There would need to be some other political scientist somewhere who wouldn't be evaluating it from the standpoint of who won or who lost, but evaluating it from the viewpoint of an innovative application of political science for a particular election, and whether the work pioneered new ground in understanding how to run a campaign or not. I think you can find a similar example in every department on campus. You do begin to run into those academic freedom issues. The RTP policy is very explicit about avoiding personal bias in evaluating other people's work and I think the earlier sentence we added to the preamble about, "The overarching principle should be to reward significant scholarly academic professional achievement regardless of the form it may take," further reinforces this notion that we are looking at the scholarly achievement regardless of the form it takes.

Q: Would it be feasible in some way either through the Senate or somewhere else to have a list of the different types of scholarship of engagement? This

may look very different from department to department. If new professors could see this list it might stimulate some ideas about how to frame their own dossiers in a way that highlights scholarship of engagement.

A: That is a great idea and not to create work for other people, but should this pass, it would be a perfect opportunity for faculty development to start putting together sample portfolios and dossiers. I will say that this university has a number of traditional departments, but also an increasing number of non-traditional departments. In some of the less traditional parts of this campus, this will not be such an unusual concept. Some departments may even choose to hire people who will have a lot of success in the scholarship of engagement. This may be something they look for as they seek to build their departments.

C: [Provost] The scholarship of engagement emerges as a challenge to logical positivism particularly in the social sciences where who the author is and who the data collectors are were challenged by things like participatory action research where all of a sudden you are co-authoring research questions with “research subjects.” That kind of blew up the paradigm of Science. There were a lot of schools that were like this is not real research and they cut it out. One of the key components that comes out of this is impact and how we measure that. That is different from service and goes back to disciplinary expertise. I think we need to highlight impact. A lot of scholarship of engagement articles are put in peer review journals, they just aren't the journals that are typical to a political science or geography department for example. If you were at a research university, a department might exclude those as not scholarship. That still happens very commonly. We want to embrace the opportunity to be much more holistic, but that doesn't mean you don't need the rigor of some level of peer review and evaluation of the impact of the work otherwise it is very hard to understand how your disciplinary expertise was applied. That is a key component that needs to be worked out and I would agree 100% that department guidelines are tremendously helpful here. We don't have department guidelines in all our departments and I think it is time we do. This is a good first step. And some of that info about impact actually covers all three areas of professional achievement. To the last point, we definitely have to train people on what this looks like, how you put a file together based on this work, how do you document impact. I'm really excited about this. I think we will get there. We will really have to work on the implementation.

C: I should add this was Senator Del Casino's referral that we take this up. We really appreciate his direction in this way. I do have a counter question for him. One issue with the word “impact” is that it invokes the cost of the invoke factors in traditional journals so we have been looking for other words such as significance or something or another, if anything occurs to you let us know.

A: [Provost] None of these words are perfect. Purdue, being one of the leaders of this, says journal citations are one measure of impact but it isn't always a good one. It is imperfect. The nomenclature has to be

operationalized and we have to be satisfied with that. However, it is common language like in the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health which demand you now outline broader impact of your work which is beyond the scholarship so that might be one place to look, but what did it do to actually address the issue and maybe change the world a little bit. That was a new thing and it wasn't taken as seriously and it's grown to be taken more seriously now at places like the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. We will have to come up with the SJSU definition and then come up with guidelines and training. It is a great question. I appreciate it.

C: I want to thank the committee for line 158. And the phrase or the term public scholarship, I always referred to it as public facing scholarship, but I think that helps around scholarship of engagement. I think this is not only a cultural paradigm shift that that is going on but also a generational shift. I think it will become more common to see this as we hire more young professors.

Q: I'm wondering if there is a way to address the issue of scholars trying to apply some of this research in a discipline that maybe doesn't have extensive literature so the research isn't respected, so they apply it in another discipline. Maybe there is a way to acknowledge that. For people who aren't experienced at evaluating this type of work may see this as less than. I'm wondering if there is a way to address the interdisciplinary nature sometimes of this work?

A: It certainly sounds like it might be useful to insert a reference in the early part similar to professional achievement and scholarship of engagement that says, "requires the application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary expertise" perhaps. We will talk about that. We are aware a lot of this is interdisciplinary.

C: I'd like to make a comment about the language of impact. There is an entire social impact space right now that is burgeoning with non-profits and public-private partnerships in an area that has received a lot of critique around the problematic use of the word impact metrics, so if there is any way to provide clarity around the word "impact," maybe you could use "reach."

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Statewide Academic Senators:

The ASCSU will be meeting March 17-19, 2021. We continue to work on implementing AB 1460. Other resolutions/issues under discussion include dedicated seats for lecturers, faculty burnout/angst over repopulation efforts, faculty and staff stress over being caretakers for multiple family members (e.g. parents/children), pay equity when comparing administrator salaries with faculty and staff salaries (e.g. \$350,000 salary for EVC and \$6,000 monthly housing allowance when faculty and staff get no housing or allowance, analysis or shared costs incurred expenses related to working from home.).

Other discussions/issues included GWAR, grading symbols (no suspension of EO 1037), and the rejection of the National Council of Teacher Quality Report.

Questions:

Q: Why is there resistance to the dedicated lecturer seat?

A: Part of it is the culture of the ASCSU. Some people get into an ASCSU seat and feel it belongs to them. The resolution was defeated by only one vote. Some of the issues had to do with the way the lecturer would be elected, the title, and rotation off the Senate. We did share campus feedback but we can share again so please send your comments. Three key issues: lecturers are the overwhelming majority of faculty, so how would you get representation, reference to contingent faculty (as linked to enrollments in the CBA), and rotation (it would prevent people from being re-elected).

C: One of the issues is representation and the question is do you carve out room from the existing group or do you add to the group? Some campuses still don't even allow lecturers on their Senate.

Q: Fifteen years ago, I was on the ASCSU, there were a number of lecturers. Instead of having dedicated seats, why not consider requiring all campuses to allow lecturers to run for campus seats. Has this changed?

A: I'm not sure there has been change, but the current number on the ASCSU is low. One suggestion is to meet with lecturers.

B. Provost:

We have a Townhall meeting coming up for the Division of Academic Affairs on repopulation efforts for Fall 2021. Letter sent out last week about fall planning.

It is time to start faculty reviews and the Provost is eager to get started on them.

The Provost is working on getting faculty hiring memos to the Deans. Think about next phase of the three-year planning and where we need go. Pushing very hard for what we will need for Ethnic Studies, Area F to bring leadership into that space.

We are continuing the Public Voices Op-Ed project for the next three years and continuing the contract.

The Provost launched season two of his podcasts with faculty on Friday. He thoroughly enjoyed making these last year and is so looking forward to another year. It is really about learning about the origin stories of our colleagues and hearing their voices.

Searches have been started for several leadership positions such as the Dean of the Library and the Vice Provost for Faculty Success. And we have several reviews of administrators going on.

This summer we will continue to have another large round of faculty training like we did last year to assist faculty with their online and hybrid classes. We have committed the resources. Cares Act has done a lot to assist us to help provide this training.

The Provost recently sent the Senate Office a referral to get rid of the University Sabbatical Committee. Sabbaticals are best reviewed by the colleges and we want to give as many sabbaticals as possible.

Questions:

Q: When we talk about modes of instruction generally, we talked about in person, online and hybrid, there is another model called high-flex (hybrid flexible). Are we going in this direction, given that this doubles the work for instructors?

A: [Provost] I don't know about doubling the workload. However, this is not feasible for us for Fall 2021. We are not in a position to push high-flex classes, but we won't stand in the way either. There are ways to do this without doubling the workload. It takes effort and planning, definitely not pushing this on our campus.

Q: Can you give me an update as to when AS will receive a response to the resolutions that were sent to you about three months ago regarding proctoring and COVID?

A: [Provost] I just haven't gotten to them. I apologize. We have discussed a lot of things, but I haven't been able to sit down and write a response. It has to do with getting people away from high stakes exams, which is a challenge pedagogically. Yes, looking at some of the answers to some of those questions so hopefully this month.

Q: Many graduate programs on campus are moving from theses to projects due to the timeline. The thesis timeline is early for a two-year Master's program. Is there any discussion about changing these timelines?

A: [Provost] This is the first I've heard the question. I'll look into this and get back to you.

C: [d'Alarcao] We are looking at ways to make it easier for students, provide more flexibility. Looking at the thesis approval process in our office, making it faster and so that there is a higher capacity to do review. Looking at this holistically. We are working on getting graduate students writing earlier.

C. Associated Students President:

AS still does not have a signed 2020-2021 budget back from the President.

The last AS Board meeting left the board members feeling traumatized. The members were subjected to humiliation and ridiculed, and were told they had blood on their hands. AS feels the university should refrain from calling itself the most transformative university, when 13 students felt like their safety was not being prioritized. None of the administration came to the support of the AS Board members during this meeting as requested by numerous board members throughout the meeting. In the wise words on Elaine Welteroth, there is no glory in a grind that literally grinds you down to dust.

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

The VPAF is putting together the budget guidelines over next few months

The Science building is moving forward. They have been working through issues identified by the Fire Marshal.

The AS House has been cleared by the Fire Marshal and is now being painted.

The International House and Audiology space in Sweeney are undergoing some upgrades.

E. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

Our enrollment is up by 223 students from last year, but who these students are is not the same as it was last year. We have spent a lot of time in enrollment campaigns. There are way more transfer students. We have spent lots of time working on admissions for Fall 2021. There were lots of concerns about safety from parents. We continue to move forward.

Good news on COVID testing. Our students have done a great job of social distancing. With our COVID testing we have a .67 positivity rate. That is less than 10 students who have tested positive for COVID. We will continue to do surveillance testing over about 10 to 15% of the population randomly throughout the Semester, but beginning this particular semester less than 1% of students tested positive.

We are looking to create more study spaces for students in the Student Union, but student didn't use them as much as anticipated when we have opened up some spaces. Share information from the report from the National Center of Collegiate Mental Health in use of services. We have also had similar findings with some decline in the utilization of services. This seems to be a national phenomenon. We are still doing outreach, offering one-on-one experiences and group experiences

We will have about \$15 million from the CARES Act to distribute to students based largely on Free Application for Student Aid (FAFSA). We will try to give to other groups as well. Try to get out those monies as quickly as possible.

Question:

Q: When will we get to see the Campus Policing Taskforce Report?

A: We have set a date as before the end of the semester. They are aiming for right after spring break. Still have some decisions about format and feedback and language within the report.

F. Chief Diversity Officer:

The CDO gave an update on the racist Zoom bombing during the SJSU Black Male Collective meeting. The CDO's across the CSU have been advised that these attacks are a concerted effort across the U.S. to create fear and terror. Administrators and staff have been reaching out to students. Information Technology (IT) is looking at the zoom platform. We did work with the university police immediately over the weekend and so we're just looking at what sort of patterns might be there, and if there's a national implication in terms of the patterns. We need to train staff and students on how to setup zoom meetings to avoid this and manage participation. We are involved with the solidarity network and other groups and thinking about how we are supporting with infrastructure. Scheduled two training on how to handle microaggression is scheduled for MPPs. In addition, the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will also be discussing this issue. Dr. Patience Bryant and the CDO will be working on a process aimed at equity and systemic racism within our Greek organizations (not just leadership, but also for members). The President's team is working through different initiatives and demands (VPSA, Chief of Staff). A spreadsheet is being compiled of all the requests/demands made to the President and leadership so that progress can be tracked and reported on.

The CDO has been meeting with different groups on campus and discussing the results of the Campus Climate Survey.

Questions:

Q: Related to the Zoom bombing incidents, are we aggregating data at a system level? Is the federal government involved and taking action?

A: The Chancellor's Office and the CDO's are looking at these incidents and whether we need to collect more information in a systematic way. The Chief of Police has reached out to the FBI, Civil Rights division. These groups have been on the radar for some times, common methodology, common images. Their tactics involve heinous images such as hangings and pornography. All in process.

Q: Have there been recommendations for Zoom like using waiting rooms, permissions,? Is there something else we should be doing?

A: The use of waiting rooms and webinar is important. The difference is these are public events. Some of this is in Time, Place, and Manner. The

Administration talked a lot about pushing people into waiting rooms. There are strategies we can use such as making people register.

Q: Since these events will be by Zoom, have you thought about the intersection about Academic events related to things like doctoral dissertation defenses. Is there some guidance? Are we taking any preventive measures for these kinds of events?

A: What we need to do is address this at the cabinet level and come up with a best practices document. Lots of people are not especially adept at using Zoom. Solidarity network and other groups are looking at this as well.

C: Many don't have a clear understanding which events and meetings are private and which must be public so there is a level of unaccountability. There are the California public meetings laws. Need to develop some best practices around these events as linked to public vs. private.

G. CSU Faculty Trustee:

Report distributed via the Senate listserv.

IX. Special Committee Reports:

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:48 pm.

**SJSU Academic Senate Committee
March 22nd, 2021 Consent Calendar**

| ADD | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| Committee Name | Name | Zip | Phone | Term | Seat (Title) |
| Accreditation Review Committee | Nina Chuang | 0128 | 46244 | 2021 | Seat N – A.S. President (Designee) |
| Accreditation Review Committee | Sharon Willey | 0031 | 47096 | 2022 | Seat I – Staff member from Student Affairs |
| Institutional Review Board | Sabrina Pinnell | 0119 | 45550 | 2023 | Seat L – Social Science |
| Instruction and Student Affairs | Krista Wirth | 0128 | 46244 | 2021 | Seat K – Graduate Student |
| Student Fairness Committee | Jasmine Shokoor | 0128 | 46244 | 2021 | Seat 4 – Student |

| Remove | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| Committee Name | Name | Zip | Phone | Term | Seat (Title) |
| Accreditation Review Committee | Zobeida Delgadillo | 0128 | 46244 | 2021 | Seat N – A.S. President |
| Accreditation Review Committee | Kayla McGill | 0031 | 46973 | 2022 | Seat I – Staff member from Student Affairs |
| General Education Advisory Committee | Flor Sario | 0128 | 46244 | 2021 | Seat 1 – A.S. Board Member |

Executive Committee Minutes
February 15, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Curry, Day, Delgadillo, Del Casino, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Papazian, Wong(Lau),
Absent: None
Guest: Mohammad Abousalem

1. President's Update:

The President commended Vice Chair McKee and the entire planning team on the Senate Retreat.

The President spent this week working on the budgets and how we can ensure there is support from Sacramento. We are fortunate we have elected officials who are advocates. We want them to understand what a lack of support would look like on the campus particularly around the graduation initiative, student success, and the deferred maintenance fee. The President reminded them that with more money coming into the coffers than expected, it would be a good time to invest in deferred maintenance.

2. Presentation on RSCA by the Vice President for Research and Innovation, Mohammad Abousalem:

This is an analysis of the assigned time for the RSCA award for the tenured faculty pool who had the choice of whether to apply for the program or not. There have been three cycles. We looked at both the applicants and awardees both by ethnicity and gender. This is based on data we obtained from institutional research. The actual number of faculty who gained entrance into the program is larger than the currently enrolled and that is because of natural attrition for obvious reasons. As you can see, this is the number of tenured applications, the number of awards, and the number of awards in each cycle as a percentage of the awards from the applications. As you can see, the percentage is going higher each cycle and that was expected because at the beginning of the program we got more applications and that decreased over time. There are applicants who applied once, or twice, or even three times. The number of individual applicants is 175. There were nine faculty who attempted three times. Six of the nine got awarded eventually. Three were from the College of Science and three from the College of Social Sciences. There were three females and three males. There were three White and three Unknown. The ones who did not get awarded in spite of three attempts were in the College of Social Sciences, two females, one male, one White and two Unknown. If you look at the two time applicants, there were 43 in total. There were eight who were not awarded. They included four from the College of Science, two from the College of Social Sciences, one from the College of Education, and one from the College of Humanities and the Arts. Four were female and four were male. There were three Asian and five White. The last category is one time applicants who were not awarded. There were 21 total. Eleven were in Cycle 1, four were in Cycle 2, and six were in Cycle 3. Please keep in mind the review and approval process changed from one cycle to the next. The first cycle was reviewed by the Provost. The second cycle was reviewed by the deans. And, the third cycle was reviewed by the deans and further approved by the VPRI. There was a change in the process of review and who reviewed and approved them. The standard process now is that the deans review and make the recommendation to the VPRI, and then the VPRI discusses with the deans and then makes the final decision. Another point to note is that there was no analysis or targeting of any demographic. It was based on the merit of the application.

Let's look at the gender distribution through the three cycles. In Cycle 1, 55 females and 47 males applied and the percentage awarded was 54% female/46% male. You have that for each cycle and then at the bottom a summary for all cycles. Then you have the awardee split between males and females. For example, for Cycle 2 there were 47 female applicants and 33 female awardees.

Seventy percent of the female applicants received awards. Before we go to the last column what you will see here is that the percentage of female and male applicants is very close to the percentage of the awardees for the same category, so 55 female/47 male applicants and 54% female/46% male awardees in Cycle 1. This is very consistent. Another interesting piece of information we wanted to look at was what did that pool of applicants represent compared to the total pool of tenured faculty at the time. We have on the far right the gender distribution in the overall tenured faculty pool at the time that cycle actually took place. What you will find is in all three cycles the distribution shows female applicants exceeded male applicants even though in the overall tenured faculty pool the number of males exceeded the number of females. In all three cycles it looks like tenured female faculty applicants were more interested in and applied more than tenured males even though males exceed the number of females in the bigger pool. If you look at the graph this is what you will see for each cycle and then all cycles in the end. Again, it shows consistency between the ratio of females and males and between applicants and awardees. Then as far as the overall pool, you are going to find males were more than females in the pool, but the female applicants exceeded the male applicants in all three cycles. There is no obvious difference in the gender distribution cycle over cycle. It stayed consistent across the three cycles. There is nothing concerning or alarming as far as distribution of male and female awards given. Let's look at ethnicity. If you look at the percentage of applicants versus awardees over time you are going to find that their percentages are representative across cycles except for two ethnicities—Asians and Whites. Twenty-four percent of the applicants were Asian and 62% were White. Of the awardees, 38% were Asian and 46% were White. Other than this, the percentages have the same representation in the respective pool. In Cycle 2 and 3, you will find that the percentages are more representative. Seventeen percent of the applicants were Asian, and 17% of the awardees were Asian. Eight percent of the applicants were Hispanic, and 10% of the awardees were Hispanic. Sixty-three percent of applicants were White, and 61% of awardees were White, etc.... Then in Cycle 3 the same thing. It is easier to look at it in graph. What we are looking at here is the awards. Again, these are very close except for a few cases and we are going to go over them. In Cycle 1 faculty that are White or Asian, the percentage was slightly reversed between the applicants and the awardees. In all three cycles ethnic distribution of applicants by percentage has been consistent with all tenured faculty except for one faculty category that in the three cycles has represented at a slightly higher percentage of applicants compared to their share in the pool. If you look at White applicants, they represent at 62%. They were 57% of the overall pool. In all three cycles, White applicants always represented at a bigger percentage of the applicant pool than the other categories which means that White faculty applied more than other ethnicities. Also, another point I think is important to look at is that only one Black Faculty member out of 15 applied in Cycle 1, zero out of 13 applied in Cycle 2, and zero out of 8 applied in Cycle 3. Even though the number is small, it is important to note that there are no applications from Black Faculty members in Cycles 2 or 3. I think there is work to be done here. We need to look at what is making this so and figure out how to make this program more attractive to African-American faculty members.

Questions:

Q: What was the reason for the change in procedure after the first cycle?

A: For Cycles 1 and 2, I'm not sure. I think the program was new and it was decided after that time how the process would go. I can tell you about Cycle 3, because that was when the new Division of Research and Innovation and VPRI were established. [Provost] Andy, Joan, and then Vin. There were three different Provosts and procedures. Joan said the Deans should do it. Andy said the Provost should do it. I say the VPRI should do it. Three different Provosts had different ideas about who should have the final word.

Q: I think it is important we monitor the gender ratios going forward. There has been a very disproportionate influence on research based on gender because of COVID. I think the biggest challenge is going to be to keep those gender ratios as good as they have been looking through a new situation in which the research agenda for many women has collapsed, whereas for men it continues the pace. This is something to keep in mind going forward. The other question I have is when you talked about the African-Americans who did not apply it reminds me of the voting rates

based on registered voters, and the number who never registered to vote because they became discouraged. I wonder what measures will be taken to try and give more encouragement and get the faculty who maybe had their research stymied for many years back in the cycle?

A: I have a couple of comments. Thank you for bringing up that women researchers have been impacted more by COVID. This is a real issue. We are looking at how we can be more considerate in the process not only for RSCA assigned time, but for all the activities and programs we do on campus to be sure our researchers are afforded the right opportunities to help them continue with their RSCA agenda. As for the issue of race, specifically African-Americans, we are connected with Jahmal Williams in the President's Office now and are looking at different areas of research development as well as ongoing grants and opportunities and how to ensure they reach these faculty members.

A: [President] The gender issue has really been thrown into chaos due to the pandemic, but the race and ethnicity issue has been with us a very long time. We have to really understand the particular reasons different populations have responded the way they have and it begins by asking very particular questions. The other piece is faculty development. I know some of you may have read the work in the Chronicle, particularly around the Associate Professor trap. We must take an intentional and direct approach and it involves the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, our Vice Provost for Faculty Success, all of our senior faculty and the deans. Having the data really helps us, but it is just the starting point. I think it is even harder after tenure when the rules aren't so clear. This is just the very beginning of the conversation and I'm really grateful for it.

A: [CDO] I agree with the President and appreciate the comments. One of my major concerns is that we need to look at the challenges for particular communities in its specificity. We have way more tenure-track Black faculty on our campus than we have ever had before. I think there are 41. What this means is that we have a whole lot of people who are qualified to apply for RSCA, but who could potentially through the experiences of their tenured peers, decide that this is not for them because they have not seen some of their Black tenured peers getting RSCA awards or applying for them. Whatever we do needs to involve the entire faculty community and looking at different ways we can mentor faculty, as well as engaging them in conversations about RSCA and their work. Maybe there could be some pre-RSCA grants or something like that.

A: [VPRI] Over the past year and a half, what we have focused on is one of the areas you are talking about which used to be called Central RSCA and now we call it CSU seed grants. These grants are to make sure faculty can use them as a starting point. This grant is focused on faculty that want to start the RSCA journey. Then we have other intramural grants that we setup internally for faculty who have already received the seed grants and need to move to the next level. Also, one of the strategic initiatives for the new research team is to reach out to faculty that have not started the RSCA journey and encourage them. We now have the Grants Academy and we have added workshops there as well. We are trying to build that awareness of what is out there. We can then learn what the struggles are.

A: [Provost] Right now our junior faculty are getting CSU seed grants through their whole cycle. One of the things I've suggested is if you mentor someone who is really good or excellent in research you should just give them another five year award. What has changed when someone goes from Assistant to Associate Professor? The challenge we are going to have is eventually all those people are going to be in the cycle and we will need more money. The other thing that this allows us to do is reimagine post tenure review for full professors. Then there will be an evaluation point or something where you can ask yourself are they continuing in the RSCA program or not. What we are talking about in the community of people is tenured folks who have had to apply into this program, but as we move on does this get baked into the program. That is the goal. For me, I was annoyed when I left Long Beach that I had to apply every year that I was eligible. I was insulted. That is part of this larger conversation. How do you hold onto it year-after-year, and how do you opt out? I want to be a little cautious that we are trying to push everyone into that model and maybe that isn't their bag. Maybe their passion is in the classroom. It will be interesting over the next 5 to 10 years.

A: [VPRI] I totally agree with the Provost. When faculty are applying for RTP and they apply for RSCA, they are automatically accepted into the RSCA program based on their RTP success. We will automatically give them the 5-year program. You will not have the situation where someone gets their tenure, but is denied RSCA.

Q: I think all of these forms of institutional support are wonderful, but I also think that we need the boots on the ground mentoring support as well. Mentoring really varies from department-to-department and college-to-college and that is really critical. That needs to be baked into the culture of this kind of thing.

A: [VPRI] Thank you.

A: [Provost] Thank you. We have to come up with something. We might not be all the way there, but we have to start with something.

C: Lots of senior faculty don't have any idea how to mentor someone who is 20 to 30 years younger than they are. It might take some skill. Maybe there need to be some incentives for senior faculty to take some time out and learn how to be good mentors.

A: We can do all of the training but the training will only achieve some of the objectives with people who are already interested that want to be trained in mentoring which is a long-term relationship. I would look at the collaborations that we are already building between research development and faculty success. I think mentoring will come out of hand-to-hand collaboration between the two sides. I support that very much.

C: I was part of my department's first cycle of RSCA reviews. I was the chair at that time. One of the challenges was that we had people applying who were not RSCA-productive. They wanted the time to become RSCA-productive. The metrics we were using at the time only rewarded people who were active and productive. This tied our hands in many ways. I think if you can provide seed program grants to support faculty in a stuck pattern that would be great.

A: This is a point well taken. This is exactly why we are having the seed program, so that we get them going in the program before we start evaluating them.

A: [Provost] You have to have some metric. In research productivity you are making a \$14,000+ investment. This program is a multi-million dollar program. The goal is to allow people to excel in their scholarship. A number of colleges took their own dollars and created a seed program when they saw the gap. People did jump on some of that stuff, but there aren't enough dollars for every faculty member. We are structurally and financially in a place where we still have to make decisions. There had to be some bars at the beginning. There are only half the number of awards as total people that applied so what are you going to use and where are you going to go? I understand how that could make people feel disenfranchised. As we have masses of faculty doing this long term, what is that going to look like? I think that will put increasing pressure on sabbaticals. The blur between 32 and 33 is not as great as I think it might have been in the past. This is a larger institutional question.

C: I understand the limited dollars, but I think we also have to understand that where we don't have the funds to invest, those individuals' dossiers will look different in the end. That is also a reality. I think that for people in that middle level that their dossier may be stuck and they don't have the time to invest in areas they need to invest in and their dossier will look different than those who did have the time to invest in RSCA and were given these resources.

A: [President Papazian] That is true. The way we used to refer to this at my last institution was the on loan time and then the other work faculty did was measured by number of credit hours or units taught. That is indicated in the dossier. It is not a factor at the tenure level. All untenured faculty have the same time distribution. It does become a factor after that. The key is there is an indicator the individual has had additional time. The other piece, and this is why I was really focused on this at the Associate level, is that this is the area where we really want to be sure our faculty who want to participate have the opportunity. I think that is the difference. The key is that we are providing the support so the faculty can make the choice.

3. Search Committee for the Vice Provost for Faculty Success:

The Executive Committee reviewed and discussed the nominees and made some recommendations to the Provost. The Provost was very impressed with the pool of nominees.

4. **University Updates:**

A. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):

COVID testing has been occurring for our returning students. Right now our rates are below 1%. That is very good news. There have been no surprises in the residence halls. We will be doing surveillance testing which is a random 10% across the population of students in the residence halls. This will continue throughout the semester. Our student athletes have a lot more contact and have a lot more testing. Our athletes have kept things tight.

Question:

Q: When and how can people get their COVID shot?

A: [Wong(Lau)] I have been monitoring five different sites and last night when I went to the myturn.ca.gov site and hit education as the category, for the first time it said I was eligible for shots. The closest place was the Oakland Coliseum, but they were sold out of appointments of course. Some of the big vaccination areas like Santa Clara County Fairgrounds, Levi Stadium, and Moscone Center will allow you to make an appointment if you are qualified. The problem is people are running out of vaccines. Also, when I took my parents for the vaccine they said they are taking anyone regardless of insurance. You have to snap up those appointments as soon as they become available.

C: Faculty are concerned because we are talking about going back to face-to-face instruction in fall and they want to be fully vaccinated.

C: [VP Faas] We are working very closely with the county to try and get something here on our campus. They have been out two or three times to look at us. They love the setup of the parking garages and the flow of the SPX. Nothing has been signed yet. They are focused on trying to get Levi Stadium up and running first. Now that that is rolling, we hope to get things moving. That should help considerably in getting our folks vaccinated.

Q: If we are in Tier 1B, is there anything preventing a department chair from writing a memo verifying the employees in their department?

A: [VP Day] This may be a Joanne Wright/University Personnel question. VP Faas will reach out about this and report back to the committee.

Q: We are getting some bad publicity. A student of mine was erroneously claiming that there was no COVID testing on campus. We have a need to highlight that we are doing testing on campus. Also, if we present ourselves as educators for the COVID vaccine, how do we prove that? Is there some way we can provide verification of current employment?

A: VP Faas will ask those questions and get back to us.

In terms of our enrollment, we are just slightly down at under 5% for undergraduates and 3.7% overall. That is good news. We will need to spend a good amount of time between now and the beginning of school getting those students that applied to come to SJSU. There are record applications to the UC system, and there is a decline in the community colleges. Those are both significant to us. We need to pay attention to both of these. The increase in the UC is likely do to the removal of the standardized test requirements. The numbers are substantial and particularly substantial among populations that intersect with our population around race and ethnicity. We compete with the UC, so a substantial increase in their enrollment impacts us. In addition, a decrease in Community College students is significant, because this is where we get our transfer students.

We surveyed about 1200 families about how they are feeling. About 70% were parents of Frosh. VP Day will share this information with the committee at a later date.

B. From the CDO:

A message was sent out today about the rise in anti-Asian crime in particular in the Bay Area.

There have been about 13 attacks in Oakland's Chinatown. There is a lot of concern coming from Asian faculty and students that are worried about their parents and grandparents. The message contained a list of services provided and contact information about the APID/A Taskforce. The CDO had a conversation with some of those leaders as well over the weekend. We want to make sure the APID/A folks know they are part of the conversation about eliminating or reducing systemic racism.

The CDO's Office is in the process of beginning to meet with different units regarding the Campus Climate Survey and findings. One concern that everyone had when taking the survey was that it would just sit on a shelf after we got the findings. The Campus Climate Survey had over 200 slides so the CDO's Office started separating out the slides into groups like faculty, staff, and students to make it easier and encourage more people to view it. The CDO's Office has already met with the College of Engineering. Six forums were also held on the Campus Climate Survey. There were 2 for faculty, 2 for staff, and 2 for students. One of the first colleges that the CDO's Office will be working with, because of the disconnect with graduate students, is the College of Graduate Studies. Many graduate students reported feeling invisible on campus.

Questions:

C: I think it is important to mention that you are continuing to support employees with Tuesday Employee Connection sessions and the next one is on March 9, 2021.

A: They have been very well attended. We have had a lot of employees with less than two years attending because they don't know many colleagues and want to get to know them, and then a good number of employees that have been here a long time and just want to chat with their friends and meet new colleagues. There is "speed connecting" game and people love that.

C. From the Provost:

There are a number of things going on. The Library Dean search fell through. We are going to do a new search and I'm going to put together a new search committee and have reopened the nominations for it. The current committee members may not be able to commit to a new search and they have already put a lot of time into this. We had the most diverse pool of candidates I've ever seen. They were very talented, but a couple of them got other jobs, etc. The library is very important to us. I will be giving a statement to the University Library Board (ULB) today on an external review that happened. It represents that we need a larger needs assessment of what the library does for us as faculty and staff.

We are moving along with Fall 2021 planning. All we can do is move forward with what we know today. We don't even know if the tiers are going to change, or could we be post-pandemic by August. We are just trying to work with everybody and provide as much flexibility as possible. It is very frustrating for people. Coming into my fourth semester as Provost, our ability to be resilient and responsive has been amazing and I love being Provost here. I know people are going to feel frustrated. We are planning with as much knowledge as possible, and then we just have to be flexible moving forward.

As far as I know all the tenure/tenure-track hiring is moving forward. We are putting a call out for people to adjust their three-year plan and add a new year. We want to use the themes we developed. I may push for some cluster hires, particularly in support of Ethnic Studies. Without this, I'm not convinced we are going to get enough people to meet the initiative. Part of that conversation could involve continuing the conversation about joint hires we started at the last Senate meeting. There might be better ways to do that through affiliation.

The Honors Taskforce came up with a really cool name. This sounds like a really cool program. Lots of conversation and multiple sets of ideas. I would like to come and talk to this body about some of the conversation that has gone on. I have tried to keep the administrators out of this and let the faculty, staff, and students handle this. There are lots of ideas and they sound really doable to me.

I've decided to continue the Public Voices Fellowship. It has been wonderful to see so many people flourish this year out of that space. There were 40-50 newspaper articles, opinion pieces on all kinds of things our faculty are involved in. We also talked about getting some staff voices into that group and I'm going to make a three-year commitment.

The Coache Survey could be launched again next year and has to include lecturer faculty. I think a lot came out of it. It certainly was a set of guideposts for me to understand people's positions vis-à-vis leadership on the campus. I think it would be valuable to do this again. I will be talking to the Coache folks, but we could decide that maybe we've had a lot of surveys and we are done for now.

We have gotten into some great conversations about the intersection of SJSU and the City of San José. There is a lot of energy for San José State University to be more deeply involved in city operations. This goes to the accessibility conversation and so forth. I can see lots of intersection for faculty in their research, outreach, and their teaching. We even had conversations about some businesses that would be interested in hosting programs from SJSU, which would be pretty cool for students looking for internships.

Chair Mathur made a motion to extend the meeting for 10 to 15 minutes to hear reports from the rest of the Administrators and the AS President. The motion was seconded and approved.

Questions:

Q: I&SA is dealing with a referral from our student Senators for CR/NC for Spring 2021. What has come up is a lack of a consistent message from the administration. We have members of the administration who are in favor of CR/NC and members of the administration that are not in favor of CR/NC. This is really hard for I&SA to make an informed decision when the administration is not giving a consistent message to our students and our faculty. I would like to ask that the administrators have a conversation and send me [Chair Sullivan-Green] a message for I&SA. Students are also complaining that we are not communicating effectively with them. We need to consider different methods of messaging students.

A: [Provost] I'm not sure what "the Administration" means? We are not told what opinions to have as part of the cabinet. Here is my view. At the end of the day the President is the one that signs the policy. We passed a policy and should go with what we passed.

A: [President] We don't tell people what to say. I'm glad people are exploring different ideas. I'm onboard with the Provost on this. I haven't changed my view. There seems to be some confusion. The Chancellor's Office didn't like our conversion of "WU" to "W." It was never about C/NC.

A: [Day] I met with students this morning. Speaking to your concern, it is difficult to find the best way. We need to give students different ways of thinking about this moving forward.

C: It is very difficult when some administrators say yes, and some say no. This is making it extremely difficult for I&SA. I think we are seeing a pattern here related to the pandemic and grades. The question is when will it stop?

A: [Provost] It is okay for someone to disagree. The final word rests with the President of the university. You either pass a policy or don't. Push it forward and let it be debated.

A: [President] These are real challenges for students and I appreciate AS President Delgado's comments. We can work on those issues while still having some consistency in the grading policy. It is not either or. This is certainly an approach we are open to. We are hoping to get some additional dollars from Sacramento fully funding the Graduation Initiative, funds from the COVID Relief Package, and funds from the CARES Act to help us address this problem. The more we can look at the issue, define it, and look at very specific possible solutions to ensure our students have every chance to be successful the better it is for all of us. A lot of this comes up in our cabinet conversations and is why people are landing in different places. It is all coming from the right place, which is to ensure our students are supported and succeed. That is why different views are not a bad thing. They help us learn more.

A: [Provost] If I&SA is under a lot of pressure, put something forward if you have something. However, I think what we have already put forward is what is going to work best for Spring 2021.

A: [CDO] I'm somebody in the cabinet who has disagreed. It is true none of us are told what to say or do and we are not threatened. However, I think the data the Provost has presented was not what any of us expected. It contributed to some understanding that we are not together as a cabinet or leadership or this issue, I think that is true. We are strong because we able to discuss, debate and to advocate. That is all part of leadership.

C: I do want to support Senator Sullivan-Green's concern. When I had a chance to visit I&SA it wasn't just that they were having debate, some really negative things were said by some of the administrators about faculty. In addition, faculty were saying some negative things about students. Shared governance is really important, but people are making these all or nothing statements about groups on the campus such as "all faculty are like this" or "all students are like that." We need to move away from this. This is the challenge Senator Sullivan-Green is having in I&SA.

C: This is not only about the grades themselves, but also the anxiety that students have about their grades. One reason to change CR/NC to reduce anxiety that students are having.

C: Listening to this, I'm thinking about some of the passionate statements we have heard from students at the meetings and it isn't really about grading, it is about something else. It is that something else we really aren't able to fix with the grading policy. Maybe there is a need to have a greater conversation regarding the two different things. I think that is important. I like what the Provost said. We already have a policy. It was passed and it needs to be enforced. I understand the dilemma you are facing. I recommend addressing the fact that there are other issues here. I'm not sure how you can do that, but maybe bringing President Papazian, VP Day, Deanna Gonzalez, and Kathleen Wong(Lau) to your meeting to discuss it with I&SA would help .

C: I feel like people are trying to make decisions from their emotions as opposed to the reality and facts and looking at the impact and workload of the people having to do it. Bringing these issues up is not well received in I&SA, because people are passionate and reacting with emotion while under stress. It is very difficult to manage and try to get members to remember that we need to make decisions based on evidence as opposed to the emotional side of things.

C: I appreciate that. I am sorry people are creating these kind of binary conversations. I will say there is no right. There are decisions that have effects. Looking at those effects, we have to decide which are the best moving forward. The wraparound services and support are the bigger issues here. We are challenged by the \$92 million budget hole that we haven't completely filled yet. We are short \$8 million or so. We are not in a place where we can say, "Great, here is a \$5 million solution to hire counselors." We know it is almost impossible to hire counselors. Even when you have the money it is a very hard thing to do. There is a lot of complexity. I will say, if we use spring, 10% of the grades were converted to CR/NC. Of that 10%, some people messed themselves up GPA-wise. To Zobeida's argument, which I agree with wholeheartedly, grades create anxiety but does changing grades ease so much of the anxiety that all the other things become unimportant? I doubt it. I think if I had seen different data I would have had a different opinion on this. Also, the faculty that do the work and the grading had some strong opinions on this. At some level we have to respect the faculty in the classes. That is a non-answer, but we will have to field the repercussions of any decision.

C: I agree and we need to have a much larger discussion at a later date.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on February 23, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on March 2, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 8, 2021.

Executive Committee Minutes
February 22, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

Absent: Papazian

1. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of February 22, 2021 as amended by Senator Marachi to include Sofia Moede as a staff-at-large member on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAPC).
2. A motion was made to approve the Senate Calendar of 2021-2022, the Appointment Calendar of 2021, and the Election Calendar of 2022. The motion was seconded. The committee voted and the motion passed (14-0-0).
3. **Policy Committee Updates:**
 - a. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

C&R will not be bringing any resolutions to the Senate for the March 1, 2021 meeting. C&R is working on the Accessibility policy and the General Education (GE) Guidelines. C&R will be reviewing the Doctoral program in Occupational Therapy today and continuing the review of feedback they received on GE (over 25 pages of feedback).
 - b. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

O&G is working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution regarding Native American students, staff, and faculty for the March 1, 2021 Senate Meeting. O&G will be asking for a taskforce to investigate the number of Native Americans in these groups in more detail, because it is difficult to pinpoint the exact number due to classification issues. O&G will also be having a visit from the University Library Board (ULB) today to discuss the reasons for a proposed expansion of the ULB membership.

Questions:

Q: Have you seen the data that Institutional Research has done that pulls apart more than one race to help identify Native American students on campus?

A: We did discuss this in committee last week. Soma de Bourbon is a committee member and she pointed out last week that the numbers are not showing all the Native Americans.

C: That is 100% true. What we did was back into the data and what we found is that there are 20 official Native Americans and almost 800 that are of more than one race on campus. The Provost will find the report and send that data on to O&G.

C: Appreciate that those numbers are being pulled together. The numbers are not consistently pulled through on the campus for other assessments. It is something that needs to happen. This is one of the gaps in equity on campus.

The CDO spent two years trying to get the Chancellor's Office to have this information available on the dashboards. It is now available on some, but not all of the dashboards.

C: If you want, I can give you a quick look at the data now. We are declining in numbers from a high of 1,253 Native American students across groups in 2014 to 765 in 2019. We are trying to figure out how to report this through Institutional Research so that we still have the official report that we need to have for the CSU, but also show the actual numbers for our campus. We might be able to add Fall 2020 data.

C: The equity gap for time to graduation as well as matriculation is greater for Southeast Asian Frosh than it is for Latinx and Black Frosh, but this is not so for transfer students. For transfer students, Southeast Asian students did better than Latinx and Black students. When you are looking at the Graduation Initiative 2025, there is no focus on APIs at all even though we know we have a huge chunk of our population on campus who is struggling with the equity gap. They are hidden by the performance of Chinese and South Asian students. In some categories they are even higher than White students. Southeast Asian students are the majority of our Asian American students on campus, but they are largely invisible on campus.

C: I guarantee most people don't know that. Cultural stereotyping has to do with this as well.

C: There is a lot of work to be done as far as awareness.

C: We are a very different looking campus than any other campus in the CSU. These type of graphs would be very helpful. This is why we are hiring in IESA. We will be getting that information online soon. This will also give faculty the opportunity to do research on our community.

C: It is also an opportunity to see what structural supports are needed on our campus.

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

I&SA is focusing on two things, credit/no credit and grade forgiveness. We have a referral to get it straightened out, because Peoplesoft is not handling it properly. We have also discovered that grade forgiveness affects credit/no credit as we are dealing with these things. For example, do credit/no credit classes count toward grade forgiveness units or the grade averaging units, because they don't count towards the GPA. I&SA may not have anything for the Senate at the March 1, 2021 meeting even though we were hoping to bring something forward. This would mean we could end up in a situation where a resolution would come for a final reading at our April meeting.

Questions:

Q: Am I correct that we have two full Senate meetings in March 2021?

A: Yes, March 1 and March 22, 2021.

A: Maybe I&SA could bring it to the March 22, 2021 meeting. We will be soliciting feedback in some sort of structured way from students.

d. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS is continuing to work on RTP reform and the Lecturer policy. Today we will be looking at department RTP guidelines as well as public health guidelines, which tie into RTP reform because public health guidelines are infused with discussion of the scholarship of engagement. There are two prongs to RTP reform that we have been looking at. One prong is trying to do something to infuse equity language into the policy. We focused initially on the 'service to students' prong, because that language was inadvertently deleted from the 2015 policy. The second prong is the scholarship of engagement language. For our meeting last week, we invited Jamal Williams and Patience Bryant. We had a robust conversation. The deeper we got into the meeting, the more we realized this was a much bigger issue than the small amendment we were proposing as the Provost told us at the last Senate meeting. PS believes we are headed is not for a small amendment this year on the service component, but a Sense of the Senate Resolution asking the Senate to endorse a year-long reform effort for next year to infuse equity language into multiple parts of the RTP policy. We will discuss this more today and lay out a series of steps and consultations and so forth aimed at a longer term effort. As for the scholarship of engagement, we are planning to bring that resolution for a first reading at the March 1, 2021 Senate meeting. We've gotten extensive feedback on the lecturer policy. There has been a difference of opinion on the use of honorific titles. Joanne Wright pointed out that many of the titles are not in the contract and they should not be used if they are not in the contract. We are suggesting one new honorific title, if the administration accepts it, of **Senior Lecturer**. We are working on a compromise there. There was language introducing the RTP policy in 2015 having to do with documents inserted into a faculty member's dossier without their permission for purposes of evaluation. The contract does permit this. Faculty Affairs had the authority to screen the documents inserted and then the faculty member had the opportunity to give a rebuttal. We cut and pasted that section from the RTP policy into the Lecturer policy. Joanne Wright is very uncomfortable with this. That leaves PS in an awkward place. Do we take the language out or revise it in some way? If we do that then we have another problem on our hands. How do we explain to lecturer faculty that they can't have the same protections that tenure/tenure-track faculty have in their evaluations? We are between a rock and a hard place here. PS wanted to put you all on notice of this.

Questions:

Q: Did Joanne Wright say why she was uncomfortable with this and is it because the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) permits it?

A: I would rather share her comments with you directly than try to tell you myself. It does have to do with a couple of terms that are also legal terms. In other words, they might be viewed one way to the average person, but to a legal professional they can be viewed another way. I think one of the terms was "inflammatory."

A: We thought it was important for our lecturer faculty to see that we thought they were important enough to have the same protections as our tenure/tenure-track faculty.

C: I do believe that PS knows my views on this. We should not be treating our Lecturers as second class citizens and should be providing them the same kind of protections as our tenure/tenure-track faculty. We should be very careful of just moving in this legalistic direction and think of what is ethical and the right thing to do for people who are very important contributors and stakeholders on our campus.

C: I agree. If it is a matter of changing the language then it should be changed for tenure/tenure-track as well.

C: We should move away from language in the CBA. The CBA is the minimal language.

C: It is difficult for people to understand the interaction of the CBA and policy. There is one philosophy that says if the CBA doesn't say it, then university policy can't either. Then there is a different philosophy that says if the CBA doesn't say you can't do it then you can do it. It is clear there has been a change in philosophy over the last 10 years at SJSU in how to apply the CBA. This is a change that I think is kind of destructive in the long run.

C: Inclusivity is something this campus is supposed to value and this speaks to that. These protections are important and largely symbolic in our culture of inclusivity.

The odds are pretty good that the Lecturer policy would probably come as another 1st reading for the March 1, 2021 meeting, or it may not come until the March 22, 2021 Senate meeting.

4. Updates from the Administrators, CSU Statewide Senator, AS President:

a. From the AS President:

AS has a new virtual book reading program. About 40 or more students have expressed an interest in it. When we move back on campus it will be in the AS House.

AS has been hosting virtual events as part of Black History Month.

AS Elections are open. There is a virtual election application on their website. If you know any students interested in running let the AS President know.

Transportation Solutions now has the Smart Pass 2021.

The AS Marketing Team created a, "where do AS fees go" flyer that gives a breakdown of where the fees go.

AS received their final occupancy permit by the Fire Marshall and state and can now move back into the AS House.

Questions:

Q: What is the book you are reading?

A: I don't really know, but once I find out I'll let you know.

C: I'm in a book club and our book is ***Four Hundred Souls*** which is really an amazing book. It is a community history of African-Americans from 1619-2019. I would highly recommend it.

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

The good news is that we have an under 1% positive COVID rate out of 900 students returning to the residence halls. As we move forward the challenges are that we are going to have some very strict controls in the residence halls. This can lead to feelings of isolation. This means we may have to have some difficult conversations with students and some could end up with the revocation of licensing agreements i.e. being removed from the residence hall. When this happens, all of the sudden people become very sympathetic. What I would say to all of us is it is a more difficult conversation to tell a parent why their child is sick. I'm putting it out there for you to be aware of when you hear stories of housing being unfair. We have to keep in mind that we are a Hispanic serving institution and some of these populations have been disproportionately hit by COVID. These students will be going home on the weekends and breaks and that can have a lot of impact. We are going to have to be more serious than we have ever been before and diligent in sticking to our rules. Athletics has had even more challenges, but they have handled it very well. We remain a very safe campus at this point.

Questions:

Q: Thank you. You are the first person to speak to the impact of COVID on specific groups and that death is a part of that. I appreciate that. Of those 900 students, what is the racial/ethnic breakdown as well as national/international?

A: I need to check. Last time I checked was last semester and it was close to what our student population looks like. There were more Latinx students than Asian students. I apologize I can't pull it up at the moment. As we are talking, I'll continue to look for it and send it to you. I think the number of Black students was close or outpaced the Black student population, because we know 50% of those students are coming from Southern California so that makes some sense. The student athlete population would push that number a little bit. What it means is that the students living in the residence halls match our student population. There is a very real dynamic associated with wanting to keep our students safe and also wanting to ensure the communities they return to stay safe as well.

Q: As greater numbers of students return to campus and greater controls get put into place, does violation of these controls result in revocation of license agreements?

A: Yes, what I would say is we will probably see a tightening this spring and then we are anticipating a larger number of students coming back in the fall with the potential for more incidents. You don't go from violation to automatic revocation. You get a warning, then probation, and then revocation. What I think we are going to see is that a lot of folks think they should get probation again when they get revocation. This is a very difficult thing. The reality is if we are going to keep our residences safe we are not going to be able to do some of the things we used to in residence halls. In that kind of environment, we don't have a margin for error. There will be a line where we will say because of the serious choices you have made, you have also chosen not to be a member of our residence community.

c. From the Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs:

Chair Mathur announced that the Provost had to leave early today and she had forgotten to move him up in the rotation. The Provost made the following comments before leaving.

That's okay Chair Mathur. I only had one thing I wanted to say, which is to mention the referral I've made to the O&G Committee to dissolve the University Sabbatical Committee. I could talk more about that and what is going on there. It could be helpful for us to redistribute sabbatical dollars around campus. I asked around a few campuses and not everyone has a University Sabbatical Committee. Many have department sabbatical committees. The truth is as you get farther away from the department, it becomes harder to dissect the intellectual work and this is a disadvantage to some colleges. For example, last year one college got 100% of their sabbaticals, and another college only got 33%. It is very hard to rank them at the university level. The colleges and the deans can do a better job of understanding what they have. This would mean redistributing the total sabbaticals. Long term we need to figure out how to invest more in sabbaticals anyway. This might produce more equity. My request is to get rid of the University Sabbatical Committee and allow the colleges to control this.

C: In my college I've often been astounded by the amount of work we do to rank the proposals that seems to be completely ignored at the University level.

A: Again, I don't think it is their fault, it is really hard to read these against each other. It is also the writing. At the end of the day, I don't see this adding value to the University. I talked to the President and she said she doesn't need to be involved in Sabbaticals. The bigger concern is will people be concerned if we get rid of this level.

d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

Notifications have been sent out to people to secure their acceptance on the campus Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Once those are received, the President will send out appointment letters.

The biggest project we are working on this semester is with the College of Health and Human Sciences. We are looking at dismantling racism within the health sciences and this is being led by Michelle Hampton who is a faculty fellow and being supported by the CDO. We are working with CSU East Bay and three other universities. We are now working with seven fellows from within the college and are gearing up for a half day summit on April 7, 2021 from 9 a.m. to noon. We are putting together a much longer asynchronous summer institute which will have a synchronous kickoff as well as a campus based course similar to the way a course was put together for online teaching for our faculty. We are looking at a collaboration with five other campuses with SJSU being the lead campus. We are involving all of the departments but two—aviation and recreation management, because they don't have the same curricular considerations. That is pretty exciting. Our office will be staffing a lot of the logistics for the first summit.

We received a letter from the Staff Council asking the President and CDO to ensure that the Staff Council and staff leaders are integrated into our racial equity work particularly around systemic racism and Black Lives Matter.

The CDO was invited by the Family Advisory Board to speak with them about what we do on the Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion as well as what some of our top concerns are on campus as related to racism. That meeting went well. There were some pretty hard questions around policing and the treatment of Black faculty and staff on campus, and what efforts we are making to work with families about their concerns for their children/students on campus.

The CDO is working with the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI), Mohamed Abousalem, to frame most of their work within a racial equity framework. We are trying very hard to provide materials and guidance to help them redesign some of the things they are doing so that faculty feel that Research and Innovation is accessible and there isn't gatekeeping and other things going on. That is a long term project.

We are finding that a lot of the exclusionary behavior that occurs gets very complicated when in a virtual environment. By the same token, there is a lot of evidence that can be captured, such as pictures or chat and other information that can be downloaded.

The CDO received a lot of comments in the last week regarding the memo sent out by her office regarding anti-Asian violence in the community. Many Asian students are not allowing their elderly parents to go out by themselves any longer. Even the CDO won't allow her parents out alone. The CDO is also not running by herself in the mornings any longer. A few of her colleagues on other campus have expressed the same fears. Chair Mathur expressed her

gratitude on behalf of the Academic Senate and many of her colleagues at SJSU to the CDO for the message she sent out and acknowledged that the faculty stand in solidarity with the CDO on this issue.

e. From the CSU Statewide Representative:

At the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) we have been talking quite a bit about the status of lecturers and there are two different projects. One project has to do with representation in terms of dedicated seats on the ASCSU for lecturers only. There is some discussion about the use of the term **contingent faculty**. This goes back to what Ken Peter, the Chair of the PS Committee, was talking about earlier and the language in the CBA. One of the terms that is being thrown around is **not tenure/tenure-track**. I warned against this particular title because it is a little bit like **not White**. Defining oneself by what one is not is never a good idea.

All of the other issues being addressed in the ASCSU are for faculty in general. One of the big things that is being talked about is faculty burnout, morale, and angst regarding the face-to-face return to instruction in the fall with what people continue to feel is very little information about vaccinations and safety measures. It doesn't mean we are not getting any information, it just means it is different at every campus and people are concerned about it. There is a move to request the Chancellor's Office issue systemwide guidelines on repopulation taking into consideration there are many unknowns and that there are different county and department guidelines. People believe that the Chancellor's Office ought to be able to get those counties to give them information. The other area has to do with division of labor, stresses around caretaking, and a relevant discussion around the fact that many of our students are either parents or caretakers of siblings/parents and the need for the CSU to consider that parenting and caretaking is something that is being ignored or not being addressed systemically in terms of how COVID is affecting individuals.

Another issue is around sensibility around the lack of community reporting of faculty and staff who have passed away as a result of COVID. Since we have been sheltered, some campuses have been doing memorial announcements about people that have died. For instance, on our campus Buddy Butler. When we go back what will we say to people about them at that point? Some Senates do honor the people who have passed and do a photo and statement and invite their family members to attend by zoom and offer a moment of silence. Which might be a very good thing to do.

Another thing you might find interesting was the announcement at the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting about the person who will replace AVC Lauren Blanchard and their salary. It was announced that this person's salary would be \$350,000 with an additional \$6,000 monthly for housing. Given that we have been talking about lecturers there was talk about how there isn't even a

small amount given to faculty for their housing expenses. Right after that we had a report about Silicon Valley housing costs and that was part of why people were discussing that.

Lastly, there was some discussion about zoom meetings and some not so nice behavior in Chat. There was a report that there is among our ASCSU Senators some hostile attacks in terms of their communication in Chat. It isn't always private. There is some concern about what is going to happen with that. This sets the tone for how they engage with each other and there is gaslighting.

There were two memos sent out this morning. One was regarding the temporary suspension of a section of EO 1037, and the other was regarding the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). Basically, they decided that they didn't feel like there was a need for improvement in teacher preparation so they are going to ignore that particular recommendation.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for the update. It is good to see the CSU calling out the NCTQ. It has been an organization that has for years put out what they call research, but it is a really deeply flawed methodology and I'll send an email link to what I've found regarding their methodology.

f. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

Over the weekend we were working with the county to try and get SJSU as a vaccination site for Santa Clara County, but the county has decided not to use SJSU as one of their options. They are using the Fairgrounds and Levi Stadium. We are disappointed. We are still working with Kaiser to try and see if we can get them here. We are very disappointed. We thought we had a really good setup at the SPX and the 4th Street Parking Garage. We thought it was good because the east side of San José is woefully short of clinics. That is not going to work for right now as they county doesn't think they can appropriately staff the site..

Questions:

Q: Thanks for sending out the Clery report. I've been hearing about additional reports of robberies on campus. Is there anything we should be doing?

A: There are a lot less people here and a lot less eyeballs to see and watch things. Doors continue to be propped open. We went to everyone having a Tower ID Card to get into a building for this reason. However, I have a video of a gentlemen walking the halls of the Clark Building at 3 a.m. on a Sunday, so how did he get in? My team is investigating this. He attempted to break into a number of offices. The offices he attempted to break into were odd. When you don't have people watching, that stuff happens. It is winter time and people are looking for shelter or to take things. Normally, we wouldn't see this, but we are now. It is worse on South Campus. No one was down there to

watch. It isn't less safe, it is just that people are not there to watch. We had an incident in Clark on the 5th floor where we weren't even sure if anything was missing because we moved people while they were working remotely and many have not even unpacked. We are doing our best. Don't let anyone tailgate behind you. Make sure the door shuts behind you before you leave.

Q: I happen to know that the Political Science Office was broken into and a computer was taken as well as some items from the mailroom right next to the Political Science Office. Do you know if there is any progress there?

A: I'm assuming this was reported to UPD right?

Q: I wasn't the one who discovered it. I'm assuming since it was announced at the department meeting that it was reported. I haven't heard anything further in terms of an investigation and whether there was any potential for identity theft?

A: If you can get me the date and time, I'll look into this.

C: It is my understanding that it was a cluster of offices and that it was reported.

C: In our case, we heard it first from UPD. It was strange since our admin's door was busted open and stuff taken from her office.

Q: On other campuses there have been announcements sent to faculty about where they can get vaccinations. Is SJSU planning something like this? I've been helped a lot by the CDO because she posts a lot of information, but I'm just wondering if SJSU is going to be posting any announcements?

C: I've heard other people say, "Why isn't SJSU posting announcements?"

A: Our county has been slow to tell us where to go and what the process is. Santa Clara County has also been limited in the amount of vaccines they have. Until next week, education won't even be in the vaccination space. When we know something for certain and can send it out we absolutely will.

C: Alameda is way ahead of many counties. They are already vaccinating Tier 1B. Santa Clara County is so disorganized. It is really frustrating.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

These minutes were taken on February 22, 2021 by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, and transcribed on March 3, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on March 5, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 8, 2021.

Executive Committee Minutes
March 8, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Wong(Lau), Delgadillo, Papazian
Absent: None

1. From the Chair:

The Chair announced it was International Women's Day and noted that the theme for this year is Choose to Challenge, something that is aligned with our Strategic Plan.

The University Council on Accessibility and Compliance is being re-formed. A call was sent out for faculty nominees. There were 18 applications for three seats. There is lots of interest in this committee which is great. Those applications have been forwarded to Cindy Marota and Deanna Fassett.

Kudos to University Personnel, the Advancement team, Lisa Millora, and President Papazian on the staff awards. Great event. Special shout-out to Erlinda Yanez who won the Staff of the Year Award. Some of you may remember Erlinda's daughter, Jade Sanders, worked in the Senate Office for a couple years. Her other daughter, Ebony, was Chair Mathur's student in ChAD. Erlinda has done an amazing job raising two daughters.

We are conducting a Senate election in the College of Business and that will run through the end of the week. All election results will be announced to the Senate at the March 22, 2021 meeting. There is almost a full Senate for next year when Vice Chair McKee takes over.

Before we move to the consent calendar, there is a need for a new staff member on the Accreditation Review Committee (ARC). There was only one staff member who put her name forward and that was Sharon Willey. We did provide you a statement for informational purposes only. If there is any objection we can pull this off the consent agenda. President Papazian acknowledged the excellent work of Senior AVP Willey. There was no dissent.

Chair Mathur announced the Campus Master Planning group will be coming to our next Senate meeting for a brief presentation.

2. The Consent Agenda was approved (Executive Committee Agenda of March 8, 2021, Consent Calendar of March 8, 2021, Executive Committee minutes of February 15, 2021, Executive Committee minutes of February 25, 2021) (14-0-0).

3. President's Update:

President Papazian recognized International Women's Day and the importance of recognizing women of all backgrounds and nationalities and to consider the intersectional identities of women in our communities.

There are a number of initiatives going on. We are launching a Master's Facility planning process. It will be a year-long process. It involves looking at both academic and non-academic areas and our goals over the next decade. This process is co-chaired by VP Faas and Provost Del Casino. There is a lot of data and many, many stakeholders. We have several external consultants working with us on this. We will be having various surveys and townhalls, and other activities.

There will be a Townhall on Wednesday on the repopulation plan. This is a day-to-day process. Every day we wake up and there are new guidelines. We expect another update no later than April 1, 2021, but probably some guidance before that. We have been working hard with VP Day's Office, Traci Ferdolage, the Provost, University Personnel, on everything that must go into this. We will try and anticipate as much as possible where we will be in the Fall. As we move into the Summer things are changing and nobody knows exactly where we will be. It is a moving target. We hope this moves in the right direction. It seems to be, but time will tell. There are things like what will the density look like, what does the signage need to look like, air flow requirements, many considerations. We will be sharing this with the President's leadership council in the next few weeks. We will be sharing as much as we can also in the Townhalls. We already have over 300 people signed up for Wednesday's Townhall.

Regarding commencement, it is tough for us to consider a drive through like some other campuses, such as CSU East Bay, due to our downtown location and our city streets that lead to interstates. We can't block access to interstates on public streets. It is really hard to compare one institution to another. An in person ceremony probably won't be feasible for May 2021, but students really want to celebrate with their families. We will probably do a virtual event in May, and then hopefully have them come back for an in person event in September. What we are looking at is a calendar over the course of this full year. We hope to do something in August 2021 for last year's graduating class, then in September 2021 for this year's graduating class. By December 2021, we hope to pickup with Fall as normal. We will put together a detailed Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) and Calendar for the New Year.

We have launched the Campus Council on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CCDEI). CDO Wong(Lau) is one of the co-chairs. There is much work to do. This is a very important committee that will address some important issues for our campus.

We are in the planning stages of a Racial, Equity, and Justice Symposium. This will be led by Jahmal Williams and working with VP Day, Patience Bryant, Provost Del Casino, and Lisa Millora. We hope to create an annual space to address these kind of issues. This is in the early stages right now, but doing some really good work.

We are hopeful that the House of Representatives will pass the American Rescue Plan and that will make it to the President's desk. We know that the aid that is in there with the Child Credits, and the direct economic support will have a tremendous impact on communities and our students. There should also be some good support

for the university as well. The numbers the President has seen are \$88 million to SJSU. Half of that will go directly to students as student aid like the \$14 million in the first aid package. This would mean going from \$14 million to \$44 million in aid to students. This is very important for our students. The other \$44 million allows us to continue to invest in health and safety, repopulation efforts, and to do multiple commencements since that is something that was impacted by COVID-19.

The Accessible Technology Initiative coming up from the Chancellor's Office is really important and we will be putting together a team to implement this. Julia Curry sent this out to the senate via email. This will ensure that universal design is there and really create that support for everyone at the university.

The President had a really frank conversation with the AS Board. This is the first of multiple conversations she will have with the board. The President and her team are engaging with students and making sure they hear them and come up with solutions and what the next steps should be. The President and her cabinet have discussed this as well. The President thanked the AS Chair and the AS Board.

Questions:

Q: When you are talking about the drive through for commencement and our campus not being a good venue I understand that, but there may be other venues. I know that Levi Stadium is being used for vaccinations, but what about the drive-in movie theatre in South San José. They have the screens there, etc. Has this been considered, because it would help a local business as well?

A: [VP Faas] I didn't realize it was still open. We will take a look at it.

[President] We are open to any ideas.

Q: You mentioned repopulation, one of the anxieties that chairs are feeling is around FTES. For example, in my case, we are being given a little incentive to go to in person teaching by dropping the caps on some of our classes because the rooms aren't big enough. The problem is that we can lose some FTES by dropping caps. FTES being our currency and this causes some anxiety. Then I'm trying to schedule for a lot of in person classes for next semester. I don't know why, maybe I'm being overly confident. I feel things are moving in a direction where we can have a significant number of in person classes next semester. However, I know a lot of other departments in my college are not so optimistic and there is added anxiety as to what if students choose other classes because they don't want to go in person. If they don't choose our classes, then are we punished for having done the gamble of trying to have in person classes next semester? I'm just bringing this up as a preview to what could come up in the Townhall meeting.

A: [Provost] Couple of things, this is where the potential for hybrid works. If you had 50% that were asynchronous you wouldn't lose any FTES, because you'd have half working one day and half working the next day while they are working asynchronously. The second thing I'd say is, students are telling us they want diversification of all things. Thalia surveyed the University Statistics course. Only 8% of students said they wanted it to be in person in the Fall 2021. Forty-five percent said they wanted hybrid and 47% said they wanted an online course. It is differential depending on where they are in the curriculum. Ask your colleagues to talk to the

students about what they want and have conversations about how to organize the curriculum. If you go with your own perceptions without asking the students, we are going to have a mismatch. I've been in a small department before and these kind of data points are critical. I wouldn't necessarily take it as an incentive to go face-to-face to have less students. I would probably have a conversation with my colleagues on how you can meet your students in the right place. The other thing is that we are going to have to tackle reorganizing access to classrooms for classes that are face-to-face. VP Faas and I have talked and VP Faas has some in roads with the Convention Center and maybe we can teach some of our classes there, because we are going to run into ceilings on size relative to physical distancing. That is brand new information we just heard today that we might have access to the Convention Center. The question is what does that look like and would people be willing to teach in the Convention Center? That could change the game quite a bit. If we are at 50% and 6 feet, but we have lots of 50 person classes, we could offer them there. We might even be able to do some larger classes if we are in yellow, because there is no cap on the gathering size of lectures. That would change things as well. The last thing I'll say is I'm landing more on the optimistic side as well. This time last year I was very pessimistic. These are some of the things going on. With these new opportunities, we may have to rethink some of the ways we were going to do things.

Q: If I understood correctly there may be an opportunity for students to actually walk the stage in September, is that correct?

A: [President] This is what we are looking into. We would like to create that possibility if we can. As soon as we know for sure we will share that information. We hope to have a virtual event in May 2021, and then students can come back and actually walk the stage in September 2021.

Q: If that does happen, will that option be offered to 2020 graduates as well?

A: [President] We are thinking of trying to have Commencement for the 2020 graduates in August 2021 if possible, and then Commencement for the 2021 graduates in September. We are not yet sure about August 2021. We have to do this in CEFCU stadium, because the Event Center won't be big enough. We have a new video screen that is a lot like what is at Levi Stadium and is really high quality. That is where commencement would take place.

Q: Seeing that other campuses are planning some initiatives around in-person commencement, will the university will be giving out any incentives to graduates this May 2021? I keep hearing comments and concerns from students calling commencement meaningless, or not as special since we've been online for a year.

A: [President] I know that Brian Bates and his team are looking at this. Please send any feedback you get from students to Brian so his team can follow-up. It is a special event and anything we can do is important. VP Day will follow-up on this with Brian as well.

Q: President Papazian I'm sure you are aware there has been this string of ugly headlines in the Mercury News and elsewhere about the sexual misconduct allegations in the Athletics Division. I know we can't really talk about the allegations once it goes into a lawsuit situation. One aspect of the story that disturbed me as well as the sexual misconduct is allegations that the whistleblower was mistreated or

disciplined. I don't know the truth to that and whether or not it really happened, but regardless of whether or not it has created a perception on this campus that whistleblowers may not be protected. Without getting into specifics of that incident is there anything that can be done to encourage people to come forward, as opposed to discouraging them, when they have complaints or concerns to make them feel their advice is welcome when they see something that should be changed?

A: [President] I appreciate the comment and the sensitivity around what can and can't be said. There is a lot we can't say. Whistleblowers and people coming forward are critical to ensuring we continue to find avenues for people to express themselves. The last place we want to be is where this is being closed down. I can assure you people are being protected. There are all kinds of rules and regulations around it. There are state laws and system-wide laws and we are following all of them very carefully. You can be sure that we are following all the guidance that is there for us. First, we believe in it. We believe it is important, because truth comes from all kinds of places. What you hear in the newspaper is what you hear in the newspaper, and I'm not going to speak to that. What I can say is that we are committed to those processes. We work closely with the Chancellor's Office on this. All the guidelines and protections are in place and that's our commitment.

Q: You may persuade me, but can you say the same thing to the whole campus so that everybody knows that their input is welcome and desired?

A: Yes, and their input is encouraged. I absolutely can without any problem. Let me talk to Joanne Wright and Kathy Wong(Lau) about what we can do.

C: [CDO Wong(Lau)] I'd like to speak to a team of people who are putting together a formal bias response protocol that we are presenting to the campus from the Bias Response Team (BRT). The reason we are doing this is because we know that across the county 85% of the things that get reported to any Title IX Office or other types of offices do not meet the minimum criteria for launching an investigation. Either the violation is not severe enough or people don't want to come forward and we have reluctant witnesses. All of these things happen that may not allow us to have a full blown investigation. That doesn't mean that things don't need to be done. Part of the BRT work is to educate the campus. Just because there wasn't a Title IX investigation doesn't mean things weren't done behind the scenes. These things are guided by Executive Orders, state rules and regulations, as well as federal prohibitions against retaliation. Part of the concern we have when working on these cases is that I have to remind the person that no matter what happens, the minute it looks like there was retaliation we are forced to open an investigation to see if there was retaliation. We take this very seriously. The CSU has struggled to codify these practices. I just wanted to let you know there is a team on campus trying to make sure we adhere to all the federal and state standards as well as system standards on how to address these issues. Part of the language we use is directly from the Whistleblower law and anti-retaliation language.

C: It sounds to me like we are doing a great job of adhering to the laws, but I'm talking about a cultural shift so the campus as a whole feels more comfortable coming forward.

A: [President] I appreciate the point. So much of this gets done behind the scenes. We will take your question and Kathy and I and the rest of the team will discuss how we can share this with the campus community in a way that is helpful to the campus community. Thank you very much for this.

A: [CDO] Just so you know, some of us are being asked to present at the Chancellor's Office because they don't have protocols themselves.

Q: Because it is public record in the Mercury now, I'm concerned about ongoing student protection on the athletics teams and how the athletes are being supported through this. Are there protocols being put into place so that students, athletes in particular, feel comfortable in case anything in the future should happen?

A: [President] You have to remember this took place in 2008. In 2008, we did not have the extensive protocols as well as a Title IX Coordinator in place like we have today. The protocols are the same for all students and all laws are followed.

4. The Executive Committee reviewed and discussed nominees for the Dean of the University Library Search Committee. Recommendations were made to the Provost.
5. University Updates:
 - a. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):
The VPAF is busy working on the budget and waiting to see what funds we get from the CARES Act.

The VPAF and his team are working on plans for reopening the campus and what must be done between now and Fall 2021. The focus is on reopening for Fall 2021. We are not trying to repopulate until then. In the meantime, the University Police Department (UPD) is working on trying to keep the buildings secure with the increase in burglaries. We continue to be a safe campus. The increase in burglaries is because there are no faculty and staff on campus right now, so there are no eyes on all the buildings. Doors have been manipulated and opened and we have caught this on camera and have made adjustments.

Questions:

Q: Is any of the money being given for infrastructure projects going to be given to campuses?

A: [VPAF] If the Chancellor's Office does receive money from the state for infrastructure projects, they will look at all the campus projects and select from there. We are not sure what the criteria will be right now. However, even if we receive funds it will be nowhere near the \$500 million we need for infrastructure projects on campus.

C: [President] I can say that the state has taken in more money than expected. We asked for more one-time funds. We will get the \$299 million back in recurring funds. We are hopeful that we will get an additional \$145 million. Please continue to make the case with your legislators. The \$145 million is focused on the Graduation Initiative.

Q: Is there any update on getting Kaiser vaccines at SJSU?

A: Kaiser doesn't have any of the vaccines yet.

- b. From the AS President:
AS is still waiting to have their budget signed by the President.

AS is excited about the AS Board nominees and their elections.

The Campus Community Garden project should be completed by the end of March 2021. They are working on finishing projects like the fence installation, etc.

Questions:

Q: Given the incidents that occurred at the last AS Board meeting are any steps being taken to prevent a repeat? Also, can you shed some light on how AS is working with no budget?

A: [AS President] I am not sure what the protocol is for next week. We need to check with the President. I am also not sure why our budget is still not signed.

A: [VP Day] I have a meeting with the AS President tomorrow. We will be discussing and putting some protocols in place.

A: [VP Faas] VP Day and I will be speaking later today about the AS Budget. I am not sure why it is not signed yet.

C: [President] I understand from the last meeting that AS received some kind of clearance with regard to the AS House?

A: [VP Faas] The Fire Marshal has cleared the AS House. We are repainting it right now and it is almost finished.

C: There need to be some protocols going forward for the AS Board meetings and the safety of the board members.

A: [AS President] The only thing I've heard is to switch to a Townhall format. The University is working with the AS Vice President on this.

A: [VP Day] Help and assistance will be provided in managing these meetings, but you have to remember that these are AS meetings. There are a list of things we can do if they are wanted.

C: [President] The protocols are not a lot different from what the Senate uses for its meetings. This just hasn't been the practice for the AS Board meetings.

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

We are wrapping up the Taskforce for Community Policing and Safety. They have some broad recommendations. Working with Edith Kinney has been amazing. The input from the faculty members on the taskforce has been invaluable. Their report with recommendations is being prepared and should be available after spring break. I will discuss the report with the Executive Committee after that.

We just finished family weekend. We had a Townhall meeting and most parents and students wanted to know what Fall 2021 was going to look like. The Provost was great. He talked about the delivery of courses. We also surveyed parents. There was lots of excitement about reopening and discussion about how students should be engaged.

Every two to three years, we do a National College Health Assessment. We will have this assessment this Spring. We will share information with the Executive Committee when the time comes. I know the committee has been concerned with students and mental health issues.

Questions:

C: The virtual guide that was sent out by Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) was very helpful.

A: Thanks. I will pass this feedback on.

d. From the CDO:

We have officially launched the CCDEI. There are two co-chairs; one faculty member and one staff member. There are seven student representatives including Senator Anoop Kaur. Senate Chair Mathur and Senator Sharmin Khan are also on the committee. This year we will spend time developing the committee members and because of the savings we have had by going virtual, we are able to send all members to NCORE this year. Normally this would cost \$2,500 per person but by going virtual this year, it is only \$300 per person. The first task of the committee is to setup subcommittees to handle the various issues.

CAPS and the CDO are in regular contact with each other. We are working on establishing a complaint forum. There is no Executive Order that directs us on what to do. Everyone is asking us what we are doing. We are in the process of setting up that protocol.

The CDO, Patience Bryant, and Jahmal Williams are creating a spreadsheet that lists the demands, activities, and requests asked of the administration. This way they can report on the progress being made on all of them.

Questions:

Q: Would the CCDEI be the committee to address the Education Advisory Board (EAB) Partnership? SJSU is not the focus, but SJSU does partner with the EAB. A number of questions have been raised about their use of data/analytics.

A: [CDO] I'm not sure the CCDEI is the best place to address this. The CCDEI has a bias response incident based focus. This doesn't mean we can't pass this on to the right person.

C: Regarding whistleblowers, I can't say how important protocols are. I urge the cabinet to be as transparent as possible.

A: Part of the problem has been that there were no protocols in the past. We want to be there for people, but many don't want to be involved. If the case is borderline it can be difficult. However, if there is retaliation we will open an investigation no matter what.

A: [President] It is important that we keep asking questions and reviewing feedback. It helps us understand how things are being heard.

A: [CDO] There are so many forms of bad behavior. We suggest certain people have certain conversations. These are hard conversations. We have advised lots of CEOs in the system on how to do that.

C: I have been victimized by many people on campus. I don't understand personally, although I understand intellectually, what is happening here. I have spent a lot of time last week trying to understand how people, our students, have experienced harassment and ended up in a legal grievance because it was not addressed or resolved on campus.

e. From the Provost:

We have the student honors numbers in. There are 10,751 President's/Dean's Scholars, which is up 7,365 students over last year. Something quite dramatic has happened. If you have credit/no credit classes you can't get honors, and if you have below a "C" grade you can't get honors. This shows students have done exceptionally well.

Tenure/Tenure-Track faculty hiring is ongoing. I have asked departments to submit their next three-year plans.

f. From the CSU Statewide Senator:

We have had two important memos sent around. One memo President Papazian eluded to was on the Accessible Technology Initiative. Another has to do with the Cal State Connect 2021 Conference in July.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:41 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on March 8, 2021 and transcribed on March 10, 2021. The minutes were reviewed and edited by Chair Mathur on March 10, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 15, 2021.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **March 22, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1803

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Appointment, Evaluation, And Range Elevation**
9 **For Lecturer Faculty**

10
11 **Rescinds:** S10-7

12
13 **Resolved:** That S10-7 be rescinded and replaced by the following policy effective as
14 soon as administratively practicable.

15
16 **Rationale:** In 2018 Professional Standards received two referrals noting several
17 provisions in this policy that were obsolete, and in response began an in-
18 depth review. The committee discussed the policy directly with the Senior
19 Associate Vice President for University Personnel, the CFA Lecturer
20 faculty Representative, and a representative of concerned Department
21 Chairs. The questions principally concerned the “range elevation” section
22 of the policy, which is a method under the Collective Bargaining
23 Agreement (CBA) whereby lecturer faculty with substantial experience
24 may apply to move up to a higher pay scale. The CBA generally leaves
25 the criteria to local campuses to determine, although recent arbitration
26 rulings have set some precedents that local policies must respect.

27
28 For example, the old policy contained one particularly notable confusion
29 that has led to numerous grievances. The discussion of terminal degree
30 requirements for lecturer faculty is handled under the “Range Elevation”
31 section of the old policy, although case law indicates that terminal degrees
32 should not be the principal qualification for a lecturer faculty to receive a
33 range elevation, particularly if not a required element of the lecturer’s
34 assignment. However, terminal degree requirements are not discussed
35 under the “Appointment” section of the policy, even though terminal
36 degrees are relevant to the initial appointment of Lecturer faculty. We
37 moved the discussion of terminal degrees out of the Range Elevation
38 section and into the Appointment section where it belonged.

39

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

50 As the committee reviewed S10-7, it found numerous passages which
51 were obsolete, abstruse, unnecessary, and in some cases, insulting to
52 lecturer faculty. For example, the preferred term is “lecturer faculty” since
53 this is parallel with the commonly used “tenure/tenure track faculty,” and it
54 calls attention to their status as *faculty*. This is the term we use. We also
55 have established a procedure for the Provost, in consultation with the
56 Professional Standards Committee, to create and revise honorific titles for
57 lecturer faculty that our university may use within the nomenclature
58 already established by the CBA. For example, we propose an honorific
59 title of “Senior Lecturer” for lecturer faculty with multi-year contracts and
60 six years of seniority.
61

62 The policy seemed to us to need a wholesale rewrite. We have attempted
63 to craft a policy that is less likely to become obsolete with each revision of
64 the Collective Bargaining Agreement, and which we hope will be more
65 intelligible for the average reader. We also modernized the numbering
66 system for ease of reference.
67

68 **Approved:** March 15, 2021

69 **Vote:** 11-0-0

70 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Monday, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quock,
71 Mahendra, Barrera
72

73 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

74 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
75
76

77 **Appointment, Evaluation, And Range Elevation**
78 **For Lecturer Faculty**

79
80 **1. Introduction**

81
82 **1.1. Purpose**

83
84 1.1.1. This policy covers the procedures for appointment,
85 reappointment, and evaluation (including range elevation) of Unit
86 3 faculty members serving a full-time or part-time Lecturer
87 appointment. This policy also establishes a procedure for creating
88 honorific titles that may be applied to lecturer faculty.

89
90 1.1.2. There are two valued professional career pathways for faculty at
91 SJSU. The appointment, evaluation, and promotion of
92 tenure/tenure track faculty are dealt with in other policies. This
93 policy concerns the appointment, evaluation, and range elevation
94 of lecturer faculty.

95
96 1.1.3. Lecturer appointments meet a variety of needs within the
97 University. Lecturer faculty are most typically appointed to
98 teaching roles. More rarely, lecturer faculty are appointed to
99 service and research roles.

100
101 1.1.4. All types of lecturer faculty appointments are distinct from
102 probationary (tenure-track) faculty appointments. Lecturer faculty
103 appointments do not guarantee or imply the right to tenure or the
104 eventuality of a tenure-track appointment, but qualified lecturer
105 faculty who apply for a tenure track appointment shall be given
106 fair consideration.

107
108 1.1.5. Evaluations for Unit 3 coaching faculty shall meet all standards of
109 the CBA and shall include an opportunity for peer input and
110 evaluation by appropriate administrators but are not otherwise
111 covered under this policy.

112
113 **1.2. Relationship to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)**

114
115 The procedures provided in this policy are consistent with the terms of
116 the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the
117 California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association

118 (CFA). To apply this policy requires frequent reference to the CBA,
119 which covers pay, length of appointment, and numerous other matters
120 that are closely related to the provisions of this policy.

121 1.3. Guidance

122
123 The University provides web-based resources of interest to lecturer
124 faculty, and lecturer faculty are also strongly encouraged to seek
125 guidance from their Department Chair for clarification of items covered
126 by this policy, as well as other University policies and department
127 practices.

128
129 1.4. Confidentiality

130
131 All deliberations in the appointment and evaluation process are to be
132 confidential. Confidentiality shall be maintained pursuant to applicable
133 policies (e.g. CBA Article 15.11) and law.

134
135 **2. Titles**

136
137 2.1 While the CBA distinguishes between temporary faculty and
138 probationary/tenured faculty, SJSU typically refers to all part-time and
139 full-time temporary instructional faculty as "Lecturer Faculty" (in all its
140 variants) and refers to all tenured or tenure-track faculty as "Professors"
141 (in all its variants,) with allowances for various specialized titles such as
142 Librarian and Counselor faculty.

143
144 2.2 SJSU maintains a list of honorific titles and variations of titles that are
145 appropriate for defined categories of lecturer faculty who meet certain
146 specified qualifications. These honorific titles are for informal and
147 descriptive use and do not replace any titles designated by the CBA, nor
148 do they expand privileges or subtract limitations associated with
149 categories of faculty defined by the CBA.

150
151 2.3 Personnel documents must use standard titles designated by the CBA.
152 Business cards, university websites, etc. may use titles from the
153 approved list.

154
155 2.4 Within the tradition described in 2.1, the list of honorific titles may be
156 expanded or revised by the Provost, in consultation with the
157 Professional Standards Committee. Creating honorific titles outside the

158 tradition described in 2.1 requires a policy recommendation of the
159 Academic Senate, signed by the President.

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

163 **3. Initial and Subsequent Appointments**

164 165 3.1. Appointment Letters and Timing

166
167 3.1.1. Offers of appointment are to be made in writing by the Dean or the
168 Provost on behalf of the President. Oral offers or offers made by
169 persons other than those listed in the previous sentence are neither
170 valid nor binding upon the University. Official notification of
171 appointment shall follow the requirements as outlined by the CBA
172 (12.2). The notification shall also state that the appointment
173 automatically expires as outlined by the CBA (12.4).
174

175
176 3.1.2. Generally, lecturer faculty appointments (both full- and part-
177 time) should be made sufficiently in advance of the beginning
178 of instruction to allow adequate time for course preparation
179 and the acquisition of appropriate texts and instructional
180 materials.
181

182 183 3.2. Nature of Work Assignments

184
185 The nature of the work performed by lecturer faculty—the proportions of
186 teaching, service, or research—is stated in the work assignment.
187 Historically, most lecturer faculty have been assigned primarily to teach,
188 but other configurations are possible. Lecturer faculty are not expected to
189 do work that is outside of their assignments. For example, lecturer faculty
190 whose work assignment does not include service cannot be required to do
191 service activities except those directly related to their teaching
192 assignment. They may, if willing, take on additional service assignments
193 and be compensated appropriately. Lecturer faculty may attend most
194 university, college, and department functions as a matter of professional
195 responsibility associated with their assignment, or otherwise on a
196 volunteer basis. Lecturer faculty may not be excluded from meetings
197 except when necessary for confidential or personnel matters.
198

199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239

3.3. Establishing the Appropriate Range at Appointment.

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

3.3.1. LA: Initial appointment at this range is for an entry-level lecturer showing promise as an educator. A candidate for this range would typically possess at least a Master's degree and/or equivalent specialized professional expertise or experience. Persons without a qualifying degree may be appointed in this range with approval from faculty affairs.

3.3.2. LB: Initial appointment at this range is for a person showing promise as an educator and/or scholar or practitioner. They will have the appropriate terminal degree, or a lower degree and additional specialized professional expertise and experience in the field that is deemed equivalent to the terminal degree.

3.3.3. LC: Initial appointment at this advanced range is for a person demonstrating notable achievements or contributions in the field as an educator and/or scholar or practitioner. They will have the appropriate terminal degree and substantial expertise and experience, or lower degree and advanced specialized professional expertise and experience that is deemed equivalent to the terminal degree. Appointment at this level implies the ability to teach advanced upper division and/or graduate courses, although such an assignment is not required of the appointment.

3.3.4. LD: Initial appointment at this highest range is for an established senior educator and/or scholar or practitioner. The candidate will have the appropriate terminal degree and advanced expertise and experience or a lower degree and recognition as a leader in the field with extensive specialized professional expertise and experience that is deemed equivalent to the terminal degree.

240 3.4. Careful Consideration for Reappointment

241
242 Lecturer faculty shall receive careful consideration in the appropriate
243 situations, as per the CBA (12.7). Chairs and Administrators should
244 consult UP Faculty Affairs/Employee Relations regarding the meaning of
245 “careful consideration” prior to making reappointment decisions for
246 lecturer faculty.
247

248 **4. Evaluation**

249
250 4.1. General Process

251
252 4.1.1. Notification. Lecturer faculty should be notified of evaluation criteria
253 and procedures as per the CBA 15.3. Decision makers should be
254 aware that the current CBA requires notification “no later than 14
255 days after the first day of instruction in the academic term.”
256

257 4.1.2. Purpose: The performance of lecturer faculty should be carefully
258 evaluated in order to provide students with the best instruction
259 possible and to assist in the careful consideration of lecturer faculty
260 for any future Lecturer or probationary positions for which they may
261 be candidates.
262

263 4.1.3. Multiple Assignments: lecturer faculty are to be evaluated
264 separately within each department for which they have an
265 assignment.
266

267 4.1.4. The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) shall be defined by and
268 include all material as outlined in the CBA (15.8).
269

270 4.1.5. Periodic Evaluation: The CBA (15.23) calls for periodic evaluation
271 of lecturer faculty which results in written statements to be placed in
272 the lecturer's Personnel Action File. The specifics of the periodic
273 evaluation are explained below.
274

275 4.1.6. Rebuttal: lecturer faculty shall be issued recommendations at each
276 level of review and have an opportunity for rebuttal as per CBA
277 (15.5).
278

279 4.2. Review Process

280

281 4.2.1. Frequency of Evaluations
282

283 4.2.1.1. Lecturer faculty holding three (3) year appointments
284 pursuant to Article 12 of the CBA, shall be evaluated at least
285 once during the term of their appointment (CBA 15.26).
286

287 4.2.1.2. Lecturer faculty appointed for two or more semesters,
288 regardless of a break in service, shall be evaluated in
289 accordance with the periodic evaluation procedure (CBA
290 15.23, 15.24).
291

292 4.2.1.3. Lecturer faculty appointed for one semester or less
293 shall be evaluated at the discretion of the Department Chair,
294 appropriate administrator, or the department. In addition, the
295 lecturer may request that an evaluation be performed (CBA
296 15.25).
297

298 4.2.1.4. Volunteer and visiting lecturer faculty: volunteer and
299 visiting lecturer faculty with an appointment of one academic
300 year or less need only be evaluated if the appropriate
301 Department Chair or the lecturer requests such evaluation.
302 Visiting faculty cannot be appointed for more than one year.
303

304 4.2.2. Role of Chairs and Committees
305

306 4.2.2.1. Full-time lecturer faculty and lecturer faculty
307 undergoing a three year cumulative review shall be evaluated
308 by a department committee of tenured faculty.
309

310 4.2.2.2. All other lecturer faculty shall be evaluated by the
311 Department Chair, who may choose to consult with a
312 department committee of tenured faculty. If the Department
313 Chair suspects that a rating of “needs improvement” or
314 “unsatisfactory” may be indicated, the Chair is advised to
315 consult with a department personnel committee before
316 concluding the evaluation.
317

318 4.2.2.3. The Department Chair may make a separate
319 recommendation as part of the evaluation process.
320

321 4.2.3 Documentation for Evaluation

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

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

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

4.2.3.1.2 All available direct observation(s) by peers

4.2.3.1.3 Information provided by the lecturer on an "Annual Summary of Achievements" form

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

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

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

4.2.4 The Lecturer's WPAF including the evaluations of the department committee and Chair, if applicable, shall be forwarded to the Dean. Following the review, the Dean shall forward copies of the completed evaluation and Summary of Achievements to UP Faculty Affairs for placement in the official Personnel Action File and to the faculty member and the department.

364 4.2.6 The evaluation process must be completed by the date indicated in
365 the annual calendar established by UP-FA. Evaluations must be
366 included in the careful consideration process where applicable
367 (addenda or revisions may be submitted later if necessary).
368

369 4.3. Criteria for Evaluation 370

371 4.3.1. The most fundamental principle of the evaluation of lecturer faculty
372 is that they be evaluated in terms of their particular assignment and
373 the criteria appropriate to that assignment. For example, if a
374 Lecturer Faculty is appointed to teach .8 and do service at .2, then
375 80% of the evaluation should focus on criteria appropriate to
376 teaching and 20% on criteria appropriate to service. Such a
377 Lecturer Faculty may not be evaluated directly on scholarship.
378

379 4.3.2. Many lecturer faculty have substantial accomplishments in areas
380 that are not directly covered by their assignment—i.e., scholarship
381 in the case of instructional lecturers. Such lecturer faculty should be
382 encouraged to explain how these achievements have a bearing on
383 teaching and thus could be considered as an enhancing factor in
384 the evaluation of the actual assignment. Similarly, lecturers who
385 contribute service should be encouraged to show how this activity
386 enhances student success, campus climate, and/or their assigned
387 activities. Asking for consideration of activities that may indirectly
388 enhance the actual assignment will be at the option of lecturer
389 faculty.
390

391 4.3.3. The evaluation of teaching must be holistic and in accordance with
392 the University policy on the evaluation of teaching (F12-6.) “When
393 evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and
394 administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. This
395 means that teaching must be considered in context and must be
396 evaluated using multiple sources of information.” (F12-6). Such
397 sources of information include the candidate’s own statements via
398 the annual summary of achievements, course materials such as
399 syllabi, direct observations, and student opinion surveys.
400

401 4.3.4. Certain teaching assignments may require continued currency in a
402 field and/or the maintenance of professional credentials, e.g.,
403 licensure in a professional field for accreditation requirements.

404 Such requirements should be delineated in an appointment letter,
405 and then may be evaluated as part of the teaching assignment.

406
407 4.3.5. If colleges or departments develop any supplementary criteria (e.g.
408 licensure, clinical practice experience, training required by
409 accreditation) for evaluating lecturer faculty, these criteria not be
410 changed until after the conclusion of the current evaluation process
411 (CBA 15.3).

412
413 4.3.6. Lecturer evaluations will be characterized using the following scale:

414
415 4.3.6.1. Unsatisfactory. The documentation does not establish that
416 the performance in the assignment has been fully met and
417 completed.

418
419 4.3.6.2. Needs improvement. The documentation does not
420 establish that the performance in the assignment has been
421 fully met and completed, but modest improvements as
422 indicated in the review—if promptly implemented—would
423 result in a satisfactory performance.

424
425 4.3.6.3. Satisfactory. The documentation establishes that the
426 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
427 completed.

428
429 4.3.6.4. Good. The documentation establishes that the
430 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
431 completed, and with a level of experience and quality that
432 goes beyond the minimum.

433
434 4.3.6.5. Excellent. The documentation establishes that the
435 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
436 completed, and with a level of experience and quality that
437 goes significantly beyond the minimum.

438 439 **5. Range Elevation**

440 441 5.1. Definition and Principles

442
443 5.1.1. Definition: Range elevation refers to movement on the salary
444 schedule for lecturer faculty to the next range (e.g. LA to LB, LB to

445 LC, or LC to LD). Range elevation represents a form of
446 advancement in salary and classification based on evaluation of
447 performance in assignment.
448

449 5.1.2. Eligibility: lecturer faculty become eligible to apply for a range
450 elevation when they meet the requirements stipulated in the CBA
451 and any pertinent ancillary documents. They shall be informed of
452 their eligibility by UP-FA.
453

454 5.1.3. Range elevation does not imply any guarantee of future
455 employment nor does it affect the conditional nature of the
456 temporary appointment
457

458 5.2. Process

459
460 5.2.1. At the beginning of each academic year, UP-FA will establish a
461 timeline for applications for range elevation and provide this
462 information to Chairs and Deans and eligible lecturer faculty.
463

464 5.2.2. Lecturer faculty who are eligible for range elevation in more than
465 one department or unit must apply separately in each department or
466 unit in which they are eligible.
467

468 5.2.3. Application Process: lecturer faculty seeking range elevation must
469 submit their application with the appropriate documentation via the
470 current electronic process.
471

472 5.2.4. Documentation. Material supporting a lecturer's request for range
473 elevation should include:
474

475 5.2.4.1 Narrative statement. This section should summarize the
476 candidate's professional growth and development that
477 warrants range elevation. The narrative should be limited to
478 2000 words and should explain how the evidence supports
479 the evaluation of the particular assignment of the lecturer as
480 outlined in the letter(s) of appointment. For example, if the
481 assignment is to teach, then the evidence should be related
482 to teaching—even indirectly, such as if research or service
483 activities can be shown to promote currency in the discipline
484 needed for effective teaching.

485 5.2.4.2. Evidence of Professional Growth and Development.
486 Appendix A provides examples that may be appropriate
487 evidence, depending on the specific assignment of the
488 candidate, and depending upon the arc of the candidate's
489 professional development.

490 5.2.4.3. Copies of all periodic evaluations, SOTEs received during all
491 years of the assignment in accordance with university
492 policies on teaching evaluation, and periodic peer reviews, if
493 available. If the assignment was for greater than six years,
494 then only materials from the most recent six years are
495 required.

496 5.2.4.4. A comprehensive index of all materials shall be prepared by
497 the faculty member and submitted with the range elevation
498 materials.

499
500 5.2.5. Criteria

501
502 To be recommended for range elevation, a lecturer must
503 demonstrate professional growth and development appropriate to
504 the lecturer's work assignment and the mission of the university
505 during the period between the date of initial appointment or, where
506 applicable, the date of the last range elevation and the time of the
507 current request. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not a
508 criterion for range elevation. This is the only review period in which
509 candidates' professional achievements shall be evaluated. Appendix
510 A lists examples of activities that may be used to demonstrate
511 appropriate professional growth and development.

512
513 5.2.6. Levels of achievement

514
515 Higher level of advancement (such as from C to D) require higher
516 levels of professional growth and development than do lower levels
517 (such as from A to B.) While sustained satisfactory performance in
518 the work assignment may be sufficient for elevation to LB,
519 performance evaluated as good or excellent is required for range
520 elevation to LC and LD, respectively. Applicants should document
521 their professional growth and development as appropriate for the
522 nature of their assignment as outlined in the letter(s) of appointment,
523 their academic discipline, and the particular range for which they are
524 applying.

525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565

5.2.7. Review Process—Department or Equivalent Unit: Range elevation requests shall be evaluated by the personnel committee (may be the RTP committee) within the department or equivalent unit. The Department Chair may provide a separate review if he or she did not serve on the personnel committee. The committee shall write an evaluation and make a written recommendation to the Dean. The Department Chair, if performing a separate review, shall do the same. The recommendations will be forwarded to the candidate who will have a ten-day period to submit a written rebuttal, if desired. The recommendation(s) and rebuttal will then be forwarded to the Dean.

5.2.8. Review Process—Dean: The Dean will review the recommendations of the department and make a recommendation. A copy of the recommendation will be sent to the candidate who will have ten days to respond in writing. The recommendations and candidate responses (if any) will then be forwarded to UP-FA and the Provost for final review and action.

5.2.9. Decision by the President. The result of the reviews by the department and Dean is to deliver a recommendation to the Provost for the President's final decision with respect to the request for range elevation. The President may choose to delegate authority to decide in whole or in part to the Provost.

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

5.2.11. Peer Review Process: Denial of a range elevation is subject to appeal to a Peer Review Panel. UP-FA shall establish a single Peer Review Panel consisting of three full-time tenured faculty (not including faculty in the FERP program) who have served on committees in the preceding academic year that made recommendations on matters of retention, tenure and promotion and who have attained the rank of full professor or equivalent. Faculty Affairs, in conjunction with a representative from CFA, shall select at random from the eligible full-time tenured faculty three (3) members and one (1) alternate for service on the Peer Review Panel. A member of the Peer Review Panel may not hear an appeal of a range elevation denial if he/she is in the same

566 department as the appealing lecturer. Relevant dates and steps in
567 the peer review process are explained below.

568
569 5.2.11.1. A lecturer who wishes to request peer review for
570 denial of range elevation shall request peer review no later
571 than 21 days after the receipt of the denial.

572
573 5.2.11.2. The Peer Review Panel shall follow the timeline
574 outlined by the CBA (12.20). The Peer Review Panel shall
575 notify the candidate and Provost of its findings and decision.
576 The Peer Review Panel shall forward to the Provost all
577 written materials it considered. The decision of the Peer
578 Review Panel shall be final and binding.

579
580 5.3. Range Elevation Amount

581
582 5.3.1. Range elevation for lecturer faculty shall be accompanied by an
583 advancement in salary of a minimum of 5% (or to the minimum of the next
584 range) (Article 31.6).

585
586 5.3.2. Deans may recommend an increase greater than the minimum called for
587 in the CBA and shall provide reasoning for such to the Provost. The decision
588 to award a range elevation greater than the minimum is at the final
589 discretion of the Provost.

590 **Appendix A**

591

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

598

599 **Note regarding synergies between the categories:** Please see section 4.3.2, “It may
600 be that a Lecturer has substantial accomplishments in areas that are not directly
601 covered by their assignment—i.e., scholarship in the case of an instructional Lecturer.
602 Such a Lecturer should be encouraged to make the case that these achievements have
603 a bearing on teaching and thus could be considered as an enhancing factor in the
604 evaluation of the actual assignment. This would be at the option of the Lecturer.”

605

606 1. Teaching related.

- 607 ● activities enhancing the effective teaching of the discipline
- 608 ● collaborative teaching
- 609 ● creative activities in support of effective teaching
- 610 ● development of instructional materials
- 611 ● increased mastery of knowledge in fields relevant to the teaching
612 assignment
- 613 ● enhanced mastery of knowledge in relevant fields via scholarly activity
- 614 ● involvement of students in the research and creative processes
- 615 ● completion of a higher academic degree

616

617 2. Service related

- 618 ● advising and mentoring student associations
- 619 ● development of standards and/or outcomes assessment
- 620 ● curriculum and program development
- 621 ● contributions to improving the campus climate: the promotion of mutual
622 respect and acceptance of diversity in all its forms
- 623 ● grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support
624 pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University
- 625 ● leadership and participation in service activities of professional
626 associations
- 627 ● external fundraising and resource development related to the mission of
628 the university

- 629 ● leadership and special contributions to the basic instructional mission of
- 630 the university
- 631 ● leadership in faculty governance and campus life at the department,
- 632 college, university, or CSU system level
- 633 ● maintenance and technical support of university labs, equipment,
- 634 materials, supplies, safety standards and any other support of
- 635 environments that require advanced professional attention
- 636 ● mentoring of colleagues
- 637 ● organizing events and activities for the sharing of ideas and knowledge
- 638 ● recruitment and retention of students
- 639 ● research and/or creative activity in the discipline thesis research and
- 640 supervision
- 641

642 3. Research related

- 643 ● collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the
- 644 community
- 645 ● editing of publications
- 646 ● participation at professional meetings and presentations at conferences
- 647 ● contributions to the community, including professional efforts which bring
- 648 the community and the campus together
- 649 ● publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- 650 ● research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy
- 651 ● patents and innovations credited to the lecturer

652

653 **Appendix B**

654

655 This appendix describes titles and categories of faculty.

656 B.1. Categories of non tenure/tenure track faculty established by the CBA.

657

658 The CBA defines certain categories of faculty, and these categories may change
659 as the CBA is revised. UP-FA provides a list of these titles and their specific
660 definitions. This appendix lists these categories as they presently are defined.

661 These categories of faculty include:

662

- 663 ● Lecturers—Describes all part-time and full-time temporary instructional
664 faculty.
- 665 ● Unit 3 temporary faculty with assignments in Athletics, Library and
666 Student Services Professional Academic-Related (SSP-AR)
667 (Counseling)—Employees in these areas will have designations
668 appropriate to their field, while differentiated from their tenure/tenure
669 track faculty colleagues.
- 670 ● Visiting Faculty—A full-time instructional faculty member for up to one
671 academic year, and is a category defined by the CBA (12.32). Visiting
672 faculty are a separate classification, independent from tenure track
673 faculty and from lecturer faculty. It should be noted that the hiring of
674 Visiting Faculty shall not result in the displacement or time base
675 reduction of an incumbent Temporary Faculty Unit Employee as
676 reflected in the order of work in provision 12.29.
- 677 ● Visiting Scholars--J-1 visa holders coming to the university through an
678 exchange visitor program. Visiting Scholars are a separate classification,
679 independent from tenure track faculty and from lecturer faculty.
- 680 ● Volunteer faculty—are defined in the CBA as “faculty who are not
681 receiving direct compensation from the CSU for the assigned Unit 3
682 work.” As such, this is not a separate category of faculty but a separate
683 category of compensation.
- 684 ● Adjunct faculty—is a term no longer used by the CBA.

685

686 B.2 Honorific Titles Established by SJSU.

687

688 SJSU uses the following honorific titles to honor and distinguish various sub-
689 categories of faculty from within the official designations of the CBA.

690

- 691 ● Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting
692 Professor, Visiting Lecturer. These are all honorific titles that may be

693 used as subsets of the Visiting Faculty designation of the CBA. These
694 honorific titles may be used when a Visiting Faculty has earned such a
695 title at a prior institution.

696
697 ● Distinguished Visiting Lecturer or Distinguished Visiting Professor.
698 These are honorific titles that may be used as subsets of the Visiting
699 Faculty designation of the CBA. These designations are reserved for
700 visitors with particularly distinguished careers, and must be approved by
701 the Provost after a request from the appropriate college Dean which
702 documents the qualifications and contributions that warrant this title.

703
704 ● Distinguished Visiting Scholar. This is an honorific title that may be used
705 as a subset of the Visiting Scholar designation of the CBA. This
706 designation is reserved for visiting scholars with particularly
707 distinguished careers, and must be approved by the Provost after a
708 request from the appropriate college Dean which documents the
709 qualifications and contributions that warrant this title.

710
711 ● Senior Lecturer—This is an honorific title that may be used as a subset
712 of the Lecturer designation of the CBA. SJSU bestows this honorific title
713 to a lecturer faculty member with a three year appointment and six
714 consecutive years of experience in a single department at SJSU.

715

8 **SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION**
9

10 **Requesting the Appointment of a Presidential Task Force on**
11 **the Needs of Native Students, Staff, and Faculty**
12

13 **Whereas:** San José State University (SJSU) is committed to the promotion of an
14 inclusive, safe, supportive, responsive, and equitable educational and
15 workplace environment for all faculty, staff, and students; and
16

17 **Whereas:** One of the goals of the California State University (CSU)'s Graduation
18 Initiative 2025 is to increase graduation rates and eliminate equity gaps¹;
19 and
20

21 **Whereas:** According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), college
22 enrollment at two-year and four-year educational institutions from 2000 to
23 2018 has increased for Black and Latinx (Hispanic) students, yet it has not
24 increased for Native students²; and
25

26 **Whereas:** From 2000 to 2019, the percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds with a
27 bachelor's degree or higher increased for White, Black, and Latinx
28 (Hispanic) populations; yet it has not increased for the Native population³;
29 and
30

31 **Whereas:** CSU and SJSU graduation rates are lower for Native students relative to
32 other Under Represented Minority (URM) students. The six-year
33 graduation rate for "all American Indians" is 53.7 percent (versus 55.4
34 percent for URM) in the CSU, and the six-year rate at SJSU was 57.5
35 percent (versus 47.2 percent for URM)⁴; and

¹<https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/why-the-csu-matters/graduation-initiative-2025/What-Is-Graduation-Initiative-2025>

² The National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education* (2020)
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cpb.asp

³ The National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education* (2020)
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_caa.asp

⁴ We note also that inconsistent and inadequate data reporting methods are one of the obstacles to addressing the issues faced by Native populations within the university community.

36
37 **Whereas:** Task forces on racial discrimination, community safety and policing, and
38 Asian/Pacific Islander/ Desi American students, have been formed to
39 assess the university's environment, but none have been established for
40 Native students, staff, and faculty; therefore be it
41
42 **Resolved:** That the Academic Senate recommends that the President form a task
43 force that will include Native faculty, staff, and students, to:
44
45 ● Assess the needs of, and services provided to, Native students,
46 faculty, and staff
47 ● Identify best practices in fostering relationships with Muwekma and
48 other Native nations with the SJSU Campus
49 ● Identify strategies for outreach, advising, and retention of Native
50 students, faculty, and staff
51 ● Identify best practices in serving Native students, faculty, and staff
52 ● Evaluate and recommend changes to the mechanisms for data
53 collection on Native students, faculty, and staff; and be it
54
55 **Resolved:** That the Native taskforce begin work as soon as feasible, reporting to the
56 President by the end of Spring 2022, with recommendations on how SJSU
57 can best serve Native students, faculty, the Muwekma, and the local
58 Native community; and be it further
59
60 **Resolved:** That the Native Task Force members be compensated with release time
61 and/or a stipend to complete the work of gathering data, formulating a
62 survey, conducting interviews, and writing a report with recommendations.
63
64
65 **Approved:** March 15, 2021
66 **Vote:** 11-0-0
67 **Present:** Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory, Millora,
68 Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson
69 **Absent:** Maciejewski
70
71 **Financial impact:** Resources needed for support staff, and stipend or release time for
72 faculty.
73 **Workload impact:** There will be additional workload for those serving on the task
74 force.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**
4 **March 22, 2021**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1807

7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

8 **Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the**
9 **Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)**

10
11 **Rescinds:** S14-5

12
13 **Whereas:** The current Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI),
14 and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) have not been
15 updated or reviewed since they were approved in 2014; and

16
17 **Whereas:** There is a [Presidential Directive 2019-01 on General Education Area D](#) that is
18 not compliant with the current CSU General Education Breadth Requirements;
19 therefore be it

20
21 **Resolved:** That Presidential Directive 2019-01 should be rescinded; and be it further

22
23 **Resolved:** That the attached GE Guidelines shall be adopted effective Fall 2021; and be it
24 further

25
26 **Resolved:** That Curriculum and Research shall be authorized to make minor changes to the
27 GE Guidelines that do not change the overall structure or intent of the program.
28 The Academic Senate shall be notified of any such changes; and be it further

29
30 **Resolved:** That the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), in consultation with the
31 Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, will develop an implementation and
32 approval process to re-certify all GE Courses under the 2021 GE Guidelines to
33 be completed no later than Fall 2023 following University Policy F15-13; and be it
34 further

35
36 **Resolved:** That the General Education, American Institutions and Graduation Writing
37 Assessment Requirements (GWAR) Guidelines shall undergo a full university
38 review with submission of a program planning document that will be initiated by
39 the General Education Advisory Committee beginning in AY 2030/31.

40
41 **Rationale:** In the academic year 2016/17, SJSU's General Education Program was
42 reviewed through the Program Planning Process and an action plan was
43 developed in 2018 to review and update the program learning outcomes and
44 develop better processes for assessment. An *ad hoc* committee was created to
45 review and modify the program learning outcomes in the academic year 2018/19.

46 These new learning outcomes were presented to the Curriculum and Research
47 Committee which, in conjunction with the Academic Senate Office, held a first of
48 its kind campus-wide two day General Education Summit in late fall 2019 and
49 early spring 2020 to gather feedback on the program learning outcomes, the GE
50 Area Learning Outcomes, and many other aspects of our GE Guidelines. This
51 extensive community input was reviewed, summarized, and considered when
52 creating the new GE Guidelines. These guidelines were distributed in early
53 spring 2021 and C&R carefully has been reviewing all the feedback that was
54 received. These updated guidelines incorporate the creation of the new GE Area
55 F (Ethnic Studies) with reduction of Area D to 6 units as well as changes each
56 GE Area, the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (formerly known as
57 Area Z on our campus), and the American Institutions Graduation Requirements
58 based upon consideration of the feedback that has been received by the
59 Curriculum and Research Committee.

60 **Timeline and Implementation:** First Time Freshman entering SJSU Fall 2021 and after will be
61 subject to the 2021 GE Guidelines. According to CSU policy, continuing SJSU students and
62 continuously enrolled California Community College transfer students can opt to adhere to the
63 GE Guidelines aligned with their catalog rights.

64 **Approved:** March 15, 2021

65 **Vote:** 9-0-2

66 **Present:** Anagnos, Backer, d'Alarcao, Hart, Kaur, Khavul, Kitajima, Maffini,
67 Masegian, Schultz-Krohn, White (chair)

68 **Absent:** Abousalem

69 **Workload impact:** There will be a temporary increase in workload for (1) faculty to update
70 syllabi and curriculum to bring into compliance with the new GE
71 Guidelines, (2) the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) and
72 General Education Review Panels created to help GEAC recertify
73 courses to align with the new guidelines, (3) staff to make changes to the
74 online catalog, degree roadmaps, various websites, publications and
75 PeopleSoft, (4) articulation staff to work with community colleges, the
76 SJSU Catalog must contain the updates to Area D and at least one
77 course in the new Area F in order to meet all catalog requirements and
78 student rights. In order to accomplish this at least one course for the new
79 Area F must be reviewed and approved by GEAC.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee**
4 **March 22, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**
6
7
8

AS 1808

9
10 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
11 **Amendment A to University Policy F20-1**
12 **Adding Classes After Advance Registration**
13

14 **Whereas:** The Waitlist Work Group, in consultation with The College of Graduate
15 Studies and Graduate Admissions and Program Evaluations (GAPE), has
16 suggested modifications to the standards by which graduate students will
17 qualify as a graduating student for accommodation on the waitlist,
18 therefore be it

19
20 **Resolved:** That F20-1 be amended as follows.
21
22

23 **Policy Recommendation**
24 **Amendment A to University Policy F20-1 Adding**
25 **Classes after Advance Registration**
26

27 Waitlists will remain active for 9 days from the first day of instruction for the semester
28 and will continue to automatically enroll courses to their enrollment caps from the
29 waitlist. The waitlists will remain active only for the ~~Add~~ Advance Registration Period for
30 the Winter and Summer sessions.
31

32 Graduating seniors will be given priority to enroll in courses from the waitlists.
33 Graduating seniors are defined as those who have an approved graduation application
34 on file for ~~the current term or the subsequent two terms, including the summer term~~ an
35 active program and at least 21 units completed. Graduating seniors will be moved to the
36 top of waitlists on an ongoing basis, both during Advance Registration and after the
37 term begins.

- 38 • Graduating seniors must have an approved graduation application on file for ~~the~~
39 ~~current or subsequent two terms~~ an active program and at least 21 units
40 completed in order to be moved to the top of the waitlist.
- 41 • When multiple graduating seniors are moved to the top of the list, they will be
42 ordered based on the time they signed up for the waitlist.
- 43 • Graduating seniors must meet all necessary conditions for the waitlist.
44

45
46 **Approved:** March 15, 2021

47 **Vote:** 11-0-2

48 **Present:** Austin, Chuang, Delgadillo, Gomez Marcelino, Jackson
49 (non-voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao,
50 Rollerson, Sen, Sullivan-Green, Wilson, Wolcott, Yao

51 **Absent:** Hill, Sorkhabi, Walker, Walters, Yang

52 **Financial impact:** None expected.

53 **Workload impact:** No change from current situation.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **March 22, 2021**
5 **Final 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.

36
37 **Approved:** March 15, 2021

38 **Vote:** 11-0-0

39 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli, Quock, Mahendra, Barrera,
40 Monday, Riley

41

42 **Absent:** None

43 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

44 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact

45 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
46 **Amendment E to University Policy S15-8**
47 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and**
48 **Standards**
49 **To provide for “The Scholarship of Engagement”**
50

51 2.3 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement
52

53 2.3.1 The second basic category for evaluation is scholarly/artistic/professional
54 achievement. Such contributions to a faculty member's discipline or professional
55 community, or application of scholarly expertise to improve the community, are
56 expected for continuation and advancement in the university. This category is
57 subdivided into several areas for ease of description and reference. ~~three areas:~~
58 ~~scholarly, artistic, and professional; this division is for ease of reference only.~~ These
59 ~~three~~ areas are not perfectly distinct and some candidates will demonstrate their
60 disciplinary expertise within two or more ~~all three~~ of the areas. Some achievements may
61 have characteristics of more than one area. The overarching principle should be to
62 reward significant scholarly/artistic/professional achievement regardless of the form it
63 may take.
64

65 2.3.1.1 The nature of the expected contributions will vary according to the
66 discipline, and may be more specifically defined in each department's
67 guidelines.
68

69 2.3.1.2 The nature of contributions will also vary according to the faculty
70 member's professional interests. Scholarly/Artistic/Professional
71 Achievements may include original research that advances knowledge; or
72 the synthesis of information across disciplines, topics, or time; or the
73 engaged application of disciplinary expertise within or outside the
74 University; or the systematic study of teaching and learning within the
75 discipline; or a combination of these forms of achievement.
76

77 2.3.1.3 Evaluation must be made by disciplinary peers. Acceptance of scholarly
78 or artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes an
79 evaluation of that work. Professional contributions should be evaluated by
80 persons in a position to assess the quality and significance of the
81 contributions. Candidates may request that disciplinary experts provide
82 evaluations of any of their work to be included in the dossier. Such
83 evaluations should characterize the broad impact, scope, or significance
84 of the work, whether within academic fields or beyond. Significant
85 contributions that would not otherwise be peer reviewed should be

86 evaluated in this manner. External reviewers must be objective, and any
87 relationships that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the
88 evaluation.

89
90 2.3.1.4 Published or otherwise completed works that are peer-reviewed,
91 evaluated by an objective disciplinary expert, or juried will normally receive
92 the greatest weight. Achievements that have a broad impact, scope, or
93 significance are particularly valued, and department guidelines may
94 explain the most appropriate evidence for making this determination. Work
95 in progress and unpublished work should be assessed whenever possible.
96 In cases where there is no external evaluation of an achievement the
97 department committee will review the work and indicate the extent of its
98 quality and significance.
99

100 2.3.2 Scholarly achievement includes work based on research and entailing theory,
101 analysis, discovery, interpretation, explanation, or demonstration. Examples: books,
102 articles, reviews, technical reports, computer software and hardware development,
103 positively reviewed grant proposals, papers read to scholarly associations,
104 documentaries, works of journalism, patents, copyrights, trademarks, translations, etc.
105

106 2.3.3 Artistic achievement includes, but is not limited to, the creation of original work in
107 poetry, fiction, drama, dance, the aural, visual and computationally generated arts; or
108 performances or direction in music, theatre and dance often requiring interpretation,
109 mastery of a skill, formal experimentation, or the curatorial arrangement of such works
110 in an original and interpretive manner.
111

112 2.3.4 Professional achievements involve the application of disciplinary expertise
113 whether within or outside the University. Professional achievements will usually be
114 evaluated within the category of service, except when department guidelines establish
115 that professional activities are the primary method of demonstrating expertise within the
116 discipline. Such disciplines shall adopt department guidelines that explain appropriate
117 standards for evaluating these activities and distinguishing them from the service
118 category of achievement. Examples of achievements that could qualify when explicated
119 by guidelines are listed under “Service to the Profession/Discipline” below but may also
120 include ongoing professional requirements for currency in an applied discipline, such as
121 licensure.
122

123 2.3.5 Scholarship of Engagement. Similar to professional achievements, the scholarship
124 of engagement requires the application of expertise and/or talent grounded in the
125 candidate’s discipline or interdisciplinary fields. Achievements that do not require such
126 expertise and/or talent shall be evaluated under the category of service. This form of

127 scholarship engages significant problems, needs, issues, and reforms in the
128 professional, academic, local, or broader public/global communities.

129

130 2.3.5.1 The scholarship of engagement may take place in a wide range of fields,
131 and often exhibits a reciprocal, collaborative relationship between the
132 expert and the public, and may involve student participation. Examples of
133 such relationships would include, among others: engagement with
134 government, private sector, non-profit sector, educational and cultural
135 institutions, community groups, and environmental, humanitarian and civil
136 rights organizations.

137

138 2.3.5.2 Examples of achievements growing from such relationships could
139 include, among many others:

140 2.3.5.2.1 the integration of expertise into university-community
141 partnerships and collaborations;

142 2.3.5.2.2 community-based participatory research, participatory
143 action research, intervention research, applied
144 developmental science, knowledge mobilization, and
145 translational scholarship.

146 2.3.5.2.3 change-based, issue-based, place-based, and/or who-
147 based “socially engaged art” or “art as social practice”
148 collaborations/outcomes

149 2.3.5.2.4 dissemination of expertise or original work to the public
150 (sometimes known as “public scholarship” or “public
151 humanities”)

152 2.3.5.2.5 the enactment of legislation or production of advisory
153 reports;

154 2.3.5.2.6 tangible evidence of any of the various forms of
155 entrepreneurship, when consistent with the university’s
156 policies on conflicts of interest and intellectual property;

157 2.3.5.2.7 significant changes in professional practice;

158 2.3.5.2.8 evidence-based improvements to the management or
159 administration of organizations.