

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2020/2021
Agenda

April 19, 2021, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/81156658754>

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 22, 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 March 15, 2021
EC Minutes of April 5, 2021
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of April 19, 2021
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**
 - A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1814, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes After Advance Registration (Final Reading)

AS 1815, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading)
 - B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (Final Reading)

AS 1812, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing Support for Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion, To be carried out by the Professional Standards Committee AY 2021-2022 (Final Reading)

AS 1813, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Endorsement of The University of Chicago Statement on Freedom of Expression (Final Reading)

- C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1816, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S17-11, Revisions to Organization of the Program Planning Process at SJSU (Final Reading)

AS 1811, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)

- D. University Library Board (ULB):

- E. 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) (Final Reading)

AS 1810, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S14-5, Adopting new Program Learning Outcomes for General Education (First Reading)

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

- a. **Time Certain: 3:30pm**, ***University Advancement Update***, Theresa Davis, Vice President, University Advancement, CEO, Tower Foundation
- b. **Time Certain: 4:00pm**, ***ULB Report to the Senate***, Emily Chan, Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, Martin Luther King Jr. Library

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

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

XI. Adjournment

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
March 22, 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, Chuang, Gomez, Birrer Absent: Walker	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 Kaur read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of March 1, 2021 were approved (45-0-1).

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.

Since our last meeting President Papazian has signed eight policies. One policy was returned to IS&A for reconsideration, F20-2, regarding grading changes.

Chair Mathur is soliciting a General Unit representative for the Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service Committee. Nominations are due March 26, 2021.

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. There will be a celebratory week of events starting April 12, 2021 and culminating on April 15, 2021.

Chair Mathur also continues to work with the President's Office on the Honors Convocation to be held on April 23, 2021. There are over 2,700 President's Scholars.

There is a Legacy of Poetry Event coming up in the next couple of weeks with the theme: "Closing the Distance: Sheltering in Technologies." As a reminder, in 2007 our senate passed a sense of the senate resolution encouraging the university to establish a legacy of poetry day and that support the rich history of poetry at SJSU.

Questions:

Q: Will the honorees from last year's FSR that was cancelled due to COVID be included with this year's FSR recipients?

A: We are going to discuss this in the upcoming meeting to see if there is some way to recognize last year's honorees. We plan to recognize these honorees in some way.

The Senate website is in the process of being migrated to the new accessible format. During this time no new information or changes can be made to the website beginning March 23, 2021.

We are also working with the President's Office regarding the reappointment of Tamar Semerjian as Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). A message was sent to Senators and feedback is due by March 31, 2021.

Faculty Trustee Romey Sabalius has been chosen as one of two nominees submitted to the Governor for consideration for appointment as Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees. The final decision will be made over the summer. Congratulations Trustee Sabalius.

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. For information on Anti-APID/A hate incidents go to "StopAAPIHate." Chair Mathur asked for a moment of silence for those killed in Atlanta. There is a processing space this evening from 7p.m. to 8:30 p.m. hosted by Mosaic and ODEI. Chair Mathur posted a link to the virtual event.

Question:

Q: Do you have any idea how long the Senate website will be down?

A: We will have to get back to you about that. The website was originally supposed to be migrated over winter break, but was delayed. This was not our delay. We hope to be back online within a week, but the Senate Administrator will then have to fix whatever is broken from the move. [Update as of April 13, 2021—Basecamp Barkley has up to 20 Business Days to complete the movement of the website.]

Q: So, we can't access the policies during this time?

A: We have the policies housed other places as well if you need a copy.

B. From the President:

Congratulations Romey. The President is optimistic the Governor will see Dr. Sabalius as the right candidate for Faculty Trustee.

We sent out the announcement about a virtual commencement while we were still in the red tier. The President has asked her team to go back and review commencement to see where we could have some in person events for commencement now that we have moved out of the red tier. We know how important this is for students and their families.

Anti-Asian hate has been rising this year, particularly in our elder communities. A message will go out later today to say we are working to expedite the opening of an APID/A Student Success Center. We know our students need this very much. The President has also asked to spend time

with our API faculty and staff association because she really feels it's important to hear directly from our faculty and staff.

We have continued to work on racial justice. There are a number of things you will start to see. There is a website which will collect all the pieces, probably with a soft launch fairly soon. As part of that Jahmal Williams and Patience Bryant are working with a steering group on a racial justice symposium. We hope this will become an annual event leading to actionable change. Many thanks to Jahmal Williams and Patience Bryant on their leadership in this.

We have been pursuing all the inquiries with regard to Title IX and Athletics. The goal is to understand what has happened over a decade where there was a lot of turnover and change. It is complicated because there has been so much change. We are working with the Chancellor's Office. There is much that the President cannot speak to because of personnel issues. However, the President wants to assure everyone that she is looking into all of this. The questions that have been asked are being addressed.

Questions:

Q: Regarding expediting the APID/A Center can you expand on that?

A: [VP Day] We had a review that started right when the pandemic started. We put it on hold. The President had said this is a priority. We have to sit down and see what we can do by fall. That might be a little bit ambitious. January might be a better goal with reopening. CDO Wong and I will be looking at what makes sense. We will be getting recommendations from students, faculty, and staff. Really of looking at experiences of these students on our campus, one because they are such a large and diverse group of students and it's going to take more than 800 square feet. So the Center is a part of it, but we really have to be talking about a broader strategy, engaging with the community.

A: [President] We need to do something for fall.

A: [VP Day] I guess it will be fall then.

Q: A few weeks ago the AS Board meeting was zoom bombed. You said you were going to meet with them. Can you update us on this and what has been done?

A: [President] We've had two meetings with the AS Board. We worked with them on how to manage the meeting. They've had meetings since then that have went very well. We've also built a communication strategy between the cabinet and the AS Board. We will continue to work hard on that. We will also be talking with them about some of the details regarding Gregory Johnson Jr. where we can.

A: [AS President] We have been having some very productive meetings on how to handle this is a more productive way.

C: While this is fantastic news, I'd love to hear where we go from here with regard to supporting our Native American Students? Will we have a center like the APID/A Center?

A: [President] We have a group working on the issues with our Native American Students. They haven't come forward with recommendations yet. CDO Wong where are we with this?

A: [CDO] From what we are hearing, I think they would like a Native American Student Center.

A: [President] I'll take this back to the team and see if I can drilldown a little bit more information on this.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of February 15, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of February 22, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of March 15, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of March 22, 2021 as amended by AVC Marachi to add Dina Izenstark to the C&R Committee.

AVC Marachi announced the results of the Senate Elections for 2021-2022. She welcomed the new senators.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

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 (Final Reading). The Senate voted and AS 1805 passed as written (45-1-0).***

C: Wanted to commend the committee for putting this forth. It is incredibly necessary to support the diversity of professional and scholarly achievements by our wide-ranging faculty.

Senator Peter asked Senate Cargill to lead the discussion on AS 1803. Senate Cargill presented ***AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: Overall I like this policy very much. I like it gives lecturers the respect they deserve. I would like to speak to 4.2.3.1.5., unsolicited materials. This is very important. It sends a message that lecturer faculty are valued. This seems to have generated some controversy from what I read in the Executive Committee minutes. However, would the committee consider not removing this clause or watering this down so it becomes meaningless? Because it is very, very important to make sure that those faculty who teach the bulk of our courses, 60% of our classes are not relegated second class status.

A: Thank you very much. We will keep this point in mind while we do the revisions.

Q: In 3.4, careful consideration for reappointment, an earlier draft had some language which spelled out what could be considered careful consideration and that language that seemed uncontroversial has been removed. Can you tell us why?

A: We had much discussion about careful consideration. We had some feedback from university personnel and long discussions about whether that extended language could be used and ultimately decided to remove it. However, I will bring this back to the committee for further discussion.

Q: You mentioned this was going to be a final reading and was changed to a first reading due to some substantive feedback recently, can you clarify why?

A: Some of it was minor and involved current practices, another section had to do with language involved in a case at Northridge and we need to review that information and see if it is pertinent to include that in the final draft.

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***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)***.

We were fortunate to have as a member of our committee, Professor Soma de Bourbon who is an expert on Native American issues. Senator Sasikumar presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the 2nd sentence of the 5th Whereas clause to read, "The six-year graduation rate for "all American Indians" is 57.1% (versus 56.8% for URM) in the CSU, and the six-year rate at SJSU was 52.5% (versus 55.5% for URM); and." Senator Wong(Lau) presented an amendment to add a new first bullet under the first Resolved clause to read, "Assess the capacity and institutionalization of accurate identification of native American students with a special focus to aggregate multi-racial/multi-ethnic identified native American students." Senator Wong(Lau) withdrew her amendment in support of the following amendment from Senator Del Casino. Senator Del Casino presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add a new first bullet under the first Resolved clause to read, "Ensure that we institutionalize the use and analysis of aggregated native and American Indian student data that accounts for the fact that many native and American Indian students are

identified in other racial and ethnic categories.” **The Senate voted and AS 1809 passed as amended (46-0-0).**

Q: I had a question about compensation, whether assigned time or stipend can be provided. Have you had the committee had a conversation with administration regarding this?

A: This is sense of the senate, so we are assuming that the president will consider this.

Q: Would it be possible to consider speeding up the timeline considering how critical these issues are and whether or not it would be possible to establish earlier timeline perhaps fall of 21 rather than spring of 22?

A: We did consider timeline, but we considered with assigned time it would be too disruptive for fall 21.

C: This is an administrative decision, and we hope to have a successful search in American Indian Studies.

Q: Did you consider pulling that gigantic data problem with Native American student identity being aggregated?

C: Yes we had quite a bit of discussion there, we need to look at the data more carefully and ensure that we aggregate appropriately.

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

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

Senator White presented ***AS 1807, Policy Recommendation, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE) American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading).***

C&R has still not finished going through all the feedback they have received. There are over 45 pages. However, C&R wanted to get Senate feedback on the GE Guidelines they have started working on. Most of their time have been spent on upper division GE, areas R, S, and V.

Questions:

Q: My question is how aware is C&R of the nature of the consultation process that the American Institutions Advisory Panel conducted. I mention this because today I talked to a member of that advisory panel that said they were given their charge on the 1st of February and had to finish by the middle of February. These are the most radical changes to the American Institutions requirements I've seen in 31 years at SJSU. I did not know my department had a representative on this group and I'm sure the rest of my department did not know as well until the work was done? Has American Institutions really been thoroughly vetted?

A: I cannot truly answer that question. They should have had at least 6 weeks. The GRPs are under GEAC, but I can reach out and ask what their consultation was.

Q: I would like to join Senator Peter and Senator Wong(Lau) with their concerns with the document forwarded from Communication Studies. I would like to know what the abstentions were about in committee on this resolution? It also seems like we are seeing here in terms of the guidelines is quite a departure from what we saw last year in terms of trajectory for the guidelines. Am I missing something and who made those changes and under what consultation?

A: First, in terms of the abstentions, there two people who abstained. I was one of them. I will not say who the other was. One of the abstentions was due to the instructor qualifications. In the current guidelines it lists instructor qualifications as a Ph.D., but it is not required. A member felt that should be a Master's level or higher. That was a concern. I abstained because I felt that we had not gotten through enough feedback for areas R, S, and V. I felt we could do a better job of looking at the feedback from the GE Summits.

Q: Given the current context of continued racial violence and injustices in our country as well as the historical oppressions in your bi-social groups, Area S is poised to emphasize the importance of diversity in our society and in the context of structured inequality and systemic oppression and disproportionate violations as opposed to individual or cultural group differences among groups it is conceivable that under these revised guidelines an Area S class might study identity and diversity without necessarily attending to the legacy of systemic oppressions and institutionalized discrimination for a variety of groups in the U.S. Would the C&R Committee consider incorporating more explicit language about structural inequalities and institutionalized discrimination by the term structural inequalities and hierarchy of difference? We have also submitted for your consideration specific edits to L02 and L03.

A: Yes, I will definitely take this back to the committee for review.

Q: Thank you to the committee for addressing these issues. I have a recommendation for the committee on the preferences for instruction, I think the terminal degree may not always be the doctorate, it may be the doctorate or terminal degree for the field. Under the instructor qualifications, it should include experience teaching the courses as well as potentially instructional or pedagogical development. The real question is with the incorporation of Area F, which of course locks out an area specific to a narrow set. The reduction in Area D has then increased the pressure on Area C and golden four type courses for additional inclusion as departments are looking at that third realm of politics around FTES. Is there in anything in this document that addresses that, or constrains other areas in ways in response to that or have we remained open?

A: I think what you are asking is can someone teach a GE Area that is not in that particular GE area, so can someone teach a GE Area C1 course that may not have traditionally been in the Humanities and Arts Department?

Q: Have the standards for C1 Changed?

A: Area D has definitely been revised significantly. To be very blunt and honest D1 has gone away. C&R had to bring forward to the Senate a new Area D, because the Chancellor's Office did not like having Area D1, D2 and D3. You will see in the new guidelines there is only an Area D. Areas R, S, and V have also changed significantly. We are proposing that all courses will have to go through a review by GEAC and show they can meet the learning outcomes. The Chancellor's Office has said that Area F must be taught by someone affiliated with that department. All the GE areas, except Area F, have no limits on who can teach them or what programs they come from.

Q: As a result of that we have not responded by withdrawing those from Area D in any way have we?

A: That is correct.

Q: I was one of the people on the American Institutions group. If the other groups were as clueless as we were, this is a problem. We were told we were on the group on February 3, 2021 and we needed to have our feedback in writing by February 17, 2021. We only had one 90-minute meeting. We actually thought we would get this back to go over one more time, but we did not. I think we might want to rethink the timeline on this. How much guidance was everybody given?

A: I can't speak on behalf of the GEAC, but my email correspondence to the GEAC was to get a response by February 24, 2021.

C: What I'm saying is that our group got no guidance from GEAC.

A: There are only two GRPs that were formed.

Q: I'm concerned with the SJSU studies section on the top of page 26. Why are we seeing the variety of disciplines with which SJSU Studies can be met being significantly narrowed?

A: We have not narrowed it. Any department with the exception of Area F can submit a class for any area as long as they can prove they can meet the learning outcomes.

C: Except your use of creative works. Creative works does have a definition. If we look at this LO's individually, creative works does exclude a variety of disciplines.

A: I can definitely take that back to the committee.

Q: As a Senator it would be difficult for me to vote on the whole package at once. I share some of the concerns that Ken Peter brought up. Particularly the vagueness of U.S. 2. Also, the restriction Senator Sullivan-Green brought up regarding creative works. These changes would affect a huge number of classes. I suggest breaking it into pieces to vote upon.

A: I would have to consult with a parliamentarian about the voting and whether we can break the guidelines up. What the Senate votes on is the policy to approve the guidelines. However, there is another way it could be done. C&R could bring a package with only a few key changes this year for

us to vote up and down on, and then bring the rest in a future year. However, that is up to C&R.

Q: You mentioned that we have an exceptionally high number of visitors at this meeting and I believe they are here because they have serious issues with the GE guidelines and we need to have more consultation. The second thing I want to do is urge the Senate to look at the document circulated by Communications Studies. I also want to respond specifically to Senator Okamoto. I teach a course in Area V that would no longer be possible under the revised guidelines specifically because of the creative works of expression. If you look at the last page of the document circulated from Communication Studies, it refers not just to creative works, but also to texts and structures. This would broaden the outline to allow scientific work to be presented in Area V. I also believe we should listen to our colleagues. My colleague who teaches in Area F states that changes to outcomes 3 and 4 in Area F shift the course from the study of inequality organized around a theme to a class about values and dialogue. Grading an assignment based on one's values is difficult, because it is subjective. Also, the word dialogue means different things to different people. This also changes the focus of Area F from self and society to just self. Also, U.S. 2 is now lacking emphasis on civic engagement, demographic changes in California and an emphasis on civil liberties, voting, and civil rights.

A: We will definitely take this back to the committee.

Q: I have two concerns. One has to do with instructor qualifications. I do not believe we should have the doctorate as a preferred requirement because it sends a message that if you don't have a doctorate you are less preferred and many of our lower division classes are taught by those with Master's degrees. I also have some language changes on line 458. This puts the students into two categories. One category for English language learners and another for multi-language speakers. However, English language learners are bilingual or multi-language speakers. Also, on line 464 it lists errors by English language learners but I would not call them errors. They are variations. The assumption here is that only multi-language speakers make errors when speaking, but many native English language speakers make errors so I think we should move away from that. On line 576 there is an editing error. Class size and English speakers. It says "classes that have English speakers are limited to 20," and I believe that is incorrect. Shouldn't it read, "Sections designed for native English speakers are limited to 20"?

A: Yes, I will take this back to the University Writing Committee, since those changes came from them. C&R asked the University Writing Committee, as the University experts, to review and recommend language for those sections.

Q: Can't C&R make changes?

A: Yes.

A: [Frazier] I sit on the University Writing Committee. We did discuss this, but something must have happened in the transition to C&R. This does not accurately reflect what we discussed. However, we didn't have a lot of time.

A: Part of the reason it is not identical is that C&R did make changes.

Q: I would like to raise some questions about Area S. I teach Area S and V classes. Some of the changes in learning objectives for Area S seem to be power evasive, admiring the problem instead of fostering critical thinking, and to have a lack of criticality. I wonder if that was intentional. As an example, learning objective three has gone from, "describe social actions which have led to greater equality and social justice in the U.S." to "describe social actions that have led to something." We are replacing that with a discussion of our own values. That seems very power evasive and very much like admiring the problem and re-centering more of an individualism perspective. In learning objective 4, we replace, "recognizing and appreciating constructive interactions" with "talking about difference." This is again admiring the problem. In learning objective 2, we replace language describing historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality and structured inequalities in the U.S." and in a time of Black Lives Matter we are going to change that to "diversity, equity, and inclusion." This is a great name for a department and office that is a change agent on campus, but is not a great critical learning objective. Has the committee considered the impact of these changes and what message this sends to our students at a time we want them to be thinking more critically about themselves within society and issues of inequality in the U.S.?

A: The committee did consider and debate this for some time. It was the consensus of the entire committee that the changes in 3 and 4 are what they wanted.

C: I'm sorry to hear that.

A: So am I.

Q: In the rewording and modification of Area S, what problems was the committee trying to fix? What was the reason for removing structural inequality and other things? It is a huge departure from what was written previously.

A: Are you asking for my opinion?

Q: Maybe asking for some wisdom as to why so much effort was made to change the goals and objectives of Area S?

A: I would defer to any of my other committee members. I was against this and spoke adamantly against it many times in my committee, or I should say the committee I chair. I was not happy with any of the changes in Area S. I also brought up all the feedback we had gotten from instructors in Area S, but the committee chose to go with what was recommended to us initially in January, so I would defer to any of the other committee members. I'm completely against these changes, but I'm one person on a committee. I probably won't vote to bring the guidelines forward if Area S remains the

same. To have LGBTQ and other inequalities removed from this area completely white washes this and makes it a neo liberal white washing that is atrocious. I apologize this is not the view of the committee. It really makes me angry beyond belief that this has been done. It is an atrocity that I cannot stand and do not support.

C: [Anagnos] I want to be clear that the guidelines that were presented are an opportunity to gather input. One of the reasons these changes were made has to do with the learning outcomes. There are nine GE learning outcomes and some of them have to do with self-reflection and self-evaluation, so there was an attempt in reworking this to address some of the overall GE learning outcomes. Now maybe we should eliminate those GE program learning outcomes, because it does not seem that explaining your own values are resonating with the community. However, that is why they were put there. There are learning outcomes that talk about self-evaluation and self-reflection on what you have learned. This can be reviewed by C&R. One of the reason that the lists were removed is that maybe a list doesn't have every identity and by removing the list the area is left more broad. There has been some very good feedback today and C&R can certainly review it.

Senator Frazier presented a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion carried. The meeting was extended to 5:15 p.m.

Q: Thank you Senator White for the explanation. My constituents have put together a list of edits. I'd like to request that C&R examine putting the lists back in. We feel that intersectionality is lost with removing them. It is not just the list but the idea that there is a vast web of identities and nuances that we live in. Perhaps that language can be changed to show these as examples instead of the alpha and omega. Would the C&R Committee consider incorporating the lists provided? Also, would C&R consider replacing the focus on values to engagement and social actions in Area S?

A: Thank you.

Q: For GE Area S, learning outcome 4, "engage in dialogue about social issues in the U.S," is it the intent of the committee for this to mean engage in verbal dialogue? If it is verbal dialogue, I am concerned that a student would be put in a potentially vulnerable position because they are being forced to speak out about something very personal to them, or they are being forced to respond to something that was said earlier that is offensive to them.

A: C&R really didn't discuss this, but I will bring it back to the committee.

Q: We discussed this in our last solidarity meeting. The solidarity network collectively denounced the changes made to Area S. We feel it is detrimental to the principles of inclusivity and trying to create a more equitable campus.

C: Thank you.

C: R, S, and V reflect the upper division versions of B, C, and D. I am heartened by the conversation we are having. I do think the whole thing should come back again for a second reading with maybe a time limited discussion on each section and then return for a final reading later. I think we are getting on the right track. I also agree with Senator Wong(Lau) that we need to know why we are doing these changes and not only who it affects, but who is left out.

C: Area F is subject to law and has to be put in place before the end of the semester. The question about whether this is brought back section by section is something we need to take seriously. We will be out of compliance in the fall if we don't have Area F in place and at least one course in it. I think these conversations are great. It does suggest maybe 9 PLOs are too many.

C: As I was listening to the comment about self-reflection being one of the reasons for the changes to Area S, I was thinking self-reflection has to happen in the context of larger unequal structures.

A: I'll bring that back to the committee.

Q: I would like to formally move to refer this back to committee.

A: This is a first reading so it will go back to committee.

Q: I'm concerned that it will come back for a second reading and not be ready. I think the idea of bringing it back in pieces is the way to go here.

Q: I was at the GE summit and remember the discussions about Area R, and Area R is reflective of Area B, and in our discussions there was a lot of talk about having Area R be broader and that seemed to be reflected in the first draft of the guidelines. Can you tell me why this was not applied in Area R in this draft?

A: They were initially applied to Area R and then the committee received additional feedback and it was changed.

Q: Can I ask you to bring it back to the committee and ask them to make it broad again?

A: Yes, I will bring it back to the committee.

C: The fact is that Area B does not require that it be broad. The campus can narrow it down if they want to.

C: I don't think we want to get to a place where we have to do this over the summer by Presidential Directive. We are between a rock and a hard place here because of the law. I think we need to look carefully and make sure they say what we want and they get passed.

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1808, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes after Advance*

Registration (Final Reading). Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, “graduating seniors” to “graduate students” in lines 32, 33, 35, 38 and 43 and in line 41 change, “graduating seniors” to “graduating students.” **The Senate voted and AS 1808 passed as amended (42-0-2).**

Q: Reason for two abstentions in the committee?

A: Some committee members who are not well versed in registration who are electing to abstain.

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Chief Diversity Officer:

B. CSU Faculty Trustee: Report distributed via the Senate Listserv

C. Statewide Academic Senators:

D. Provost:

E. Associated Students President:

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

G. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

IX. Special Committee Reports:

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m., Campus Master Plan Report:

Traci Ferdolage, Senior AVP for Facilities Development and Operations, Jane Lin, Architect and Linda Dalton, Professor Emeritus Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Dalton Education & Associates presented a report on the Campus Master Plan.

Traci Ferdolage: We have only just begun this process. Campus Master Planning is a multi-year process. Our master plan is designed to build upon Transformation 2030 and serve as a long range planning guide for accommodating projected student enrollment and its related educational research, student support programs as well as various administrative services necessary for the successful operation of the campus. In short, the plan is designed to envision the future physical development of the campus. During the fall semester, our team conducted over 80 hours of interviews with leadership from more than 20 campus stakeholder groups to see what they thought should be addressed in the plan. Stakeholder groups represented students, faculty, and staff from all the colleges and divisions. The purpose of this presentation is to provide the Senate with an overview of the project, and to provide opportunities for feedback and also to explain the schedule a little bit. This is just the first engagement with Senate and there will be many engagement opportunities throughout this process. We encourage each of you to attend the open house and we will speak more to that later. We are very committed to collecting a variety of feedback. Campus Master Planning is one of the biggest planning activities that my team does. I’m deeply committed to collecting a wide range of input that is as diverse as our campus is. I’m going to turn it over to Jane now.

Jane Lin: What is a Campus Master Plan? A Campus Master Plan is a long range planning guide for projecting student enrollment, its related educational, research, and student support programs, as well as the administrative services necessary for the successful operation of the university and envisions the future physical development of the University and its properties. All physical improvements constructed by the University must be consistent with and supportive of the Campus Master Plan. Our time horizon for the project is about 20 years from now. We want you to think big about what the campus can be. It is our intention to be as inclusive as possible. We've just introduced you to the members from FD&O and they are in charge and leading the project. FD&O is working with our consultant team on a daily basis. We also work with the Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee that is Co-Chaired by VP Charlie Faas and Provost Del Casino. The committee consists of 25 members who represent faculty, students, staff, and campus affiliates. We meet with the committee 1 or 2 times a semester. The Campus Master Plan also involves you if you learn, live, teach, and/or work on or near the university. We need your input to make the Campus Master Plan as grounded and complete as possible. The goal of the Campus Master Plan is to build off the strategic plan—Transformation 2030. It is also closely tied to academic and enrollment planning on campus. The Campus Master Plan informs other plans such as South Campus Plan, Utilities Plans, FD&O Plans, Housing Plans, Landscape Plans.

The properties involved in the Campus Master Plan include Main Campus, South Campus, and all associated properties that include campus programming, some of which are not owned by the campus. We are in Phase 1, which is primarily an information gathering phase. At the end of the semester we will present a preliminary background report that summarizes the work we put in Phase 1. We have begun by evaluating the existing plan, and interviewing key stakeholders. The virtual open house that we are presenting about today is a very big part of our information gathering and will give everyone a chance to weigh in on what is important. We will be developing a framework for the plan in the fall. We will also be holding focus groups and workshops in the fall. In Phase 3 we will be drafting and writing the Campus Master Plan and an Environmental Impact Report follows that. In Phase 4 the Campus Master Plan will go to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Linda Dalton: As both Traci and Jane have mentioned, we conducted over 80 hours of interviews. The interviews help provide direction for the Campus Master Plan. They also provide information on the changing nature of teaching, learning, and work on campus. We are particularly interested in how the campus is going to balance between face-to-face, hybrid, and/or remote learning so we can design the right facilities for the future. We were encouraged to develop better connections with the city of San José, and to find a way for the main and South campuses to be safe and welcoming. In

addition, interviewees offer many suggestions such as making ground floor activity much more visible. We were encouraged to include very flexible classrooms. Interviewees also wanted an expansion of food and beverage options both in location and menu. In addition, interviewees wanted a way to bring the South Campus and Main Campus together so they don't feel so separate. Stakeholders encouraged us to be thinking about implementation and as we move along about how to be thinking about making the plan adaptable while ensuring continuity. Jane will now give information on the Open House.

Jane Lin: [A video about the virtual open house was presented.] The virtual open house can be found on the Campus Master Plan website. The website includes FAQs, etc. You can find the virtual open house on the "Get Involved" page. Browse anytime without logging in. You can visit anytime you wish before March 31, 2021. On Wednesday there is one more event for questions and answers. We hope you join us and please tell your colleagues and students to participate in the virtual open house.

Questions:

Q: When I arrived in 1990, we were promised a new College of Social Sciences Building. Is there any thought to unify our academic colleges to create some sense of community?

A: We really do need to understand how we utilize space on campus, and how we will move forward. The comment is incredibly important and we need to have additional discussion about it so that a department or college can be as vibrant as possible. I'm happy to discuss this further as we move forward.

Q: I completely missed the announcement of this virtual open house. This has far reaching implications. Would it be possible to extend the time for collection of feedback?

A: I apologize you didn't get the announcement. What I want to reassure you is that this is just the very first step towards gathering information and establishing a vibrant community feedback loop. The team is planning more in-depth opportunities. This won't be the last time to comment.

Q: As a representative of the Career Center, could we be moved to a more student centered building than the Administration Building? Is there any thought to putting all of student services together?

A: I hear what you are saying and I certainly recognize we are here to support our students. We need to think strategically about how we repurpose space. At the same time, we need to think about what things will look like as we move forward 20 years from now.

Q: What has been the interaction with the Campus Planning Board? Also, we are in these tight budget times so can you give us a ballpark estimate of the consulting costs?

A: We met with the CPB in February and we anticipate we will be meeting routinely to give the CPB updates on the progress of the project. As for the budget, we don't want that to necessarily hold us back right now, but there is a reality and reckoning. This is one reason we have an economist on the planning team. In addition, as we move closer to the end, we will begin to start estimating that cost and start looking at a 10 to 15-year capital investment plan and how we achieve that. Budget is always a concern. Some of our strategies will be renovation and some will be building new building. We will be looking at what the funding mix will be. We recognize we will have to be creative. We will have to think of alternatives sources of funding. We will examine all of this when we get closer to finalizing the plan.

Q: What is the current consulting cost and other costs around this project?

A: The costs for the Campus Master Plan are largely funded from a trust we have on the construction management side of the house. This is a multi-year process. It will run \$3-\$4 million total by the time we get through. Which also requires a full Environmental Impact Report.

C: [Provost] These are system requirements and real costs associated with the process.

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

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

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

Absent: Curry

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur commented on the planning for Honors Convocation and that there were approximately 2,700 President's and 7,900 Dean's Scholars. This event will be on April 23rd.

Chair Mathur reminded everyone to save the date for the live virtual Faculty Service Recognition Awards Event on April 15, 12:30-1:30pm. There are approximately 135 faculty honorees and two faculty with 40 years of service.

2. The Consent Agenda was approved (Executive Committee Agenda of March 15, 2021, Consent Calendar of March 15, 2021 as amended to include Sabrina Pinnell on the IRB, Executive Committee minutes of March 8, 2021 (14-0-0).

3. Consent Calendar Discussion and Referral:

The Executive Committee discussed the seat for the AS President on the Accreditation Review Committee (ARC). The website shows the seat as being for the AS President. The AS President cannot serve on the committee due to a class schedule conflict. A member noted that the policy establishing the ARC does show "or designee," but the website does not. The Senate Administrator noted that many changes occurred as a result of the global changes to the bylaws by O&G last year. However, the Senate Administrator will research this and report back to the committee. [Note: The Senate Administrator researched this and it was an error on her part and the website has been corrected.]

The committee discussed the fact that the AS President from a few years ago requested specific AS Board members be assigned to committees. Previously the policy committee seats were designated for a Student Senator. The committee discussed a possible referral to the Organization and Government Committee (O&G) to look into changing all AS President or other AS Board member seats to add "or designee." Chair Mathur will do a referral to O&G. O&G will work with the AS President on this referral.

4. Update from the President:

The President thanked Kathy Wong(Lau) for attending and speaking at the STOP AAPI HATE rally at San José City Hall on Saturday March 13th.

The President commented on the budget. They are beginning the hearings phase. It looks pretty certain that we will get the return of the \$299 million that was taken from us last year. However, we are less certain about the additional \$145 million we

asked for. Please continue lobbying. We may also get some one-time funds for deferred maintenance.

The American Rescue Act has two parts to the \$82 million received. About 50% of that monies will go out immediately in direct student aid. Of the remaining funds, \$5 million will be set aside for specific needs such as with Student Success Centers and advising. The good news is that we have until 2023 to draw down on those funds. To get these funds we have to spend and then submit receipts.

The President commented that she would leave comments and questions regarding in-person Fall classes to the Provost. We are still not sure where we will be in all communities with regard to the vaccine. As of this weekend 4 million vaccines have been given in Santa Clara County. We are continuing on the path we previously set. We will stick with the density guidelines in housing and all the protocols we had set in place.

There will be a phased-in return to campus for staff. This will be based on work needs evaluated on a unit-by-unit basis, and on employee needs on a case-by-case basis. We are aiming for a start date in July 2021.

The President is having her team look again to see if there is anything could be done to complement the Spring 2021 Virtual Commencement. She has heard information from other campuses, some are virtual, some have live events. Brian Bates and his team are looking at various possibilities, please send him any ideas you may have.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for signing all of the policies that have you recently signed. One of the two policies on joint appointments was signed. Will the other one be signed as well?

A: [President] I've asked the Provost to take this one back to PS. I do not see where the input of the Deans is in the policy.

C: [Provost] I'm wondering if this is an implementation issue or needs to be addressed in the policy. I've sent my comments to Chair Peter to discuss with the PS Committee. There is a role for the deans. If it is part of implementation, it could or could not happen. There should be some mechanism for the dean to weigh in.

C: There are no joint committees at the college level. We could create them. That's why the policy is silent on this. The President could order the deans to do this.

C: [President] Okay, I will sign and have the Provost put this in the implementation.

C: Most joint appointments on our campus are in the same college.

C: [Provost] I had an appointment in two separate colleges.

C: [President] I'm comfortable with implementation within the provost's office and will get that policy back to the senate.

Q: Thanks also for signing the policies. There are two from I&SA that are still pending. There is the amendment to F20-2 and the Honors policy. Is there a concern?

A: [President] I probably just haven't gotten to them yet. I'm not inclined to sign the F20-2 amendment with the inclusion of Summer. At some point we must return to the normal order.

C: Winter and Summer were added on the floor of the Senate. I&SA brought the resolution without it.

A: [President] I will probably return that one asking that Summer be removed. I'm good with Winter, but not summer. I will follow-up offline.

Q: What is the origin of the you.sjsu.edu site? Where is this site coming from? Who has access?

A: [President] I don't know.

A: [VPSA] This is a website set up for students by CAPS and Kell Fujimoto.

A: This website is very useful to share with students.

Q: Are the letters Sage Hopkins wrote to student athletes going to be addressed?

A: [President] Those letters are being addressed. Follow-up and outreach are being done with student athletes. I share your concerns. There are a lot of processes. As we are able to report we will. We cannot comment on certain things as they are personnel issues.

C: Please make processes and safety for Whistleblowers more transparent for the campus. People still don't know how to report and where to report safely. Can we send out more clear information to the campus? Many are afraid of retaliation or other whistleblowing concerns.

A: We are compliant with the CSU regulations, working closely with Joanne Wright's office, and often other campuses are coming to us to get assistance. We are ahead of many other campuses.

C: People don't know what the processes are.

A: Most people are not aware unless they must go through these cases. Lots of things are happening in University Personnel and at the Chancellor's Office levels. There are flowcharts on the web that show the process. CDO Wong(Lau) will research where the flowcharts are on the website and report back to the Executive Committee.

A: [President] For other COVID related information and other important information, a year ago, I started the FYI website. We put things out there as we can. These things take a long time to resolve.

5. On the anniversary of a year working from home due to COVID-19, Chair Mathur took a moment to offer her appreciation and to thank the members of the executive committee for working tirelessly for the past year. The members of the committee (as well as the Senate Administrator) have worked round the clock to keep the university functioning for our students, faculty, and staff.

6. Policy Updates:

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

The I&SA Committee decided not to move forward with a change in the current CR/NC policy. It was a divided vote with a lot of substantive discussion.

I&SA is working on corrections to the Waitlist policy.

I&SA continues to work on the Grade Forgiveness policy and trying to get Peoplesoft improvements.

I&SA recently received an Academic Integrity Policy referral.

b. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS is working on the Lecturer policy and the Scholarship of Engagement Amendment to the RTP policy. These will come to the next Senate meeting.

PS is working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution that is a roadmap of RTP Equity Reform.

PS is also working on a University of Chicago Academic Freedom Statement Endorsement.

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

C&R is working on updates to the GE Guidelines and will bring for a first reading to the next Senate meeting.

C&R is working on the Accessibility policy.

C&R is also working on a referral from Research and Innovation.

Questions:

Q: How are the GRPs going?

A: The American Institutions recommendations are incorporated into the guidelines and will come to the Senate at the next meeting. Area F is also continuing their work on the new learning outcomes, they will also be continuing to work on course approval as new Area F courses come in. A draft of the General Education Guidelines will be complete and sent to the Senate with everything incorporated.

A: [Provost] The legislature is considering aligning UC and CSU GE requirements.

A: [President] Can they do this if the UC is separate from the CSU?

A: [Provost] The BOT of the CSU are back on their radar. This is something just rattling around.

Q: What is the projected date students can take an Area F course?

A: There must be at least one Area F course on the books for Fall 2021.

Students probably won't take the courses until Spring 2022.

C: Students entering in Fall 2021 will be required to have an Area F course for graduation.

C: We must have something in the Catalog for Fall 2021. Some courses are already coming to GEAC for approval for Fall 2021. The big rollout will be Spring 2022. If GEAC doesn't get this done by May 2021, the Executive Committee will have to handle this review.

Q: What is their reasoning for aligning the CSU and UC?

A: [Provost] Maximum flexibility for students if they transfer.

A: [President] Lots of attention is being given to transferability. Aligning lower division in all three sectors would help there.

d. Organization and Government Committee:

O&G will be bringing a Sense of the Senate Resolution asking for the appointment of a Presidential Taskforce on the Needs of Native Students, Faculty and Staff for the next Senate meeting.

O&G is also working on a referral received from the Provost on disbanding the University Sabbatical Committee. In addition, O&G is working on a policy referral about amending the membership of the Program Planning Committee.

7. University Updates:

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

The VPAF and his team are working on plans for reopening the campus and what must be done between now and Fall 2021. We are looking at July 2021 as the start date.

b. From the AS President:

The AS Budget was signed by the President.

AS is in the midst of the AS Elections.

AS Scholarships are now open, so if you know any eligible students please encourage them to apply.

On March 18, 2021, AS will host the Spartan Talent Event.

AS is working on return to work plans.

AS is currently hiring a new Administrative Assistant.

Questions:

Q: Did your last AS Board Meeting go well?

A: It went very well.

C: The AS meeting was great. There were new meeting measures put in place and the Vice President ran the meeting with these measures in place.

Q: How do we avoid the issue AS had this year with getting their budget signed?

A: This was a DocuSign issue. It was not anyone's fault. It was a logistical error and not a hold-up by the President.

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

COVID Testing in the residence halls is continuing and we are still in the single digits. However, there is an increasing push by the students for more engagement with one another. We hope to continue to provide a safe environment in the residence halls.

About \$14.8 million has been allocated out to students from the American Rescue Act.

There have been many COVID cases and deaths around the country. We are looking at our procedures and policies around Greek Life. So far, our Greek organizations have been handling COVID protocols very well. They are trying to keep students safe. It is hard for these students, because all they want to do is just engage.

Questions:

Q: Will we get to see a contract or report on EAB?

A: The VPSA will be happy to report. We did have a meeting and talked about the issues that have been raised on how predictive analytics are utilized. There are lots of good options. They were very receptive and willing to come back and talk more about it anytime.

A: [Provost] We can go through and have a conversation on the variables. The tools are only as good as the cultural politics of the campus. We need some mechanism to pay attention to our students.

C: [President] This is an important conversation. Whatever we do with the information we collect is very important.

C: It would be great if we could get a follow-up report on what they are doing in about a month. Would that be possible?

A: I know what we are doing. I'm not sure we can hold EAB completely to this. We did look at EAB's contract and decided to go another way.

d. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

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

On April 7, 2021, the CDO will have an event with the Nursing Department and the College of Health and Human Sciences led by Michelle Hampton (Antiracism Reprogramming in Health Professions Education). There will be a longer institute in the summer open to all CSUs with CHHS programs.

e. From the Provost:

There will be a Townhall meeting next Monday. We are hitting records every day on vaccinations.

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

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on March 15, 2021 and transcribed on March 31, 2021. The minutes were reviewed and edited by Chair Mathur on April 1, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 5, 2021.

Executive Committee Minutes
April 5, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur met with the Family Advisory Board and it was a wonderful opportunity to talk with some of the parents about the Senate. We talked about what their concerns were and how the Senate could provide assistance. It is a relatively new board. We discussed key resources on campus with whom the Board may want to connect. It was a very rich experience.

There are a number of reports due to the Senate throughout the year. We only have a few meetings left and we have asked for those remaining reports to be submitted in writing due to the packed agenda for the final meetings of the year. This includes a report on Academic Integrity, Exceptional Admissions, etc.

Chair Mathur has invited Dr. Junelyn Peeples, Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics (IESA) to speak with the Executive Committee about the Campus Data Warehouse Project.

The Exceptional Assigned Time Committee is being reconstituted for this academic year. It was supposed to expire in 2017, but the policy was amended to allow it to be extended as long as the contract was in effect and they continue to extend the contract. The Senate's role is to appoint the General Unit member.

C: In the past, one of the issues in getting someone to apply for this position is that the General Unit members are not allowed to apply for this award because they are not classified as being in teaching positions and so is difficult to provide assigned time for these faculty (e.g., librarians, counselors).

2. The Executive Committee Agenda was approved (Executive Committee Agenda of 4-5-21, and Executive Committee Minutes of March 15, 2021)(15-0-0).

3. From the President:

We have come up with a hybrid model for Commencement. Students will be able to sign-up to walk across the stage with their name being announced and have a few family members with them. The formal degrees will still be handed out in a virtual format. The hybrid experience will cover three days. The President and Provost will be there. Students will have the opportunity to put their gowns on and walk across the stage. The President is very excited about this opportunity.

The President has been spending time with our elected officials and talking about our campus priorities. We are pushing hard for a path for our California Dreamers. The other piece we are talking about is the Recovery Act and the Infrastructure Bill. SJSU has over ½

billion in infrastructure needs. We are optimistic that we will get some one-time funding for infrastructure. We are pushing for a Public Institutions Infrastructure Package.

We are hard at work on a repopulation plan for the campus. University Personnel is doing a lot of work on this as well. In terms of staff, we are looking at when they will come back, how that will be phased in, what the density will look like to have a safe environment.

SJSU had hoped to be a vaccination site, but the County of Santa Clara decided not to go with us. We are working with the Chancellor's Office and the county and haven't given up on this. As we continue to increase the amount of vaccine that is available in the county, we hope they will reconsider. As you may have heard there are some universities that have stipulated that vaccinations will be required of all students. We aren't there yet and the President is not sure we will ever be there. We will be looking at ways to strongly encourage this. We may require it in residence halls and in Athletics.

You may not be aware of a new bill AB 940 that would increase support for mental health for our students. We are working hard to support this bill.

Chancellor Castro will be visiting the campus virtually on May 4, 2021. We are still working out the details, but he will be visiting with various groups on campus.

Questions:

Q: There have been lots of complaints about the outside firm that has been helping with the website transfers. People are saying they are not helpful and seem confused. One chair told me she had over 30 emails about this. Can someone look into this?

A: [President] I had no idea. I will take it back to the folks that can look into it.

C: The Senate website was supposed to be migrated starting on March 23, 2021 and we have had no movement yet. We were initially supposed to be migrated over on December 15, 2020 and got moved to March 2021. It has been extremely frustrating.

A: I get it. It is never a fun thing to do. I will share the feedback and see what we can do.

Q: Speaking of mandating vaccines, is the reason we can't mandate having students get the vaccine because we are a public university?

A: [President and VP Day] We can't even figure out if we can mandate because of the Emergency Use Authorization. There is a whole set of data that has to go with this authorization. I think it is highly doubtful we will get to a point of requiring vaccinations beyond those activities that are optional such as living in residence halls and Athletics. This is what I'm hearing. We are getting guidance from the Chancellor's Office. As we know more we will share that with you. The challenge is that now the variants are highly contagious.

Q: I'm curious to know for some of these optional activities that may require vaccines if there will be proposals for some of these apps that are being used for proof of vaccination like daily pass? Is that part of the conversation or would people be allowed to use other methods to show proof of vaccination?

A: [President] We haven't even gotten to that point and I haven't even heard of these apps yet. This hasn't even come up yet.

C: If this comes forward hopefully we can have a conversation about it.

A: [President] Absolutely.

C: I have heard concerns from people about Commencement being on the exam make-up day and now faculty are having to rearrange those exam makeups.

A: [President] Duly noted.

4. Senator Sasikumar, Chair of the Organization and Government Committee, announced that AS President, Zobeida Delgadillo just received acceptance to a Master's degree in Sports Management at University of San Francisco and was awarded a scholarship. The committee congratulated AS President Delgadillo.
5. The committee discussed and approved the general unit nominee for the Exceptional Assigned Time Committee.
6. University Updates:
 - a. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

Lots of work going on around the campus with construction and new spaces and improvements such as in Audiology and the International House. The Science building is continuing to make progress. There are some field issues on South Campus we are working through. With people not physically around we can get a lot more done.

Questions:

Q: The faculty in the College of Science were recently told there has been a significant delay in building the College of Science.

A: We haven't had this problem until this year with the state Fire Marshal, but they are really far behind in inspections. We are assessing how much of an issue this can cause us right now. It is probably from three to six months delay. We are trying to figure out if the fall is at risk now or not. We are trying to get the siding up on the building in the next month and then things can move more quickly.

Q: When we return to face-to-face instruction, what does the faculty member need to do if a student refuses to wear a mask? Some CSU Campuses are saying call the police? Other campuses have response teams that go out.

A: [VPSA] We are working on this right now. Faculty should not be calling the police. There will be some kind of a response team or person. We haven't thought this through completely yet, but we are working through scenarios.

C: There is a concern among faculty about in the moment response by faculty. How do you respond on the fly?

A: [VPSA] There will probably be some information on that and this is what we are working on. It is not nearly as simple as sending someone to the classroom.

Q: There is a new Chief of Police in San José and I'm wondering if there have been discussions between our Chief of Police and San José's Chief of Police regarding downtown safety?

A: Our Chief of Police meets routinely with all the other local police chiefs. In addition, we routinely walk the paths students travel going to and through the campus checking for problem areas and broken lights, etc.

C: Because of all the recent attacks on Asian people, I'm very concerned with all our students, faculty, and staff returning to campus.

Q: There was an incident a couple weeks ago where a student who is Asian was assaulted close to campus. Are we able to provide safety to our students, faculty, and staff in walking to campus?

A: The original report was filed with the San José Police Department, but it occurred on the edge of campus near 4th Street. We were able to look at surveillance information and track down and arrest the perpetrator the same day we got the information. This was really good hard work by our UPD.

b. From the AS President:

Voting in AS Elections will be held on April 12-13, 2021. A virtual meet and greet the candidates on Instagram will be held this week with debates following next week.

Please encourage students to sign-up for coffee with a faculty member through the Center for Faculty Development. The first 100 students to sign-up will receive coffee gift cards.

AS is working on renewing their operating agreement. The current agreement expires on June 30, 2021.

AS is also working on their staffing plan for Fall 2021.

Questions:

Q: When will the election results be available?

A: We will know on April 15, 2021.

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

The intent to enroll numbers are going back up to what they were in Fall 2019. That is really good news. For example, our first-time freshmen are at 76% and our transfer students are at 57%. It is early, but it is good the number is bouncing back. This is good news early on in the process.

We are still seeing our FAFSA applications down. That is a concern. We don't know if students are leaving because they couldn't do the online learning, or if they have moved to other institutions. We just don't know yet. We are down 1%, but that is about 600 students. Our Dream Act students are down about 5% or 56 students. Hopefully, we will make progress with the re-enrollment campaigns we have going on right now. The good news is that fall is looking good albeit very early in the process.

We are doing our APID/A review. In addition, the Taskforce on Community and Policing will be wrapping up their report shortly.

Questions:

Q: With regard to standardized test scores, has there been any movement towards ending that process permanently? What is the comparison of FAFSA applications at SJSU to other universities?

A: There has been no additional news on the standardized tests. There was a real interest in not going back. The consensus among VPSA's is not to go back. With regard to FAFSA, what we know is that FAFSA completion rates vary across communities. There are some trends. Some communities have different perspectives around financial aid than others. I'll have to get back to you on where SJSU is specifically. It is a challenge.

C: It would be helpful to have a comparison of SJSU to other universities.

A: Sure, I'll look into where we are.

C: [President] Please tell them about your nomination.

A: [VPSA] Yes, I've been nominated by the CSU to the CA Student Aid Commission. There are some significant things proposed with regard to CAL Grants. There is a real interest in expanding CAL Grants.

C: Some of the reasons our students don't use FAFSA is that in some Latinx and Southeast Asian communities there is a fear that if you get financial aid you are in a mixed status family in terms of immigration status. This will require a lot of education to change these concerns/fears.

Q: Has there been any kind of exploration of what kind of communication is going to students from EAB? For example, if a student is reported to be at-risk for not completing the coursework. I haven't been answering, because there used to be a dropdown menu that had options for the faculty member like financial reasons, mental health reasons, etc. I'm wondering if they are getting communication from EAB about this and whether they might be also getting emails from others saying something like, "We understand you might be struggling financially, let us help."

A: [VPSA] We probably need to be looking at all communication to students. The Provost and I have been on three or four calls with them. We have spoken about communication and specifically how students are selected, how their model works, and how equity and race are used in their model. Yes, we are in the process of getting answers from them.

A [Provost] There is no messaging going to students from EAB. All messaging is done by SJSU. It is a tool with analytics behind it that does the work. What is interesting about that is different universities have selected different inputs to inform the algorithm. It is not an individually oriented tool, it is an aggregate tool.

If you are worried about what happens with the data, not much is being done with it right now. What the model is predicting right now is potential to graduate. Shockingly, the predictions look like the historical graduation rates of the institution, which show an equity gap in graduation between different populations.

The data is not widely used except for the VPSA's folks.

A: [Provost] It is critical that we train our advisers so they know as soon as they see the data where they need to reach out and provide help.

Q: How much are we paying for this tool we aren't using very much?

A: The CSU was paying for it initially, now we are. The problem is we don't have enough analytic people in front of it to use it effectively to target things.

d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

The CDO and the Department of Nursing are partnering on an event on April 7th where they are looking at anti-racism and dismantling racism within Health and Human Sciences. It is a 3 hour conference. There are other CSUs attending that have

professional programs. It is being led by Dr. Michelle Hampton. We are bringing in guest speakers. It is really a kickoff for things like how to write case studies that are not stereotyping. It is also a kickoff for a summer long institute. Our office is putting together a pretty extensive canvas course dealing with equity and systemic racism.

The first meeting of the Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will have its first meeting on April 16, 2021. There will be four meetings and a summer retreat. The co-chairs are Anne Marie Todd and Angee Ortega McGhee.

Just to remind folks, the Chauvin trial is underway in Minnesota. This has affected a number of our faculty, staff, students, and community members. We think the trial will be done in a month. We are very concerned that if the trial doesn't go against Chauvin, there will be a lot of distress in our community.

Anti-Asian and Anti-APID/A hate continues to be a concern as well.

Questions:

Q: We used to have an over 65 years old program at SJSU. I loved having those students in my class and the younger students benefited from those interactions. What happened to this program? Are we going to start focusing on ageism?

A: [President] We will look into what happened and see what may be possible.

C: There has been a lot of excitement about the APID/A Center. Many faculty, staff and students have been waiting a long time for this center (including APIFSA)

e. From the Provost:

We did a search for a Special Advisor to the Provost on Sustainability. The committee recommended William DeVincenzi from the College of Business.

The Honor Taskforce will report back to the Provost in the next week or so.

The VPAF and Provost have been working together on the International House renovation. Looks like they will start with safety upgrades. They plan to house students there in Fall 2021.

The VPSA and Provost have been having lots of discussions about advising. We are going to be investing in a restructuring of advising and an increase in the number of advisers who will start with a first-year set of people with a ratio almost unheard of in higher education. We will be looking for leadership on that side. The idea behind the model is that for the first 60 units students will have the same adviser. We will have a serious training program this summer. Over the next three years we will roll out a really aggressive advising plan.

Questions:

Q: Can we get an update on scheduling for Fall?

A: I've suggested to departments to try to use flexibility so that students have different options for multiple sections. We don't yet know the distancing requirements. We don't yet know if we will be in the yellow tier. Will there be changes? The usual ones. Will there be wholesale changes? We don't plan on it. We will do an evaluation here soon as

far as classrooms. We may have to move some classes around if the space isn't being used effectively.

Q: Can you go into more detail about the advising you talked about, especially with regard to faculty advisers? Is there going to be a way for faculty to get messages to the GE advisers or how will that play out?

A: We don't have an effective training program for advisers. We want to take and train advisers for a full month, before they begin advising any students. What we are talking about right now is mainly GE advising. We are going to want real outcomes based learning objectives. We don't have that right now. We don't have a consistent note-taking system. Obviously, we also need a feedback mechanism from the departments and deans. These new first-year advisers will be the most trained on campus. Advisers will be hired and after their first year will move up and a new group of advisers will take their place.

Q: Are you also going to train faculty?

A: Faculty won't be involved in GE advising, only in major advising.

C: I have to disagree with you about that. Faculty should take an interest in advising students so they take the GE classes needed for their major.

A: Faculty move around a lot. I'd rather faculty spend their time doing other things.

C: I find advising in GE more rewarding than a lot of things I do at SJSU. I'm afraid if you give this up to professional advisers less faculty will want to be involved in GE advising.

A: I taught all GE. As a department chair if I thought it was valuable for a faculty member to learn GE, I assigned them GE classes. The top 10 reasons students leave a university include financial difficulties, health and welfare issues. We need professional advisers who can stick with the student.

C: The learning outcomes that the Area F GRP has created will not be modified. We as a Senate are going to utilize the expertise of our Ethnic Studies faculty. Also, the Area F GRP will not be disbanded and will continue with the course approval process.

7. The meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 5, 2021 and transcribed on April 9, 2021. The minutes were reviewed and edited by Chair Mathur on April 9, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 12, 2021.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee**
3 **April 19, 2021**
4 **Final Reading**

AS 1814

5
6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment A to University Policy F20-1**
10 **Adding Classes After Advance Registration**
11

12
13 **Whereas:** The Waitlist Work Group, in consultation with the College of Graduate
14 Studies and Graduate Admissions and Program Evaluations (GAPE), has
15 suggested modifications to the standards by which graduate students will
16 qualify as a graduating student for accommodation on the waitlist;
17 therefore be it

18
19 **Resolved:** That F20-1 be amended as follows.
20
21

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

26 When demand for a course exceeds the enrollment cap for the course, students who wish to
27 enroll may place themselves on a waitlist. When a department elects to use waitlists to
28 automatically enroll courses, students who are on the waitlist will be automatically enrolled up to
29 the enrollment cap of the course should a space become available.
30

31 Departments, in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Studies and/or the College of
32 Graduate Studies, may opt out of using waitlists for select courses both during Advance
33 Registration and after the term begins.
34

35 Waitlists will remain active for 9 days from the first day of instruction for the semester and will
36 continue to automatically enroll courses to their enrollment caps from the waitlist. The waitlists
37 will remain active only for the Add Advance Registration Period for the Winter and Summer
38 sessions.
39

40 The students on waitlists will primarily be ordered based on the date a student signed up for the
41 waitlist, though the waitlists will be adjusted to give priority to graduating seniors and graduating
42 graduate students. Due to this adjustment, a student's position on the waitlist may change over
43 time.
44

45 Graduating seniors will be given priority to enroll in courses from the waitlists. Graduating
46 seniors are defined as those who have an approved graduation application on file for the current
47 term or the subsequent two terms, including the summer term. Graduating seniors will be
48 moved to the top of waitlists on an ongoing basis, both during Advance Registration and after
49 the term begins.

- 50 • Graduating seniors must have an approved graduation application on file for the current
51 or subsequent two terms, including summer term, in order to be moved to the top of the
52 waitlist.
- 53 • Graduating seniors must meet all necessary conditions for the waitlist.
54

55 Graduating graduate students will be given priority to enroll in courses from the waitlists.
56 Graduating graduate students are defined as those who have an approved candidacy form on
57 file for an active program and at least 21 units completed ~~the current term or the~~
58 ~~subsequent two terms, including the summer term~~. Graduating graduate students will be moved
59 to the top of waitlists on an ongoing basis, both during Advance Registration and after the term
60 begins. Graduating graduate students will be moved to the top of the waitlists for upper division
61 and graduate level courses with the same standing as graduating seniors.

- 62 • Graduating graduate students must have an approved candidacy form on file for an
63 active program and at least 21 units completed ~~the current or subsequent two terms,~~
64 ~~including summer term~~, in order to be moved to the top of the waitlist.
- 65 • Graduating graduate students must meet all necessary conditions for the waitlist.
66

67 When multiple graduating students are moved to the top of the list, they will be ordered based
68 on the time they signed up for the waitlist.
69

70 Waitlists will be used to automatically enroll a course up to the enrollment cap. Students who
71 are on the top of waitlist may not be enrolled if they are not able to satisfy all necessary
72 conditions. These conditions may include the following:

- 73 • Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if they are enrolled in another section of the
74 course.
- 75 • Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if they have a time conflict with another course.
- 76 • Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if the additional units will cause the student to
77 exceed any maximum-unit limit that applies to the student, such as first-semester
78 freshman, first-semester-transfer students, or those on academic probation, etc.

79
80

81 **Approved:** March 15, 2021

82 **Vote:** 11-0-2

83 **Present:** Austin, Chuang, Delgadillo, Gomez Marcelino, Jackson
84 (non-voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao,
85 Rollerson, Sen, Sullivan-Green(chair), Wilson, Wolcott,
86 Yao

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

88 **Financial impact:** None expected.

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

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:** April 12, 2021
69 **Vote:** 10-0-0
70 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Monday, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quock, Mahendra,
71 Barrera
72
73 **Absent:** Smith
74
75 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact
76 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
77
78

79 **APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, AND RANGE ELEVATION**
80 **FOR LECTURER FACULTY**

81
82 **1. Introduction**

83
84 1.1. Purpose

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

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

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

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

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

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

116
117 The procedures provided in this policy are consistent with the terms of
118 the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the
119 California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association
120 (CFA). To apply this policy requires frequent reference to the CBA,
121 which covers pay, length of appointment, and numerous other matters
122 that are closely related to the provisions of this policy.

123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165

1.3. Guidance

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

1.4. Confidentiality

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

2. Titles

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

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

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

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

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

166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209

3. Initial and Subsequent Appointments

3.1. Appointment Letters and Timing

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

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

3.2. Nature of Work Assignments

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

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.

- 210
- 211 3.3.1. LA: Initial appointment at this range is for an entry-level lecturer
- 212 showing promise as an educator. A candidate for this range
- 213 would typically possess at least a Master's degree and/or
- 214 equivalent specialized professional expertise or experience.
- 215 Persons without a qualifying degree may be appointed in this
- 216 range with approval from faculty services.
- 217
- 218 3.3.2. LB: Initial appointment at this range is for a person showing
- 219 promise as an educator and/or scholar or practitioner. They will
- 220 have the appropriate terminal degree, or a lower degree and
- 221 additional specialized professional expertise and experience in
- 222 the field that is deemed equivalent to the terminal degree.
- 223
- 224 3.3.3. LC: Initial appointment at this advanced range is for a person
- 225 demonstrating notable achievements or contributions in the field
- 226 as an educator and/or scholar or practitioner. They will have the
- 227 appropriate terminal degree and substantial expertise and
- 228 experience, or lower degree and advanced specialized
- 229 professional expertise and experience that is deemed equivalent
- 230 to the terminal degree. Appointment at this level implies the
- 231 ability to teach advanced upper division and/or graduate
- 232 courses, although such an assignment is not required of the
- 233 appointment.
- 234
- 235 3.3.4. LD: Initial appointment at this highest range is for an established
- 236 senior educator and/or scholar or practitioner. The candidate will
- 237 have the appropriate terminal degree and advanced expertise and
- 238 experience or a lower degree and recognition as a leader in the
- 239 field with extensive specialized professional expertise and
- 240 experience that is deemed equivalent to the terminal degree.

241

242 3.4. Careful Consideration for Reappointment

243

244 Lecturer faculty shall receive careful consideration in the appropriate

245 situations, as per the CBA (12.7). Chairs and Administrators should

246 consult UP Faculty Services/Employee Relations regarding the meaning

247 of "careful consideration" prior to making reappointment decisions for

248 lecturer faculty.

249

250 **4. Evaluation**

251

252 4.1. General Process

253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296

- 4.1.1. Notification. Lecturer faculty should be notified of evaluation criteria and procedures as per the CBA (15.3). Decision makers should be aware that the current CBA requires notification “no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction in the academic term.”
- 4.1.2. Purpose: The performance of lecturer faculty should be carefully evaluated in order to provide students with the best instruction possible and to assist in the careful consideration of lecturer faculty for any future Lecturer or probationary positions for which they may be candidates.
- 4.1.3. Multiple Assignments: lecturer faculty are to be evaluated separately within each department for which they have an assignment.
- 4.1.4. The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) shall be defined by and include all material as outlined in the CBA (15.8).
- 4.1.5. Periodic Evaluation: The CBA (15.23) calls for periodic evaluation of lecturer faculty which results in written statements to be placed in the lecturer's Personnel Action File. The specifics of the periodic evaluation are explained below.
- 4.1.6. Optional Response: lecturer faculty shall be issued recommendations at each level of review and have an opportunity for rebuttal or response as per CBA (15.5).

4.2. Review Process

- 4.2.1. Frequency of Evaluations
 - 4.2.1.1. Lecturer faculty holding three (3) year appointments pursuant to Article 12 of the CBA, shall be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment (CBA 15.26).
 - 4.2.1.2. Lecturer faculty appointed for two or more semesters, regardless of a break in service, shall be evaluated in accordance with the periodic evaluation procedure (CBA 15.23, 15.24).
 - 4.2.1.3. Lecturer faculty appointed for one semester or less shall be evaluated at the discretion of the Department Chair, appropriate administrator, or the department. In addition, the

297 lecturer may request that an evaluation be performed (CBA
298 15.25).

299
300 4.2.1.4. Volunteer and visiting lecturer faculty: volunteer and
301 visiting lecturer faculty with an appointment of one academic
302 year or less need only be evaluated if the appropriate
303 administrator or Department Chair requests such evaluation.
304 Visiting faculty cannot be appointed for more than one year.
305

306 4.2.2. Role of Chairs and Committees

307
308 4.2.2.1. Full-time lecturer faculty and lecturer faculty
309 undergoing a three year cumulative review shall be evaluated
310 by a department committee of tenured faculty.
311

312 4.2.2.2. All other lecturer faculty shall be evaluated by the
313 Department Chair, who may choose to consult with a
314 department committee of tenured faculty. If the Department
315 Chair suspects that a rating of “needs improvement” or
316 “unsatisfactory” may be indicated, the Chair is advised to
317 consult with a department personnel committee before
318 concluding the evaluation.
319

320 4.2.2.3. The Department Chair, if not serving on the
321 department committee, may make a separate
322 recommendation as part of the evaluation process.
323

324 4.2.3 Documentation for Evaluation

325
326 4.2.3.1 In accordance with the CBA (15.23, 15.24), documentation
327 for evaluation shall include:

328
329 4.2.3.1.1 All available data from student opinions of teaching
330 effectiveness (SOTEs) in accordance with university policy on
331 teaching evaluation
332

333 4.2.3.1.2 All available direct observation(s) of teaching by
334 peers
335

336 4.2.3.1.3 Information provided by the lecturer on an “Annual
337 Summary of Achievements” form
338

339 4.2.3.1.4 Evidence of performance in academic assignment
340 including course materials such as syllabi and evidence of
341 performance in other assignments if applicable.
342

343 4.2.3.1.5 Evidence of required qualifications (e.g. credential,
344 continuing education).
345

346 4.2.3.1.6 All department and administrative level evaluation
347 recommendations from the current cycle, and all rebuttal
348 statements and responses submitted.
349

350 4.2.3.1.7 Unsolicited materials. In addition to materials
351 required by policy and/or provided by the candidate, the CBA (11.4,
352 15.2, 15.8) permits the inclusion of additional information provided
353 by faculty unit employees, students, external reviewers, and
354 academic administrators. For such materials to be inserted into the
355 working personnel action file without the consent of the candidate,
356 they must be submitted to the Department Chair or Dean before the
357 closing date, and they must subsequently be inspected by an
358 administrator with relevant academic credentials designated by the
359 President to determine a) if the insertion is allowed under the
360 Collective Bargaining Agreement, and b) that the insertion is both
361 germane to the criteria of this policy and neither prejudicial nor
362 defamatory. If the insertion is allowed, it will be withheld from the
363 working personnel action file until the candidate has been given at
364 least seven days to include a response to the material.
365

366 4.2.3.1.8 If the lecturer under review does not submit any
367 material, evaluation will be based on information available within
368 the electronic evaluation portal.
369

370 4.2.4 The Lecturer's WPAF including the evaluations of the department
371 committee and Chair, if applicable, shall be forwarded to the Dean.
372 Following the review, the Dean shall forward copies of the
373 completed evaluation and Summary of Achievements to UP Faculty
374 Affairs for placement in the official Personnel Action File and to the
375 faculty member and the department.
376

377 4.2.6 The evaluation process must be completed by the date indicated in
378 the annual calendar established by UP-FS. Evaluations must be
379 included in the careful consideration process where applicable
380 (addenda or revisions may be submitted later if necessary).
381

382 4.3. Criteria for Evaluation

- 383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
- 4.3.1. The most fundamental principle of the evaluation of lecturer faculty is that they be evaluated in terms of their particular assignment and the criteria appropriate to that assignment. For example, if a Lecturer Faculty is appointed to teach .8 and do service at .2, then 80% of the evaluation should focus on criteria appropriate to teaching and 20% on criteria appropriate to service. Such a Lecturer Faculty may not be evaluated directly on scholarship.
 - 4.3.2. Many lecturer faculty have substantial accomplishments in areas that are not directly covered by their assignment—i.e., scholarship in the case of instructional lecturers. Such lecturer faculty should be encouraged to explain how these achievements have a bearing on teaching and thus could be considered as an enhancing factor in the evaluation of the actual assignment. Similarly, lecturers who contribute service should be encouraged to show how this activity enhances student success, campus climate, and/or their assigned activities. Asking for consideration of activities that may indirectly enhance the actual assignment will be at the option of lecturer faculty.
 - 4.3.3. The evaluation of teaching must be holistic and in accordance with the University policy on the evaluation of teaching (F12-6.) “When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. This means that teaching must be considered in context and must be evaluated using multiple sources of information.” (F12-6). Such sources of information include the candidate’s own statements via the annual summary of achievements, course materials such as syllabi, direct observations, and student opinion surveys.
 - 4.3.4. Certain assignments may require continued currency in a field and/or the maintenance of professional credentials, e.g., licensure in a professional field for accreditation requirements. Such requirements should be delineated in an appointment letter, and then may be evaluated as part of the assignment.
 - 4.3.5. If colleges or departments develop any supplementary criteria (e.g. licensure, clinical practice experience, training required by accreditation) for evaluating lecturer faculty, these criteria shall not be changed until after the conclusion of the current evaluation process (CBA 15.3).

426 4.3.6. Lecturer faculty annual evaluations will be characterized using the
427 following scale:

428
429 4.3.6.1. Unsatisfactory. The documentation does not establish that
430 the performance in the assignment has been fully met and
431 completed.

432
433 4.3.6.2. Needs improvement. The documentation does not
434 establish that the performance in the assignment has been
435 fully met and completed, but modest improvements as
436 indicated in the review—if promptly implemented—would
437 result in a satisfactory performance.

438
439 4.3.6.3. Satisfactory. The documentation establishes that the
440 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
441 completed.

442
443 4.3.6.4. Good. The documentation establishes that the
444 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
445 completed, and with a level of experience and quality that
446 goes beyond the minimum.

447
448 4.3.6.5. Excellent. The documentation establishes that the
449 performance in the assignment has been fully met and
450 completed, and with a level of experience and quality that
451 goes significantly beyond the minimum.

452
453 4.3.7 Lecturer faculty cumulative evaluations will be characterized using a
454 dichotomous scale of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

455 456 **5. Range Elevation**

457 458 5.1. Definition and Principles

459
460 5.1.1. Definition: Range elevation refers to movement on the salary
461 schedule for lecturer faculty to the next range (e.g. LA to LB, LB to
462 LC, or LC to LD). Range elevation represents a form of
463 advancement in salary and classification based on evaluation of
464 performance in assignment.

465
466 5.1.2. Eligibility: lecturer faculty become eligible to apply for a range
467 elevation when they meet the requirements stipulated in the CBA
468 and any pertinent ancillary documents. They shall be informed of
469 their eligibility by UP-FS. Counselor faculty classification review

470 follows a different process (CBA 12.30); hence counselor faculty
471 are not covered under the range elevation portion of this policy.

472

473 5.1.3. Range elevation does not imply any guarantee of future
474 employment nor does it affect the conditional nature of the
475 temporary appointment

476

477 5.2. Process

478

479 5.2.1. At the beginning of each academic year, UP-FS will establish a
480 timeline for applications for range elevation and provide this
481 information to Chairs and Deans and eligible lecturer faculty.

482

483 5.2.2. Lecturer faculty who are eligible for range elevation in more than
484 one department or unit must apply separately in each department or
485 unit in which they are eligible.

486

487 5.2.3. Application Process: lecturer faculty seeking range elevation must
488 submit their application with the appropriate documentation via the
489 current electronic process.

490

491 5.2.4. Documentation. Material supporting a lecturer's request for range
492 elevation should include:

493

494 5.2.4.1 Curriculum Vitae

495 5.2.4.2 Narrative statement. This section should summarize the
496 candidate's professional growth and development that
497 warrants range elevation. The narrative should be limited to
498 2000 words and should explain how the evidence supports
499 the evaluation of the particular assignment of the lecturer as
500 outlined in the letter(s) of appointment. For example, if the
501 assignment is to teach, then the evidence should be related
502 to teaching—even indirectly, such as if research or service
503 activities can be shown to promote currency in the discipline
504 needed for effective teaching.

505 5.2.4.3 Evidence of Professional Growth and Development. Appendix
506 A provides examples that may be appropriate evidence,
507 depending on the specific assignment of the candidate, and
508 depending upon the arc of the candidate's professional
509 development.

510 5.2.4.4 Copies of all periodic evaluations, SOTEs received during all
511 years of the assignment in accordance with university
512 policies on teaching evaluation, periodic direct
513 observation(s) of teaching, and copies of all past department

514 and administrative level evaluation recommendations
515 including rebuttal or response statements submitted, if
516 available. If the assignment was for greater than six years,
517 then only materials from the most recent six years are
518 required.

519 5.2.4.2. A comprehensive index of all materials shall be prepared by
520 the faculty member and submitted with the range elevation
521 materials.

522

523 5.2.5. Criteria

524

525 To be recommended for range elevation, a lecturer must
526 demonstrate professional growth and development appropriate to
527 the lecturer's work assignment and the mission of the university
528 during the period between the date of initial appointment or, where
529 applicable, the date of the last range elevation and the time of the
530 current request. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not a
531 criterion for range elevation. This is the only review period in which
532 candidates' professional achievements shall be evaluated. Appendix
533 A lists examples of activities that may be used to demonstrate
534 appropriate professional growth and development.

535

536 5.2.6. Levels of achievement

537

538 Higher level of advancement (such as from C to D) require higher
539 levels of professional growth and development than do lower levels
540 (such as from A to B.) While sustained satisfactory performance in
541 the work assignment may be sufficient for elevation to LB,
542 performance evaluated as good or excellent is required for range
543 elevation to LC and LD, respectively. Applicants should document
544 their professional growth and development as appropriate for the
545 nature of their assignment as outlined in the letter(s) of appointment,
546 their academic discipline, and the particular range for which they are
547 applying.

548

549 5.2.7. Review Process—Department or Equivalent Unit: Range elevation
550 requests shall be evaluated by the personnel committee composed
551 of tenured faculty that are elected by probationary and tenured
552 faculty (may be the RTP committee) within the department or
553 equivalent unit. The Department Chair may provide a separate
554 review if he or she did not serve on the personnel committee. The
555 committee shall write an evaluation and make a written
556 recommendation to the Dean. The Department Chair, if performing a

557 separate review, shall do the same. The recommendations will be
558 forwarded to the candidate who will have a ten-day period to submit
559 a written rebuttal or response, if desired. The recommendation(s)
560 and rebuttal will then be forwarded to the Dean.

561
562 5.2.8. Review Process—Dean: The Dean will review the recommendations
563 of the department and make a recommendation. A copy of the
564 recommendation will be sent to the candidate who will have ten days
565 to respond in writing. The recommendations and candidate
566 responses (if any) will then be forwarded to UP-FS and the Provost
567 for final review and action.

568
569 5.2.9. Decision by the President. The result of the reviews by the
570 department and Dean is to deliver a recommendation to the Provost
571 for the President's final decision with respect to the request for range
572 elevation. The President may choose to delegate authority to decide
573 in whole or in part to the Provost.

574
575 5.2.10. Effective date of range elevation: Range elevation salary increases
576 shall be effective as indicated in the CBA (12.16).

577
578 5.2.11. Peer Review Process: Denial of a range elevation is subject to
579 appeal to a Peer Review Panel. UP-FS shall establish a single Peer
580 Review Panel consisting of three full-time tenured faculty (not
581 including faculty in the FERP program) who have served on
582 committees in the preceding academic year that made
583 recommendations on matters of retention, tenure, and promotion
584 and who have attained the rank of full professor or equivalent.
585 Faculty services shall select at random from the eligible full-time
586 tenured faculty three (3) members and one (1) alternate for service
587 on the Peer Review Panel. A member of the Peer Review Panel
588 may not hear an appeal of a range elevation denial if he/she is in
589 the same department as the appealing lecturer. Relevant dates and
590 steps in the peer review process are explained below.

591
592 5.2.11.1. A lecturer who wishes to request peer review for
593 denial of range elevation shall request peer review no later
594 than 21 days after the receipt of the denial.

595
596 5.2.11.2. The Peer Review Panel shall follow the timeline
597 outlined by the CBA (12.20). The Peer Review Panel shall
598 notify the candidate and Provost of its findings and decision.
599 The Peer Review Panel shall forward to the Provost all

600 written materials it considered. The decision of the Peer
601 Review Panel shall be final and binding.

602

603 5.3. Range Elevation Amount

604

605 5.3.1. Range elevation for lecturer faculty shall be accompanied by an
606 advancement in salary of a minimum of 5% (or to the minimum of the next
607 range) (Article 31.6).

608

609 5.3.2. Deans may recommend an increase greater than the minimum called for
610 in the CBA and shall provide reasoning for such to the Provost. The decision
611 to award a range elevation greater than the minimum is at the final
612 discretion of the Provost.

613 **Appendix A**

614

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

621

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

628

629 1. Teaching related.

- 630 ● activities enhancing the effective teaching of the discipline
- 631 ● collaborative teaching
- 632 ● creative activities in support of effective teaching
- 633 ● development of instructional materials
- 634 ● increased mastery of knowledge in fields relevant to the teaching
635 assignment
- 636 ● enhanced mastery of knowledge in relevant fields via scholarly activity
- 637 ● involvement of students in the research and creative processes
- 638 ● completion of a higher academic degree

639

640 2. Service related

- 641 ● advising and mentoring student associations
- 642 ● development of standards and/or outcomes assessment
- 643 ● curriculum and program development
- 644 ● contributions to improving the campus climate: the promotion of mutual
645 respect and acceptance of diversity in all its forms
- 646 ● grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support
647 pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University
- 648 ● leadership and participation in service activities of professional
649 associations
- 650 ● external fundraising and resource development related to the mission of
651 the university
- 652 ● leadership and special contributions to the basic instructional mission of
653 the university

- 654 ● leadership in faculty governance, including the Academic Senate and its
655 committees, campus life at the department, college, university, CSU
656 system level, and CFA leadership.
- 657 ● maintenance and technical support of university labs, equipment,
658 materials, supplies, safety standards and any other support of
659 environments that require advanced professional attention
- 660 ● mentoring of colleagues
- 661 ● organizing events and activities for the sharing of ideas and knowledge
- 662 ● recruitment and retention of students
- 663 ● research and/or creative activity in the discipline thesis research and
664 supervision
- 665

666 3. Research related

- 667 ● collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the
668 community
- 669 ● editing of publications
- 670 ● participation at professional meetings and presentations at conferences
- 671 ● contributions to the community, including professional efforts which bring
672 the community and the campus together
- 673 ● publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- 674 ● research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy
- 675 ● patents and innovations credited to the lecturer

676

677 **Appendix B**

678

679 This appendix describes titles and categories of faculty.

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

681

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

685 These categories of faculty include:

686

- 687 ● Lecturers—Describes all part-time and full-time temporary instructional
688 faculty.
- 689 ● Unit 3 temporary faculty with assignments in Athletics, Library and
690 Student Services Professional Academic-Related (SSP-AR)
691 (Counseling)—Employees in these areas will have designations
692 appropriate to their field, while differentiated from their tenure/tenure
693 track faculty colleagues.
- 694 ● Visiting Faculty—A full-time instructional faculty member for up to one
695 academic year, and is a category defined by the CBA (12.32). Visiting
696 faculty are a separate classification, independent from tenure track
697 faculty and from lecturer faculty. It should be noted that the hiring of
698 Visiting Faculty shall not result in the displacement or time base
699 reduction of an incumbent Temporary Faculty Unit Employee as
700 reflected in the order of work in provision 12.29.
- 701 ● Visiting Scholars--J-1 visa holders and non-J-1 visa holders coming to
702 the university through an exchange visitor program. Visiting Scholars are
703 a separate classification, independent from tenure track faculty and from
704 lecturer faculty.
- 705 ● Volunteer faculty—are defined in the CBA as “faculty who are not
706 receiving direct compensation from the CSU for the assigned Unit 3
707 work.” As such, this is not a separate category of faculty but a separate
708 category of compensation.
- 709 ● Adjunct faculty—is a term no longer used by the CBA.

710

711 **B.2 Honorary Titles Established by SJSU.**

712

713 SJSU uses the following honorary titles to honor and distinguish various sub-
714 categories of faculty from within the official designations of the CBA.

715

- 716 ● Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting
717 Professor, Visiting Lecturer. These are all honorary titles that may be
718 used as subsets of the Visiting Faculty designation of the CBA. These

719 honorific titles may be used when a Visiting Faculty has earned such a
720 title at a prior institution.

721

722 ● Distinguished Visiting Lecturer or Distinguished Visiting Professor.
723 These are honorific titles that may be used as subsets of the Visiting
724 Faculty designation of the CBA. These designations are reserved for
725 visitors with particularly distinguished careers, and must be approved by
726 the Provost after a request from the appropriate college Dean which
727 documents the qualifications and contributions that warrant this title.

728

729 ● Distinguished Visiting Scholar. This is an honorific title that may be used
730 as a subset of the Visiting Scholar designation of the CBA. This
731 designation is reserved for visiting scholars with particularly
732 distinguished careers, and must be approved by the Provost after a
733 request from the appropriate college Dean which documents the
734 qualifications and contributions that warrant this title.

735

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

740

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **April 19, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**
6

AS 1816

7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Amendment C to University Policy S17-11**
9 **Revisions to Organization of the Program**
10 **Planning Process at SJSU**

11
12 **Amends:** S17-11

13
14 **Effective:** Immediately

15
16 **Whereas:** There have been changes in Academic Affairs positions responsible for
17 program planning; and

18
19 **Whereas:** San José State University continually monitors, updates, and improves its
20 curriculum through the program planning process; and

21
22 **Whereas:** Administrative restructuring should be reflected in the membership of the
23 Program Planning Committee; therefore be it

24
25 **Resolved:** That Article III.B. of S17-11, regarding the membership of the Program
26 Planning Committee be amended as follows: Seat A (III.B.i) be changed
27 from "Office of the Provost" to "Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
28 and Strategic Analytics;" Seat B (III.B.ii) from "Vice Provost for
29 Undergraduate Education designee" to "Vice Provost for Undergraduate
30 Education or designee;" and Seat D (III.B.iv) from "Director of Institutional
31 Research or designee" to "Dean of Graduate Studies or designee."
32
33
34
35

36 **Approved:** April 5, 2021

37 **Vote:** 12-0-0

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

40 **Absent:** None

41 **Financial impact:** None anticipated

42 **Workload impact:** Reduction in workload for administrators who are no longer serving,
43 and greater workload for administrators joining the committee

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment D to University Policy S14-5
Modification of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI),
and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)

Amends: S14-5 and 2014 GE Guidelines

Whereas: Amendment C to University Policy S14-5 was signed by the President to create a 3-unit GE Area F and reduce the GE Area D unit requirement from 9 units to 6 units to bring SJSU in alignment with California Education Code 89032; and

Whereas: [Presidential Directive 2019-01 on General Education Area D](#) is not compliant with the current CSU General Education Breadth Requirements; and

Whereas: The SJSU GRP Area F Group proposed area learning outcomes and curriculum content that was reviewed and recommended by the General Education Advisory Committee and then submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee; and

Whereas: Area D and Area F criteria must be implemented by Fall 2021, but more time is needed to gather feedback and review the other areas of the GE Guidelines, therefore be it

Resolved: The Academic Senate recommends that Presidential Directive 2019-01 be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved: That the attached Area D language, replacing the Area D language in the 2014 GE Guidelines, shall be adopted effective Fall 2021; and be it further

Resolved: That the attached Area F language shall be inserted into the 2014 GE Guidelines and shall be adopted effective Fall 2021; and be it further

Resolved: That Curriculum and Research Committee will continue the full review of the 2014 Guidelines considering all feedback that has been given; and be it further

Resolved: That Undergraduate Education Office will collaborate with the Chancellor's Office and departments to determine and implement a curricular solution for programs that would exceed the 120 unit limit because of changes to Areas D and F.

Rationale: These changes to the GE Guidelines incorporate the inclusion of the new GE Area F (Ethnic Studies) and reduction of Area D to 6 units based upon consideration of the feedback that has been received by the Curriculum and Research Committee.

Timeline and Implementation: First Time Freshman entering SJSU Fall 2021 and after will be subject to the updated 2014 GE Guidelines including the new Area F. According to CSU policy, continuing SJSU students and continuously enrolled California Community College transfer students can opt to adhere to the GE Guidelines aligned with their catalog rights.

Approved: April 12, 2021

Vote: 9-0-1

Present: Anagnos, Backer, d'Alarcao, Hart, Izenstark, Kaur, Kitajima, Masegian, Schultz-Krohn, White (chair)

Absent: Abousalem, Khavul

Workload impact: There will be a temporary increase in workload for (1) faculty to update syllabi and curriculum to bring into compliance with the updated GE Guidelines for Area D and F, (2) the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) and General Education Review Panels created to help GEAC certify courses for the new Area F, (3) changes to Area D courses to reflect the new learning outcomes, (4) staff to make changes to the online catalog, degree roadmaps, various websites, publications and PeopleSoft, and (5) articulation staff to work with community colleges. The SJSU Catalog must contain the updates to Area D and at least one course in the new Area F in order to meet all catalog requirements and student rights. In order to accomplish this at least one course for the new Area F must be reviewed and approved by GEAC.

Appendix

Area D: Social Sciences

6 semester units

NOTE: The CSU requires students to complete General Education courses in the Social Sciences in at least two different disciplines. Students may meet this requirement by either 1) taking two lower-division Area D courses in different disciplines, or 2) taking two lower-division Area D courses in the same discipline and an Area S upper-division GE course in a different discipline.

Area D courses increase students' understanding of human behavior and social interaction in the context of value systems, economic structures, political institutions, social groups, and natural environments. Through fulfillment of the Area D requirement, students develop an understanding of problems and issues from different disciplinary perspectives and examine issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D.

A. Goals

Students learn from Area D courses that human behavior is inextricably interwoven with social, political, and economic institutions. By exploring the principles, methodologies, values systems, and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry, students come to appreciate processes of social change and social continuity, the role of human agency in those social processes, and the forces that engender social cohesion and fragmentation.

B. GE Area D Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of an Area D course, students should be able to:

1. demonstrate understanding of the ways in which social institutions, culture, and environment shape and are shaped by the behavior of individuals, both past and present;
2. compare and contrast the dynamics of two or more social groups or social systems in a variety of historical and/or cultural contexts;
3. place contemporary social developments in cultural, environmental, geographical, or historical contexts;
4. draw on social/behavioral science information from various perspectives to formulate applications appropriate to contemporary social issues.

C. **Content**

1. Courses shall include fundamental skills necessary to the practice of social science.
2. Courses shall teach students how to practice social science, not just understand what social scientists have concluded.
3. Course content shall develop students' analytical skills and understanding of social science in ways that develop the capacity for informed civic engagement.

Diversity Requirement

Issues of diversity shall be incorporated in an appropriate manner.

Writing Requirement

The minimum writing requirement is 1500 words in a language and style appropriate to the discipline.

American Institutions Requirement

Area D courses may meet American Institutions requirements if they:

1. focus on cultural pluralism; and
2. meet the criteria for American Institutions and Area D.

Instructor qualifications

1. an understanding and appreciation of general education;
2. a doctorate (preferred but not required);
3. college-level teaching experience or graduate training in the subject matter of the course; and
4. sections designed for foreign students require substantial formal training and experience in teaching speakers of other languages, in addition to above requirements; and
5. a professional commitment to the learning needs of a diverse student body;
6. teaching associates shall be allowed to teach a GE class only after training and under close supervision of an expert in the field.

F: Ethnic Studies Requirement

The Area F requirement is based on the premise that all students graduating from the CSU have an understanding of race, racism, and social justice history in the United States. As stated in AB1460/California Education Code 89032 Section 2 Subsection (d): “Commencing with students graduating in the 2024-25 academic year, the California State University shall require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one three-unit course in ethnic studies.”

To fulfill this requirement, eligible courses shall have the following prefixes: Native American Studies (NAS/AIS), African American Studies (AFAM), Asian American Studies (AAS), and Chicana/Latina Studies (CCS). Courses without ethnic studies prefixes may meet this requirement if cross-listed with a course with an ethnic studies prefix. Currently, San José State has three ethnic studies programs/departments whose classes meet the Area F requirements, as stated under the AB1460 guidelines: AFAM, AAS, and CCS. To ensure that the AB1460 guidelines are met, any additional programs that are created with ethnic studies prefixes, must undergo a thorough evaluation process and be approved by the ethnic studies experts in the GRP.

A. Goals

- Students will acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for comprehending continued sovereignty movements, the racial and ethnic dynamics, and colonial settler and social justice histories of the United States, and the socio-historical origins, processes, and consequences of racial construction, racialization, and racial oppression in the society in which they live.
- Students will learn core interdisciplinary and comparative concepts and frameworks in ethnic studies with a focus on understanding race and ethnicity as they apply to the historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Chicana/Latina Americans.
- Students will gain the skills to better operate as responsible, informed, and constructive citizens in an evolving multiracial and multicultural democracy.

B. Student Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of an Area F course, students should be able to: discover and critically evaluate significant topics, then compose and deliver oral and/or media-driven presentations on these topics as related to the group(s) studied in *this* class. Area F emphasizes comparative concepts and frameworks in ethnic studies with a focus on historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Chicana/Latina Americans. Approved courses shall meet at least three of the five following student learning outcomes:

1. Analyze and articulate concepts such as race and racism, racialization, ethnicity, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self-determination, liberation, decolonization, sovereignty, imperialism, settler colonialism, and anti-racism.
2. Apply ethnic studies theory and knowledge to describe and actively engage with anti-racist and anti-colonial issues and the practices and movements that have and continue to facilitate the building of a more just and equitable society.
3. Critically analyze the intersection of race and racism as they relate to class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, tribal citizenship, sovereignty, language, and/or age.
4. Critically review how struggle, resistance, racial and social justice, solidarity, and liberation are relevant to current and structural issues such as communal, national, international, and transnational politics as, for example, in immigration, reparations, settler-colonialism, multiculturalism, language policies.
5. Describe and actively engage with anti-racist and anti-colonial issues and the practices and movements that have contributed to the building of a more just and equitable society.

C. Content:

1. Courses shall establish foundational knowledge appropriate to the area of study and focus on critically analyzing the socio-historical origins, processes, and consequences of dominance and subordination in regards to race, ethnicity, patriarchy, power, and social stratification.
2. Courses shall be inclusive of interdisciplinary and intersectional theories & methods by incorporating social science and humanistic scholarly approaches in its course materials.
3. Courses shall include readings, lectures, relevant media, creative works, and facilitate discussions which introduce students to core and new interdisciplinary and comparative concepts and frameworks in ethnic studies.
4. Each course shall include written and oral assignments and in-class exercises that develop the skills necessary for critiquing a range of literature including: a critique of dominant narratives, interpreting historical documents, and drawing logical conclusions related to ethnic studies content.
5. Courses shall incorporate materials and assignments that include cultural and creative expression that will allow students to develop research, analytical, and critical thinking skills.
6. Courses shall incorporate applied knowledge and practical application through creative and/or media-driven assignments that illustrate value to the community at large.

Diversity requirement

Issues of diversity shall be incorporated in an appropriate manner.

Writing requirement

The minimum writing requirement is 1500 words in a language and style appropriate to the discipline. All writing shall be assessed for grammar, clarity, conciseness, and coherence.

Class size

Lower division courses shall be limited to 40 students.

Supplementary assistance

Some students may require special or more assistance than the regular class can provide. In such cases, faculty shall refer the student to the appropriate program for special or supplementary assistance.

Instructor qualifications

1. A thorough understanding of the Area F general education requirements and its implementation;
2. a doctorate (preferred but not required) in ethnic studies or related fields such as: Native American Studies (NAS/AIS), African American Studies (AFAM), Asian American Studies (AAS), and Chicanx/Latinx Studies (CCS) ;
3. college-level teaching experience or graduate training that demonstrates qualifications to teach in one of the ethnic studies areas (NAS/AIS, AFAM, AAS, CCS);
4. sections designed for foreign students require substantial formal training and experience in teaching speakers of other languages, in addition to above requirements; and
5. a professional commitment to the learning needs of a diverse student body;
6. teaching associates shall be allowed to teach a GE class only after training and under close supervision of an expert in the field.

Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to University Policy F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic

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

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

Resolved: That F20-2 be amended to remove the language as shown:

That SJSU should, so far as is legally possible, convert all WU grades in Fall 2020 ~~and Spring 2021~~ to W grades.

Resolved: That SJSU should consider, so far as legally possible, converting all grades of Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) to No Credit (NC) for Winter and Spring 2021.

Approved: April 12, 2021

Vote: 12-2-0

Present: Austin, Gomez Marcelino, Hill, Jackson (non-voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao, Rollerson, Sen, Sorkhabi, Sullivan-Green (Chair), Wilson, Wirth, Wolcott, Yang

Absent: Chuang, Delgadillo, Walker, Walters, Yao

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
April 19, 2021
Final Reading

AS 1812

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION
Expressing Support for
Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion
To be carried out by the Professional Standards Committee
AY 2021-2022

Resolved: The Academic Senate of San José State University receives the attached report by the Professional Standards Committee entitled “Roadmap for Equity Reform of RTP policies;” be it further

Resolved: The Academic Senate endorses the approach outlined in the “Roadmap” and looks forward to reviewing the particular policy recommendations that may emerge from this effort.

Approved: April 12, 2020.

Vote: 10-0-0

Present: Peter, Wang, Raman, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quock, Mahendra, Barrera, Monday

Absent: Smith

Financial Impact: Long term reforms unknown, no impact to produce the policy recommendations.

Workload Impact: Significant work for the Professional Standards Committee and others.

34
35 **Roadmap for Equity Reform of RTP policies**
36 **The Professional Standards Committee**
37 **April 2021**
38

39 **Overview and Rationale:**
40

41 In AY 2020-2021, the Professional Standards Committee began the process of examining
42 our Retention, Tenure, and Promotion policies to better promote fairness, equity, and
43 inclusion in the retention, tenure, and promotion of our faculty. While our university has
44 spearheaded various initiatives to recruit diverse faculty, progress in faculty diversification
45 has been slow. As noted in our report from Spring 2020, the University needs to carefully
46 examine how it supports our diverse faculty as they transition through the various career
47 stages laid out in the CBA and University policy.¹
48

49 The Professional Standards Committee is concerned that our RTP policies lack
50 sufficiently specific language about fairness, equity, and inclusion. The obsolete policy
51 (S98-8) referred to educational equity, but this reference and other related paragraphs
52 were not carried forward into the new policy (S15-8.) While the new policy (S15-8) is
53 broad enough to encompass educational equity activities, the lack of specific language
54 misses an opportunity to further shift our culture towards wider acceptance and reward for
55 this important work. Furthermore, we suspect that the workload associated with
56 educational equity activities falls disproportionately on certain segments of our faculty.
57 Failing to adequately reward this work introduces structural inequalities into the RTP
58 system.
59

60 To address the situation, Professional Standards drafted and the Senate reviewed a first
61 reading item, “On enhancing service to students” (first reading included in Appendix B).
62 While there were no specific objections to the language we drafted, we received
63 considerable feedback that much more substantive changes were warranted, including
64 deeper and wider consultation with the Campus community. Professional Standards has
65 “heard” this advice, and decided to focus its work over the next year on a broader review
66 of equity issues in the Criteria and Standards RTP policy. This resolution is a first step
67 designed to memorialize the work done so far, to organize the future reform effort, and to
68 solicit Senate support going forward.
69

70 **Record of the Spring 2021 Service Amendment:**
71

72 Appendix B reflects the initial amendment presented to the Senate with revisions
73 undertaken immediately after by the Committee. The Committee realized that this
74 proposed amendment would not be comprehensive or sufficient, but hoped it could
75 address some aspects of fairness, equity, and inclusion in RTP evaluation in time for the
76 next cycle. But the feedback from the Senate was that a half measure may be worse than
77 no measure, and so a broader reform effort would be needed, even at the cost of delay.
78 We record this amendment as an initial step—parts of which may be useful in the
79 upcoming broader reforms. The following steps outline the broad approach for the
80 Professional Standards Committee in AY 2021-2022.
81

¹ <https://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/rtpreport.pdf>

82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122

Consultation and Information Gathering:

To undertake a careful review of our RTP Policies with an eye on fairness, equity and inclusion will require consulting with a broad range of members of our University community. The Professional Standards Committee is committed to consulting with groups and individuals throughout the campus community. The following list is far from exhaustive:

1. BIPOC faculty: three focus group meetings each with a focus on different areas of achievement: Academic Assignment, Service, RSCA. Separate groups should focus on assistant professors vs. ranks
2. The Faculty Diversity Committee
3. Center for Faculty Development
4. Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
5. Director of Black and African American Equity, Patience Bryant. Director Bryant has received and shared correspondence (e.g. Black Spartan Advisory Council, APIFSA)
6. UCCD: may be beneficial to break it out as focus groups on three different areas, Academic Assignment, Service, RSCA
7. Past RTP evaluators from college and university committees
8. Individuals who have just gone through the RTP process
9. Consultation with faculty more generally
10. Additional groups yet to be identified

Timeline for Reform:

Taking more time to do a thorough review of RTP equity has a cost—every year faculty go through the existing system. Since changes in RTP policies cannot go into effect except between RTP cycles (as per contract) Professional Standards is committed to completing any necessary policy changes during the next Academic Year. To meet this deadline the following timeline will be necessary:

1. Fall 2021 - intensive series of consultations, rough draft of language for RTP document. Focusing on Criteria and Standards policy.
2. Spring 2022 - share rough draft with RTP committee, work through edits, collect feedback from groups on language/changes, edit draft further, bring forward to Senate by end of Spring 2022.

123 **Appendix A:**

124

125 **Materials consulted to date:**

126

127 Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association, letter to President Papazian and
128 SJSU Community, July 28, 2020.

129

130 Belong @ SJSU survey results. <https://www.sjsu.edu/belong/findings/index.php>

131

132 Black Spartan Community, letter to President Papazian, August 25, 2020.

133

134 Gibson, Amerlia M. *Civility and Structural Precarity for Faculty of Color in LIS*. Journal of
135 Education for Library and Information Science 2019 Vol. 60, No. 3.

136 Kezar and Posselt, eds. *Higher Education Administration for Social Justice and Equity*.

137 Routledge, 2020.

138 Rucks-Ahidiana, Zawadi. "The Inequities of the Tenure-Track System." Inside Higher Ed,
139 June 7, 2019.

140

141 SfN Neuronline. "Leveling the Playing Field: Improved Tenure and Promotion Practices
142 Lead to a More Diverse Faculty."

143

144 Shillington et. al. "Commentary: COVID-19 and and Long-Term Impacts on Tenure-Line
145 Careers." *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, Volume 11, Number 4.

146

147 SJSU Diversity Initiatives. [https://www.sjsu.edu/diversity/systemic-
148 racism/initiatives/index.php](https://www.sjsu.edu/diversity/systemic-racism/initiatives/index.php)

149

150 SJSU Faculty Survey summary. [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zWhMnbCTrZHe-ydP4-
151 HpA67CRdaXd077/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zWhMnbCTrZHe-ydP4-HpA67CRdaXd077/view)

152

153 Wong(Lau), Kathleen. Letter to Black Spartan Advisory Council. March 16, 2021.

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161 **Appendix B:**

162

163 **First reading presented to the Senate on February 8, 2021, with committee edits**
164 **from February 15, 2021**

165

166

167

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

168

Amending S15-8

169

**University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:
170 **Criteria and Standards****

171

To enhance service to students

172

173

174

1.4.1

175

2.0 Categories of Achievement:

176

....

177

2.4 Service

178

2.4.1 The third basic category for evaluation is service. Contributions in
179 service are expected for continuation and advancement in the
180 University. All faculty have an obligation to contribute to the
181 governance of the institution, ~~and~~ to enhance the surrounding
182 community, and to contribute to our core mission of providing equal
183 educational opportunities for our diverse students.

184

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

186

2.4.2.1 Service to students. Service to students. Advising,
187 mentoring, and participating in activities to enhance student
188 learning and success that are not subsumed in teaching or
189 the primary academic assignment. ~~that go beyond the~~
190 curriculum.

191

2.4.2.2 Service to the University. Participation in the Academic
192 Senate and its committees, search and review committees,
193 program coordinators and part-time department chairs,
194 leadership in the California Faculty Association,
195 membership in the Academic Senate of the CSU, work on
196 system-wide committees and task forces, administrative
197 activities (to the extent that such assignments are not the
198 primary academic assignment), and participation in
199 campus organizations and clubs of benefit to faculty or
200 students.

201

2.4.2.3 Service to the Community. Participation in public interest
202 groups sponsored by or affiliated with the University;
203 Service in the local, state, national, or global communities
204 as a representative of SJSU.

205

2.4.2.4 Service to the Profession/Discipline (see also Professional
206 Achievement.) Consulting, service on editorial boards or

207 as editor of a professional journal or newsletter;
208 adjudicator, reviewer for publishers or other agencies and
209 associations. Public lectures, newspaper editorials,
210 television or radio analysis, honors and awards. Active
211 participation or leadership in disciplinary or professional
212 associations; organizing panels, activities or workshops.
213 Serving in accreditation or other discipline-based review
214 capacities, Service to K-14 educational segments.

215 2.4.2.5 Educational equity activities. Providing support to
216 historically underserved students, helping to shrink the
217 achievement gap, increasing student retention, helping
218 students transition to work or to further education, working
219 to make our faculty, staff, and administration more
220 representative of the student population we serve, and
221 partnering with staff, community members, and other allies
222 in the effort to make our educational opportunities equitable
223 for all.

224 2.4.3 Significant service should be systematically evaluated and
225 documented. Election to a position in a contested election is a form
226 of peer evaluation of service. Faculty should also request written
227 evaluation of significant service from persons in a position to know
228 the extent and quality of their contributions, such as the chair of a
229 committee.

230 2.4.4 Considerations for Applying the Criteria for Service

231 2.4.4.1 Service expectations increase with rank. As faculty gain
232 experience at the university, they will normally assume
233 greater responsibility for service activities at all levels.

234 2.4.4.2 Higher levels of service require higher standards for
235 evaluation. While fairly routine levels of service will often
236 be listed rather than evaluated, service accomplishments
237 involving leadership, the production of documents, the
238 management of organizations, the creation of opportunities
239 for students, and other tangible results should be
240 independently evaluated in order to be eligible to be
241 designated at higher levels of achievement.

242
243
244

245 3.3 Criteria to be used when evaluating candidates for Promotion and Tenure

246

247 3.3.3 Service

248

249 3.3.3.3 Baseline. The candidate has undertaken a fair share of the workload
250 required to keep the Department functioning well. This includes activities such
251 as work on department committees, educational equity activities, the creation or
252 revision of curricula, the assessment of student learning outcomes, or
253 participating in department planning, accreditation, outreach, and advising. This
254 level of achievement must include some documented service to students. A

255 baseline level of achievement for promotion to Professor will also include at
256 least some service at the University level.

257
258 3.3.3.4 Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has
259 documented extensive and effective engagement in one or more service
260 categories. The nature of this documentation will vary depending on the nature
261 of the service, but in all cases the service must be described and evaluated by
262 faculty, administrators, students, or community members in a position to
263 understand its importance and impact. Service at this level will usually
264 transcend basic department functions and may include college-level service,
265 University level service, service in the community, significant activities in a
266 professional organization, engagement with students and student
267 organizations, and effective educational equity activities.

268
269 3.3.3.5 ~~Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has also~~
270 ~~participated in significant service activities beyond the department. This will~~
271 ~~usually include college-level service and may include University level service,~~
272 ~~service in the community, or significant activities in a professional organization.~~
273 ~~In at least one facet of service, the candidate will have demonstrated leadership~~
274 ~~resulting in tangible, documented achievements.~~

275
276 3.3.3.6 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate
277 has documented significant influence at a high level characterized by
278 leadership in one or more service areas. For University service, candidates will
279 generally have occupied several elected or appointed positions of leadership.
280 For service to students, to the community, and towards educational equity,
281 candidates will document leadership leading to specific accomplishments that
282 have widespread and/or deep significance. In service to the
283 profession/discipline, candidates will also have taken leadership roles in their
284 professional organizations or may have served as leading editors of journals or
285 senior organizers of professional activities

286
287 ~~3.3.3.7 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate~~
288 ~~has documented significant influence at a high level, whether it be service to~~
289 ~~students, the University, the community, or the profession. Candidates who~~
290 ~~achieve an evaluation of “excellent” in service will generally have occupied~~
291 ~~several elected or appointed positions of leadership and will document multiple~~
292 ~~specific accomplishments that have significance for people beyond the~~
293 ~~candidate’s department or college.~~

294
295
296

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **April 19, 2021**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1811

7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment B to S16-8**

9 **Revision to University Policy, Selection and Review of Administrator**

10
11 **Amends:** University Policy S16-8

12
13 **Effective:** Immediately

14
15 **Whereas:** Library staff comprise two-thirds of library employees and are responsible
16 for the complex and ever-changing infrastructure that supports the library's
17 services and resources; and

18
19 **Whereas:** Increasing staff representation on the committee that chooses the library
20 dean would bring a valuable perspective to the search as well as increase
21 equity in representation; and

22
23 **Whereas:** The faculty majority on the committee may be maintained by increasing
24 faculty representation; therefore be it

25
26 **Resolved:** That Article 1.3.2 of S16-8, be amended as follows: "The search
27 committee shall be composed of **eleven** members: **four** faculty librarians
28 selected by and from the faculty librarians; **two** Library staff members,
29 selected by the staff of the university library; one department chair from
30 outside the library; one faculty member (not a chair) from outside the
31 library; one student, one Dean (from outside the Library), and one member
32 of the community, each designated by the Provost. The committee chair,
33 ideally a faculty member, shall be appointed by the Provost.

34
35 **Approved:** April 5, 2021

36 **Vote:** 12-0-0

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

39 **Absent:** None

40 **Financial impact:** None anticipated

41 **Workload impact:** None anticipated

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**
4 **April 19, 2021**
5 **First Reading**
6

AS 1810

7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment E to University Policy S14-5**
9 **Adopting new Program Learning Outcomes for General Education**
10

11 **Amends:** S14-5 and 2014 GE Guidelines
12

13 **Whereas:** The WASC Senior College and University Commission requires that
14 academic “programs ensure the development of core competencies
15 including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative
16 reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking”; and
17

18 **Whereas:** General Education underwent a program review in Academic Year 2016-
19 17 with a notable recommendation that a taskforce be created to oversee
20 developing an “overall model for GE Assessment”; and
21

22 **Whereas:** A task force deliberated for four months to propose new Program Learning
23 Outcomes as a way to provide coherence to the GE program and
24 establish a foundation for GE Assessment; and
25

26 **Whereas:** GE Summits were held in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 to gather feedback
27 for the proposed Program Learning Outcomes; and
28

29 **Whereas:** The Curriculum and Research committee reviewed all feedback from the
30 GE Summits; therefore, be it
31

32 **Resolved:** That the attached Program Learning Outcomes and preamble be adopted
33 for General Education to replace the existing learning outcomes.
34

35 **Approved:** April 12, 2021

36 **Vote:** 10-0-0

37 **Present:** Anagnos, Backer, d’Alarcao, Hart, Izenstark, Kaur, Kitajima, Masegian,
38 Schultz-Krohn, White (chair)

39 **Absent:** Abousalem, Khavul

40 **Workload impact:** No impact anticipated to adopt the new learning outcomes.

41

42 **Appendix**

43 **SJSU General Education Program Learning Outcomes and Goals**

44

45 **Preamble:** SJSU's general education program establishes a strong foundation of
46 versatile skills, fosters curiosity about the world, and prepares students to engage and
47 contribute responsibly and cooperatively in a multicultural, information-rich society.
48 General education classes integrate areas of study and encourage progressively more
49 complex and creative analysis, expression, and problem solving. The program aims to
50 equip students with the knowledge, skills, and values they need for a lifetime of
51 intellectual and personal growth.

52

53 The program has three goals and nine program learning outcomes (PLOs):

54

55 **Goal 1: To develop students' core competencies for academic, personal, and**
56 **professional pursuits. Goal 1 has five learning outcomes (PLOs 1-5):**

57

58 PLO 1. [Oral Communication] Create and deliver well-organized, well-supported, and
59 compelling messages both in presentation and in conversation for specific audiences
60 and diverse settings.

61

62 PLO 2. [Written Communication] Develop and practice a writing process that accounts
63 for the goals, dynamics, and genres of written communication, with special attention to
64 the conventions of writing at the university.

65

66 PLO 3. [Critical Thinking] Identify and analyze a subject/topic/issue/problem of
67 significance by evaluating the merits of different positions or perspectives; support the
68 analysis with relevant evidence and information while stating assumptions; and draw
69 well-supported conclusions.

70

71 PLO 4. [Quantitative Reasoning] Analyze, interpret, and represent quantitative
72 information in various forms to examine a question; explain the processes behind data
73 collection and generation; and communicate evidence in support of an argument or
74 purpose while stating assumptions, limitations, and biases, and drawing appropriate
75 conclusions.

76

77 PLO 5. [Information Literacy] Identify information needs, locate and access relevant and
78 credible information while accounting for bias, and use information legally and ethically.

79

80 **Goal 2: To enact the university’s commitment to diversity, inclusion, and justice**
81 **by ensuring that students have opportunities to serve and contribute to the well-**
82 **being of local and global communities and the environment. Goal 2 has two**
83 **learning outcomes (PLOs 6 and 7):**
84

85 PLO 6. [Diversity, Inclusion, and Justice] Examine diverse cultures, communities, and
86 environments; explore different perspectives; analyze connections to issues of
87 justice/injustice; and prepare to live and work responsibly and cooperatively in
88 multicultural societies.

89
90 PLO 7. [Civic and Global Engagement] Engage with global perspectives and
91 knowledge; develop civic skills, interests, and values; and apply knowledge, skills and
92 values to multicultural, community, and environmental interests.

93
94 **Goal 3: To offer students integrated, multidisciplinary, and innovative study in**
95 **which they pose challenging questions, address complex issues, and develop**
96 **cooperative and creative responses. Goal 3 has two learning outcomes (PLOs 8**
97 **and 9):**
98

99 PLO 8. [Integration and Application]: Integrate and apply knowledge and methods from
100 more than one discipline or area of study to explore a complex question, address an
101 issue, or produce a creative work.

102
103 PLO 9. [Reflection and Self-Assessment]: Evaluate and reflect on one’s own learning
104 while building on prior knowledge and life experiences.

6
7 **SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION**
8 **Endorsement of**
9 **The University of Chicago Statement on**
10 **Freedom of Expression**

- 11
12 **Whereas:** Academic Freedom is a cherished value and a necessary condition for the
13 work of a University; and
14
15 **Whereas:** Numerous threats to Academic Freedom from across the political spectrum
16 have emerged in recent years; and
17
18 **Whereas:** The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act of 1979 (HEERA)
19 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement support academic freedom in
20 teaching, research, and learning through the free exchange of ideas among
21 the faculty, students, and staff of the Californian State University; and
22 whereas
23
24 **Whereas:** In 2014, the University of Chicago Committee on Freedom of Expression
25 authored an influential defense of academic freedom¹ that has since be
26 endorsed by 81 universities²; and
27
28 **Whereas:** The 2014 Chicago Statement is entirely consistent with SJSU’s own policy
29 on academic freedom and professional responsibility (S99-8); therefore, be
30 it
31
32 **Resolved:** The Academic Senate of San José State University (SJSU) endorses the
33 2014 statement on Freedom of Expression (attached) authored by the
34 University of Chicago committee, and stands firmly with the growing list of
35 responsible universities who have done so; be it further
36
37 **Resolved:** Copies of this resolution shall be distributed widely to students, faculty, and
38 staff members of the SJSU community, to the Academic Senate of the CSU,
39 the campus senates of the CSU, campus and higher education publications
40 and media outlets, Offices of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (or equivalent)
41 in the CSU, the University of Chicago Committee, the AAUP, and other
42 interested parties.
43
44 **Approved:** April 12, 2020.
45 **Vote:** 11-0-0
46 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quock,
47 Mahendra, Barrera, Monday
48 **Absent:** None
49 **Financial Impact:** None foreseen
50 **Workload Impact:** None foreseen

¹ <https://freexpression.uchicago.edu/foundational-principles/>

² <https://www.thefire.org/chicago-statement-university-and-faculty-body-support/>

Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression

The Committee on Freedom of Expression at the University of Chicago was appointed in July 2014 by President Robert J. Zimmer and Provost Eric D. Isaacs “in light of recent events nationwide that have tested institutional commitments to free and open discourse.” The Committee’s charge was to draft a statement “articulating the University’s overarching commitment to free, robust, and uninhibited debate and deliberation among all members of the University’s community.”

The Committee has carefully reviewed the University’s history, examined events at other institutions, and consulted a broad range of individuals both inside and outside the University. This statement reflects the long-standing and distinctive values of the University of Chicago and affirms the importance of maintaining and, indeed, celebrating those values for the future.

From its very founding, the University of Chicago has dedicated itself to the preservation and celebration of the freedom of expression as an essential element of the University’s culture. In 1902, in his address marking the University’s decennial, President William Rainey Harper declared that “the principle of complete freedom of speech on all subjects has from the beginning been regarded as fundamental in the University of Chicago” and that “this principle can neither now nor at any future time be called in question.”

Thirty years later, a student organization invited William Z. Foster, the Communist Party’s candidate for President, to lecture on campus. This triggered a storm of protest from critics both on and off campus. To those who condemned the University for allowing the event, President Robert M. Hutchins responded that “our students . . . should have freedom to discuss any problem that presents itself.” He insisted that the “cure” for ideas we oppose “lies through open discussion rather than through inhibition.” On a later occasion, Hutchins added that “free inquiry is indispensable to the good life, that universities exist for the sake of such inquiry, [and] that without it they cease to be universities.”

In 1968, at another time of great turmoil in universities, President Edward H. Levi, in his inaugural address, celebrated “those virtues which from the beginning and until now have characterized our institution.” Central to the values of the University of Chicago, Levi explained, is a profound commitment to “freedom of inquiry.” This freedom, he proclaimed, “is our inheritance.”

More recently, President Hanna Holborn Gray observed that “education should not be intended to make people comfortable, it is meant to make them think. Universities should be expected to provide the conditions within which hard thought, and therefore strong disagreement, independent judgment, and the questioning of stubborn assumptions, can flourish in an environment of the greatest freedom.”

The words of Harper, Hutchins, Levi, and Gray capture both the spirit and the promise of the University of Chicago. Because the University is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University of Chicago fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community “to discuss any problem that presents itself.”

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University may restrict expression that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University’s commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

In a word, the University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University’s educational mission.

As a corollary to the University’s commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest

speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

As Robert M. Hutchins observed, without a vibrant commitment to free and open inquiry, a university ceases to be a university. The University of Chicago's long-standing commitment to this principle lies at the very core of our University's greatness. That is our inheritance, and it is our promise to the future.

Geoffrey R. Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law,
Chair

Marianne Bertrand, Chris P. Dialynas Distinguished Service Professor of
Economics, Booth School of Business

Angela Olinto, Homer J. Livingston Professor, Department of Astronomy and
Astrophysics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College

Mark Siegler, Lindy Bergman Distinguished Service Professor of Medicine and
Surgery

David A. Strauss, Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law

Kenneth W. Warren, Fairfax M. Cone Distinguished Service Professor,
Department of English and the College

Amanda Woodward, William S. Gray Professor, Department of Psychology
and the College