

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2018/2019

Agenda

November 5, 2018, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call –**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - Senate Minutes of October 1, 2018***
 - Senate Minutes of October 15, 2018***
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President of the University
- IV. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
 - EC Minutes of October 8, 2018***
 - EC Minutes of October 22, 2018***
 - B. Consent Calendar –
 - Consent Calendar of November 5, 2018***
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- V. **Unfinished Business:**
- VI. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
 - AS 1713, Policy Recommendation: University Writing: Requirements/Guidelines and Support by the University Writing Committee (First Reading)***
 - AS 1714, Policy Recommendation: University Grading System Policy (First Reading)***
 - B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
 - C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
 - AS 1715, Senate Management Resolution, Creating a Task Force for a Supportive Workplace and Calling Upon our Community to Preserve Civility and Combat Bullying at San José State University (First Reading)***
 - AS 1716, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of S96-2, Direct Instruction Obligation (First Reading)***

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
***AS 1717, Policy Recommendation, Amendment of Bylaw
15a (First Reading)***

E. University Library Board (ULB):

VII. Special Committee Reports:

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

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

X. Adjournment:

2018/2019 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
October 1, 2018**

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CHHS Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Day, Ficke, Wong(Lau)
Faas
Absent: Papazian

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Khavul
Absent: Bullen

Deans:

Present: Stacks, Olin
Absent: Ehrman, Elliott

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gill,
Pang, Rodriguez, Kethepalli
Absent: Gallo

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Ramasubramanian, Kumar, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Mok, Ormsbee
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart, Trulio
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Higgins, Matoush, Hurtado
Monday, Trousdale
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of September 17, 2018 were approved.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Details on the Celebration of Life for Dr. Amy Strage will be announced shortly. Dr. Gleixner is collecting stories and memories to give to Dr. Strage's family at the event. The MLK Library is also hosting a table in honor of Dr. Strage from October 8, 2018 to November 6, 2018.

Chair Frazier is still working on getting a meeting setup between Athletics and the Senate to hear information about concussions.

The mayor of San José alerted the Senate Chair to Measure V on the ballot for November regarding affordable housing. The city is actively talking to SJSU administration about partnering on projects that would create rent restricted housing for SJSU staff and students. AS will be planning a forum and Chair Frazier will be sending out a message with details to the Senate.

There have been a number of policies that are still pending in the President's Office. In order to keep track of those, Chair Frazier has had the Senate Administrator create a document of pending policies and post it on the website with the policies.

B. From the President of the University – Not present-no report.

IV. State of the University Reports:

A. CSU Statewide Senator –

There are a group of venture philanthropists that are conducting field orchestrations of higher education. They create new media platforms and in-house research, and they form alliances of educators and government officials. They also create local groups that make it seem like there is a local grass roots issue going on. They have incentives for compliance and cooperation and they heavily lobby legislators. The U.S. is susceptible to these things. The problem is we aren't graduating enough students and we aren't graduating enough students of color at the rates others are graduating students. These groups say they have the solution for you. These groups include the Bill and Linda Gates Foundation, the James Irvine Foundation, Luna, and the College of Futures Foundation. Some of the alliances you will see include Complete College America, the College Futures Foundation, and the University Innovation Alliance.

The CSU has a relationship with Complete College America and the University Innovation Alliance. It looks like they want to use in-house publications to support change agenda. It looks like they want to target the minority serving institutions. They also want to test out new ideas to scale, which means taking them campus-wide and not just having small pilot studies. They want to report what works to others. However, here is an interesting fact. The Bill and Linda Gates Foundation says there is not universal agreement about the way forward and knowledge about what works is still being gathered, so this is an experiment on higher education. What's the plan? Data sharing and polling with Complete College America, opponents based funding, 15 to finish, math pathways and co-requisite sports, structured schedules, advising software and empowered staff advisers, reconfiguring academic calendars and schedules, providing degree credit for life experiences, online university and cost savings to cover added expenses of bringing in more students. We do have a response to this in the CSU and it is Graduation Initiative 2025.

This is affecting other campuses. It is not just us. The idea for Performance Based Funding is that you tie money to student retention, job placement, etc. College Futures Report indicates that we could reform faculty benefits to save some money,

and even the size of the graduate program. The disagreement is about the role of faculty in education. The reforms I just presented to you imply that the curricula must change without faculty involvement. The faculty role is being stripped away from planning degree programs, determining course content, assessing credit worthiness of courses, and how to offer a construction to fit learning. The EO 1110 and 1100 were the last straw in a series of decisions the Chancellor's Office had made that eliminated faculty involvement in decision-making. There is a law out there called HEERA that empowers faculty to have a role in governing their institutions. When EO 1100 and 1110 came out campuses reacted with shared governance resolutions, the ASCSU got into a tizzy, the unions got involved, and because of all of that the Senate wondered what to do next so they voted to have the Executive Committee of the Senate meet with the Chancellor's Office and come up with an agreed upon definition of joint decision-making and recommend the process by which decisions are made. This statement I'm referring to is known as the "Tenants of Shared Governance." Senator Lee will be forwarding the tenants to Senators for their review and comments.

Questions:

Q: Why does the ASCSU think this statement will be any more effective than the last statement?

A: I don't know.

C: I have two observations about the Tenants of Shared Governance. First, I'm not sure the words are as important as the process by which a conversation is started between the ASCSU, the Executive Committee, and the Chancellor's Office and a commitment that that conversation be ongoing. My second observation is that the debate over this last year in the ASCSU became highly uncivil. This was completely unproductive. When I contrast that with the tenor of debate in the Academic Senate at SJSU, I am extremely grateful for what we have.

Q: Do you think the Student Success Initiative is part of the umbrella of this larger initiative? How can we get full disclosure to students if their data is being shared? They should know.

A: It is absolutely part of the larger initiative. All data agreements are being vetted by legal counsel.

Q: There is a difference between a lot of the ideas that are out there that have been adopted after having went through proper channels, and an idea that hasn't went through proper channels but was still adopted.

B. Interim Provost Joan Ficke:

The outstanding faculty awardees were given a plaque after the football game.

We have a site visit and three deans visiting us that were recommended to us by the Council of Graduate Schools. They are the Deans of the Graduate Schools at Old Dominion, Western Carolina University, and Wichita State. They are visiting with us for three days and will help us understand from their perspective what we are doing

well and what we should be doing going forward. Time to degree is as important for our graduate students as it is for our undergraduate students.

Questions:

Q: The College Futures Foundation argues that too much money is being spent on graduate student education and it is not fair you are getting faculty with three, four, or five students per class, whereas at the undergraduate level you have up to 60 students and that we need to shift resources from graduate programs to undergraduate programs.

A: This is hopelessly unsophisticated. We need to have an analysis of what the curriculum is meant to do for the UG student and the Graduate student. There will be occasion where a graduate course will have a smaller number of students, but that shouldn't carry the day. However, sometimes that needs to happen to get students through. It need to be predicated on a real deep analysis.

C. AS President:

The Child Development Center on 8th Street now has 112 children. There are 56 children enrolled that have SJSU student parents, and 56 spots were opened to non-student families.

AS gave out 5,000 new Clipper cards, and has requested a grant of \$150,000 for to offset their transportation solutions budget.

AS had a transfer student mixer that went very well and they will be hosting another one in the spring.

Voter registration is being handled by Senator Pang and the campaign is being called SJSUVotes.org. AS is also pairing up with a SJSU class, POLS 108, and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group to get voters registered. AS is also participating in the CSU Ballot Bowl started by Alex Padilla and hopefully they win.

AS President Manzo has developed a presentation on Senate committees and is willing to come to faculty classes and give a few minute presentation. Please contact her for information.

A mixer for graduate students was held by Student Affairs last spring, and again this fall. There will be another one this coming spring semester.

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

There were a number of high ranking officials at the football game this past weekend including the mayor, and our city councilmember, the head of VTA, the Commissioner of the Mountain West Conference, and Senator Beall. We gave them tours and talked about DASH, VTA, etc. Thirty percent of our students use VTA. I reminded the head of VTA of that this weekend. We have some clout with VTA. DASH ran from Diridon Station around town and back to Diridon Station. DASH is going away, but if BART opens up to Berryessa there will be a bus called Rapid 500.

That bus will go from Berryessa to SJSU to Diridon and back again. It will be faster and more expeditious.

Question:

Q: The faculty/staff dining room has been moved. Is there a replacement room planned?

A: The Academic Space Planning Group made the recommendation that that space was better used as a food pantry for our students. We do not have an answer right now as to where we can place a faculty/staff dining area.

C: We used to have a faculty/staff dining room which was adequate, but it didn't make enough money and they got rid of it. When they designed the Student Union, the Senate Chair was adamant we needed a faculty/staff dining area. Sometimes you need to have a space to get away and there are very few large institutions of this size that don't provide a private space for their employees. There is also a tremendous value in having a space where faculty and staff can find each other. There are many campuses where the President and VPs join a communal table in dining areas and it humanizes them to the campus. This campus has never really honored the idea of having a faculty/staff dining room. Some things are more important than money. I would really hope that you think about what you end up setting up as a faculty/staff dining room and honor the fact that people spend their entire days here. Faculty/staff would really enjoy having an elegant space they could meet and greet their colleagues that isn't just a room with two tables and a coffee pot. [Standing ovation and applause from Senate].

Q: Can students be involved when you meet with city leaders again like at the football games to give their views and share the support they get here, etc.?

A: Absolutely.

Q: Is anything being done about scooters on campus? A student nearly ran me over this morning in the hallway.

A: What we are looking to do is have two or three drop off places around campus.

Q: Is there any discussion about a "wheels free" campus? It isn't just scooters. It is bicycles too.

A: I'm not sure if we are ever going to be able to do that. We have worked out cages for the bicycles. It is a shame people can't walk the short distances across campus and need skateboards.

Q: Lot 14 is being used for Lyft and UBER pick up and drop off and our faculty are concerned it isn't safe due to lack of space. How can we ensure safety in that lot?

A: We need to designate specific UBER and LYFT pickup and drop off zones. They have done this at UCLA.

E. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):

VPSA Day has now been at SJSU for six weeks. He acknowledged the faculty that supported the students and folks in Student Affairs from summer through

Homecoming.

Safety and security around the residence areas is an issue Student Affairs is looking closely at. VPSA Day has worked at several urban campuses. There are some places where we probably need to have some boundaries and the residence areas are one of those places. We need to thoughtfully consider what we can do there. Some examples of problems that need to be fixed include the fact that the entire campus has to walk through the residential quad to get to the dining commons.

The VPSA is also looking at processes in Student Affairs and what additional and cooperative operations Student Affairs needs to create. Student Affairs will be looking to faculty for their suggestions.

F. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

The CDO has completed about 1/3rd of the Faculty Diversity Training for search committees they have scheduled. The requirement is that at least one member of every faculty search committee attend the training, but more are attending.

Using the grant from the Chancellor's Office the CDO is developing materials such as a local resource directory for the Santa Clara region for non-profits and entities in the region, and information on library resources, etc. Chairs can offer this to candidates when they come to show that we have connections with the local community. This should be coming out by the end of the week.

The CDO and staff are currently training faculty search committee advocates that will work in the colleges and sit as consultants with college search committees. The CDO has also been doing training in different departments by request.

The CDO is sending two faculty members to Annual Society for the Advancement of Chicano/Hispanic/Native Americans in Science meeting.

The CDO and staff developed a travel kit.

University Advancement is working on a new poster to put in the display case of the new Science Building when it is completed.

Again this year, the CDO is having an "Identity in the Classroom and with Colleagues Seminar" for white identified faculty.

We have arranged a four-part diversity training for all the trades personnel in FDO.

The CDO has a search for a Diversity Trainer ongoing. There are some good candidates.

There is a new Title IX Coordinator coming onboard on October 2, 2018.

The CDO is completing a Title IX Investigator search as well. Candidates will be interviewed next week.

The CDO also has initiated a search for a Survivor Advocate position that will report to the Director of Counseling Services.

An email will be going out to all personnel telling them they need to do their sexual harassment online training.

Questions:

Q: Is there a streamlined way to help students file a complaint? When I try to help students file a complaint it is very confusing.

A: There is a button on the CDO website that allows you to submit either a named or anonymous complaint. Also there are a number of webpages that talk about Title IX and all the services. The CDO also trains all the resident advisors in these areas.

C: Could someone address the search engine on our website then maybe if you put in a search for sexual harassment complaint it could take you directly to the website that would be great.

A: There is an update coming to the general university website.

G. CSU Faculty Trustee (by invitation):

Friday was Trustee Sabalius first year as Faculty Trustee. Trustee Sabalius plans on running for another term as Faculty Trustee.

The trustees had a good year. The legislature almost fully funded the trustee's budget. There was no tuition increase, and they hired three new presidents. Right now more than half of the executive positions are filled with female presidents. In addition, half of our campus presidents are from an underrepresented minority. Together, over 80% of the CSU Campus Presidents are from underrepresented groups in higher administration, and that is amazing. However, there is more work to do. Just this morning another two CSU Presidents announced their retirement (San Francisco and Humboldt). Last week the President of San Marcos, our longest serving President, announced her retirement, and there is also a search for the President of Fullerton.

Trustee Sabalius recently visited Fullerton, and Long Beach State. In October, Trustee Sabalius will be at San Diego, Sonoma, and Cal Poly Pomona.

Next week, Trustee Sabalius will give a speech at the Council of Senate Chairs and at the Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (ERFSA).

On Friday, Trustee Sabalius was at an Academic Freedom Conference at Berkeley.

The Chancellor's Office proposed that the Trustees make a larger budget request this year. Last year the Board of Trustees asked for \$283 million in additional funds. We

received more funds than requested, but some in one-time funds. This year the Chancellor's Office suggested we should ask for an additional \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 to our base budget. The numbers will be fine-tuned and then presented at the November meeting. Additionally, the Chancellor's Office suggested we ask for additional one-time funds of \$50 million for the CSU Basic Needs Initiative and \$150 million for deferred maintenance. Trustee Sabalius asked for \$1 billion in deferred maintenance costs. California's current rainy day fund is filled to the maximum at \$15.9 billion. Every year Governor Brown put several billion in that fund. Next year we should have extra funds to spend. If we don't spend it on the CSU in really good years then we are going to be in real trouble. Trustee Sabalius will ask for the \$1 billion for the next three years as well, because the CSU total deferred maintenance costs are \$3.7 billion. Not doing anything about it will cost us millions going from year-to-year. It also creates liabilities.

The Board of Trustees is very interested in getting a multi-year deal with the state legislators. It wasn't realistic in the last cycle, but the Governor and other legislators will cycle out this year. The student organizations have asked for it as well. It would help us with our budget planning as well.

Question:

Q: We have a history of getting less funds from the legislature than are needed and having to make do and then we are handed unfunded mandates. What can we do collectively to lobby in effort to see to it that we get the opportunity to identify where those funds are needed to be used.

A: The key is to tell our story about how successful we are with limited funds, but to also say how we are doing our best to improve education and graduation with what we have been given. We are doing a good job of that. This is why the legislature has been generous with us lately. Hopefully, the next Governor will have a better understanding of higher education needs.

Q: Wouldn't it be better to ask for a percentage of the total that is granted to the CSU dedicated to deferred maintenance and base the percentage on how old the campus and facilities are. According to my calculations, SJSU should then get 10% of the total, but what we got was 4.54% this year which is totally inadequate. You should make that statement over and over again.

A: You can be certain that I make this point over and over again. As the Faculty Trustee, I cannot advocate for one campus over another, but I will make the case for the system. If the legislature doesn't want to give us \$1 billion in one-time funds, they can give us \$67 million to our base budget which would allow us to purchase a General Obligation Bond for \$1 billion to address our deferred maintenance costs.

Q: Did the Chancellor suggest a general obligation bond at the last Board of Trustee's meeting?

A: Yes, about \$3 to \$4 billion was suggested to address our deferred maintenance. However, that would have to be put on the ballot way before an election and I don't want to put the future of our billions for maintenance in the hands of voters. I will ask

the legislators straight up for the money.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of September 10, 2018 –

Chair Frazier reminded the Senate that the minutes of the Executive Committee have already been approved by the Executive Committee and are in the packet if the Senate has questions about them and not edits.

Senator Van Selst commented that the minutes may be correct, but some of the information from the CSU Statewide Senate is incorrect. CDO Wong(Lau) and Senator Marachi also commented that some information from the CDO is also incorrect. Chair Frazier asked that this information be forwarded to him so he can review and determine if corrections need to be brought back to the Executive Committee for a second approval.

Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of October 1, 2018 was approved.

B. 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): No report.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented *AS 1711, Policy Recommendation, Principles Regarding Privacy of Electronic Information, Rescinds and Replaces F97-7, Policy on Privacy of Electronic Information (Final Reading)*

The Senate voted and AS 1711 passed as written with No Nays or Abstentions.

Senator Peter presented *AS 1710, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Advocating Additional Protections for the Privacy of Electronic Information at San José State University (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1710 passed as written with no Nays and 1 Abstention.**

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1708, Policy Recommendation, Charge and Membership of the Institutional Review Board (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike the last resolved clause. Senator Riley presented an amendment that was friendly to remove the grammatical error of an apostrophe on line 54. Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change 1.0 on line 81 to (1). **The Senate voted and AS 1708 passed as amended with No Nays or Abstentions.**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1669, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to Senate Constitution: Regarding Administrative Representatives (Final Reading)*.
The Senate voted and AS 1669 passed as written by majority vote of (39-0-2).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1656, Modification to Bylaw 1.10 Pertaining to Administrative Representatives on the Senate (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the Resolved clause to read, “Resolved that “if the accompanying constitutional amendment (presented here as AS 1669) passes...” Senator McKee presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the capital letter “M” in “Modify” on line 10 to a lower case “m.”

The Senate voted and AS 1656 passed as amended with 1 Nay and 1 Abstention.

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

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

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

2018/2019 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 15, 2018

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CHHS Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Day, Ficke, Wong(Lau)
Faas, Papazian (at start)
Absent: None

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Khavul, Bullen
Absent: None

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Stacks, Olin, Ehrman, Elliott
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi
Absent: Mathur

Students:

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo,
Pang, Rodriguez, Kethepalli
Absent: Gill

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Ramasubramanian, Kumar, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Mok, Ormsbee
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Absent: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Hart, Trulio
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Higgins, Matoush,
Monday, Trousdale
Absent: Hurtado

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– Not applicable.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Frazier requested that Senators place their tent cards on the back table before leaving and remove any trash and other items that they brought with them when they leave.

Chair Frazier requested volunteers to write the Pro and Con Arguments for the ballot for the Constitutional Amendment passed by the Senate at the last meeting.

B. From the President of the University –

The President reminded faculty to submit their colleagues for the four faculty awards

and to consider submitting both faculty and staff for the Wang Award (Note: Only Administrator III and IV's are eligible for the Wang Award from the staff).

The President's Office will be launching a Chief of Staff search in the near future.

The President is moving ahead with plans to establish and VP of Research and Information Technology position and will be putting out a call for search committee members very soon.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of September 24, 2018 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of October 15, 2018 was approved.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): None

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS): None

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): None

D. University Library Board (ULB):

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

VII. Special Committee Reports:

A. University Budget Presentation by VP Faas. [See University Budget Report.](#)

VPAF taught at USF on planning and budgeting. The VPAF is working on tying in the budget with the Strategic Plan. This past year has been a special year facilities-wise. The Spartan Recreation and Aquatics Center is set to open up in the first quarter of next year. Tremendous progress has been made this year on this building. The new Student Union and the MLK Library are buildings that students will stick around for and spend some time in-between classes. This recreation and aquatics building also has the ability to get students involved in staying on campus and is a healthy option. This will get students happier, more engaged, and when they are engaged they will graduate sooner. The new Science and Innovation building is part of that strategic plan.

The Mubadala Silicon Valley Tennis Tournament brought 4,000 people per day to our campus and gave us great visibility. Serena Williams, arguably one of the best tennis players ever, brought us great visibility and recognition. She is coming back next year. What is important about that is International Marketing Group paid us a rights fee for the campus and built the stands, and the viewing deck. What this does is show us what is possible for us on this campus. We have tremendous assets here that we don't always fully utilize.

We have this same opportunity with places like our library, the Hammer Theatre, and the new science building. The new science building is an eight story building and is the first academic building to be built in 30 years on campus. These are the type of facilities we need to put on the campus. At night when the science building is lit up you will be able to see faculty, staff, and students interacting in the building. We are trying to raise the level of our game with buildings like these. VP Faas got a text from the Mayor of San José saying, “Wow, gorgeous building. Thank you. This is a great addition to our landscape here in the city.” This is an example of a relationship we have with the city.

The RSCA work that we’ve budgeted for is moving forward. Information Technology is now a standalone group that crosses over all divisions. We have a \$150 million endowment which is one of the largest in the CSU, and VP Lanning is looking to massively increase that number.

VP Faas has established the Office of Sustainability reporting directly to him. Dr. Cushing is leading that group, and about six students will be working with the group moving forward.

The housing problem in the valley is a huge issue. As every one of us retires, VP Faas is not sure how any of our replacements can find an affordable place to live. VP Faas is looking into how he can have staff/faculty housing reasonably close to the university. We also need to have more student dorms that are affordable. It is proven that when students live on campus they graduate faster and that they get more involved in campus events.

We also need to continue our work in diversity inclusion. The work that Kathy Wong(Lau) is doing is right up there with the best in the country.

The operating plan has been linked to the Strategic Plan.

Over the past years the Graduation Initiative has been a big part of our budget and it again this year. Almost as big is all the work we are doing on this campus. We are also looking at release time for faculty. Safety is another priority. The night safety walk is next week on South campus. We also need to correct what is broken in the budget, things that haven’t been addressed previously.

For the Graduation Initiative, we have taken the \$3.5 million from the Chancellor’s Office and effectively matched that and have continued to invest that and more in the Graduation Initiative. If we can get students out of here earlier, we look better and make progress.

AAD will discuss further, but Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) became a budget priority this year. It isn’t a big dollar amount this year, but it is the first step in this process.

For security and safety, the HGH building has been leaking for a long, long time and fixing the roof has been waiting for a long, long, time. We are putting \$1.5 million into fixing that roof. Cameras are now in every one of our garages and can track ingress and egress. License plate readers are coming very soon as well. We are continuing to look at our dorms and the library to ensure they are safe.

The VPAF has a police chief search underway and will be doing interviews at the end of this month as well as a search for a Clery Coordinator, a CSU-mandated position, reporting directly to VP Faas, and EH&S position.

Joe West Hall has been here for 50 years. Over the past two years we have upgraded and put sprinklers into the building and other safety features. It is now a good and safe building for our students to be in.

Question:

Q: The Music building doesn't have cameras and other safety features and this leaves us vulnerable to attack. What can we do?

A: VPAF noted that they are constantly doing training and role playing. We installed clocks in every classroom last year with digital readouts and speakers. This is the fastest way we've found of notifying people to shelter in place. The next thing we are doing is making sure we have S2 locks throughout the campus.

Q: I think what might make the faculty feel better is to have a more visible presence by UPD on the campus.

A: Agreed

Correcting what's broken refers to items that in the past we paid to fix with salary savings. We are trying to get these things into the budget as we move forward.

Last year was the closest we've come to breaking even with the Athletics budget. We want to make sure that the Athletics budget continues to break even and they aren't overspending.

For Space Management Planning, the VPAF wants to make sure we are doing the right things around this campus such as getting out of the 10th Street garage. Student facing services must move out of the garage. We are looking at what services don't need to be right on the campus and which services we really need in the spaces we have. Student Services should be located somewhere in the middle of the campus. In regards to the Hammer Theatre, we have a short term lease and we are working on making that a long term agreement. As far as commencement is concerned, we have added funding to the VP of University Advancement's budget to cover commencement.

The process that we went through is a three-year budget. Everything the state does is on a one-year basis. We are doing a three-year budget. We have a plan going forward for each year. We did this for every line item we have. We had \$143 million in requests. Lots of things didn't get funded, but we went through and were able to

fund about \$44 million of that \$143 million.

The CSU asked for \$280 million in additional funding from the state and we got \$190 million from the state. The bulk of that is salary and benefits based money. SJSU got about \$14.5 million from the state. We got \$3.5 million for the graduation initiative, \$13 million for benefits and compensation, so our total budget for SJSU from the state was \$372 million. The \$372 million is our operating budget, but our bigger budget is \$650 million. We are a pretty big entity.

We have more than \$400 million in deferred maintenance on this campus. We have \$2 million for deferred maintenance in the base budget this year. Three years ago we had \$0 in the base budget. We are taking steps to get better. We have a long way to go.

About 63% of our \$372 million goes to Academic Affairs. Advancement had an increase this year of about \$900,000, because we funded graduation. The rest are about the same as last year.

Question:

Q: Last year Athletics was at 2.4%, and this year they are at 3%?

A: Last year it didn't fund the \$1.6 million for cost of attendance. That is why it shows 3%. This is the whole budget. Last year to this year there has been no change in Athletics.

As you can see 79% of our budget goes to salary and benefits. About 54% goes to salaries and 25% to benefits. Last year it was 50% to salaries and 25% to benefits. This has always been a people equation.

Questions:

Q: My recollection from an earlier version of this presentation is that when you went out to the divisions and asked about their increased budget request it was around the \$145 million mark with \$65 million being allocated, but the number here is \$44 million so where did that come from?

A: There was \$44 million allocated, but there was another \$22 million that were must fund items like the Hammer Theatre. These are items we are committed to.

Q: You noted a 5% reduction in student aid and I was wondering what this means in terms of student access?

A: Essentially we had more student aid given to us than what our students could use. There really is no impact on an aggregate level.

Q: You mentioned the funds for the deferred maintenance being so low, are we actually doing enough for the students?

A: You never do enough. Most of it is heavy lifting items that pick up over time. It is little fixes that grow bigger and bigger each year and by year 10 they require significant funds.

Q: I'm always confused in terms of Spartan Shops and Chartwells, can you explain?

A: Spartan Shops is an auxiliary, same as Associated Students is an auxiliary, and is in charge of the bookstore, food services, real estate, and the concessions facilities down at South Campus. That auxiliary remains in place. Nothing changes. The only thing we traded out is the food services. Instead of being in house it is outsourced.

Q: I get that you have an idea of being forward-looking, and you are looking at creating buildings that are inspirational to keep the ball rolling, but I have issues with money going towards academic excellence and innovation, when we have \$400 million in deferred maintenance? I can't teach in labs anymore because I've been begging FDO for three years to fix a sink, and their solution was to give me plywood around a sink. I begged them to fix that problem and they replaced it with plastic. Neither of these work well in a chemical lab. Cheryl has been working with us greatly. We are trying to recruit faculty to help us deal with the water crisis in California. This is not going to go away. This is multidisciplinary and multi-departmental. The lab that we have that would be best for this I can't even let students into, because it is in such disrepair. How can we say we are looking at academic excellence and forward looking when the basic infrastructure isn't there? FDO also charged an exorbitant \$15,000 to do the study of what to do in this space, when we are abundantly clear on what needs to be done. I understand there are some design things that come with that, but \$15,000 to do the study before anything gets done. These are the types of things that make it difficult to have any faith in this progress because I can't even provide basic academic experience and not excellence with spaces like that and I know I'm not alone with that. What are we doing to make FDO a more productive part of the university to work with? I have a mile-long list of things just in the last week that I've fought with them about. Basically, we can't get even adequate service from them.

A: If even 1/10th of what you said is accurate, then you and I need to talk because that is unacceptable. That is the answer I've given in the past and will continue to give. We've got to fix these things one at a time and will move forward. If I don't put on a chart this is where we are going, we aren't going to get there. I'm looking 15 to 20 years down the road. If we don't solve the housing problem, your sink won't matter. Your sink is important and we will work with FDO on that. The improvements we are making to the Music building are all cosmetic, but it will look nice. We are moving through the campus making these changes.

Q: On page three, there is a mention of surplus FTEF and there is a lot of it there in the projected budget. Can you explain what that is and let me know when we have surplus is that FTEF that we have gone over some mark and we are not getting support for?

A: We get funded based on our targeted headcount, but anytime we go above we get less money. All we get is tuition money. We don't get state funded.

Q: So, that leaves us at a disadvantage?

A: It is not as good as getting state funding, but it is better than getting no money. Back when most of us were going to school, if we went to a CSU 90% of the money being paid came from the state. This year 46% is coming from the state. That is up

from 44%, but is less than half what we need.

Q: On page 7 under university-wide commitments there is mention of 4th Street rent. Is that for the group that's moving off campus? My second question is what is the item called cabinet commitment?

A: Yes, that is correct. The 4th Street rent is for those moving off campus. The cabinet commitment refers to a line item for the Chief of Staff.

Q: I notice in multiple places budgets were going to come in at a deficit, but then there is a line that says, "prior year funding balance" and that either breaks even or shows a surplus. A prior year fund balance doesn't happen every year.

A: Yes, it does. It rolls forward.

Q: Can you explain that briefly.

A: If we don't spend everything we have, it rolls forward. That is the whole reason we changed the budgeting for the salaries. The reason salaries aren't globally based and are now centrally based is those salaries would just roll forward wherever they happened to be. Now they are aggregated in a central pot and that is how these initiatives get funded.

Q: At what point can we revisit the allocation of the IRA fund? Out of \$10 million, \$8 million is going to Athletics. When do we start shifting that towards the academic areas of the house? When do we start using those funds for the library instead of using the lottery funds.

A: There is a committee (CFAC) that meets on that on a regular basis.

Q: My question is about the Graduation Initiative 2025, are there any plans for after 2025?

A: The state lots of times gives us one-time money for things, but then there is no money to fund the projects for future years. That's where having a multi-year budget process comes in.

Q: Thank you for putting the Athletics budget under the category of something that is broken. I think you meant when you said they were balanced that they didn't spend more than they were given. Still compared with other campuses in the CSU they are hardly balanced. It appears 67% of their budget comes from student fees and operating funds. San Diego and Fresno are only 46%, so they are coming close to balancing their budgets by raising their own funds.

A: Those figures are correct. We have a \$28 million Athletics budget. We are the bottom school in the Mountain West Conference when it comes to funding Athletics. San Diego State is on the top. Fresno happens to be number three. Looking at those schools is a little like comparing apples and oranges, because they are spending way more on their Athletics programs.

Q: About two Athletics Directors ago, our Athletics Director said that the highest priority for Athletics was reducing that level of subsidy. Two Athletic Directors later we are still at 67%. It doesn't seem we've made any progress at all in weaning our Athletics program off our support?

A: I can't argue with the numbers that are there. We need to be more self-sustaining.

The way you do that is by having a football program that can play and win and that our students and faculty can rally behind.

Q: Under Intercollegiate Athletics salaries are listed as \$6.53 million, but on the same page last year salaries were listed at \$4.56 million. They have went up from \$4.56 million to \$6.53 million?

A: Honestly I thought it was just the opposite. Let's talk about this after the meeting and I'll show you a chart that shows the exact opposite trend.

A. Academic Affairs Budget Presentation by AVP Bradley Olin, Academic Budgets and Planning, and Joan Ficke, Interim Provost. [See Academic Affairs Budget Presentation Slides.](#)

Let me lay out some rules of the road so you know what to expect from the presentation. We are going to talk about three things; the planning priorities for the division, the demographics on why we are spending this money, and then a little bit of detail on how the division budget works.

Planning Priorities and Highlights:

We have a variety of investment areas including research areas, faculty growth, audiology program (three-year commitment), no limit enrollment, and support for our international students.

A key accomplishment has been the rollout of RSCA. This is about preserving the educational program and making sure we continue to teach our students well but also giving our faculty the opportunity to focus on the teacher-scholar paradigm. Faculty are able to bring the knowledge that they are getting from their research back into the classroom and our students then get to engage in some of that world class scholarship. This is just the beginning. It is a phased-in approach across a few years.

One thing we continue to talk about is tenure density. However, we are trying to transition away from that in terms of our faculty. Every year the Chancellor's Office produces tenure density information, but the reality is that tenure density progress doesn't capture the kind of success we are experiencing on the campus. As you can see, it has been pretty steady. Even though we are making tremendous gains in expanding our faculty ranks, we are hiring more and more lecturers to cover the growth in our student population. I think it is important that we take control of the conversation on this campus about the fact that we are doing really well.

Our faculty ranks have expanded very rapidly. We are talking about net gains. We had a 12% increase in tenure/tenure-track faculty. We average about 21 new faculty members to our ranks per year. This is significant. This is done in a challenging environment where we are facing losses from faculty members that are retiring or leaving. This year we are looking at a slightly smaller net gain of 14. We have representation across the division as far as new faculty coming

onboard.

The no limits enrollment plan is a significant investment in terms of changing the way we move our students through their scholarly experience here. There are two diagrams. One is average unit load per undergraduate student and you can see we are above 13 units per student. This is a tremendous milestone. We will probably never get to the magic number of 15 units per student, but remember that if a student doesn't attempt 15 units per semester they won't make it in four years. As you can see we have a trend that jumped from 13% to 46% of our incoming frosh attempting 15 or more units per semester. This is a culture change. We can attribute this to advising, our "Frosh Finish in Four Campaign," and a lot of the work that has been done throughout the division and in the classrooms to ensure students know they can take a 15-unit load and be successful. These are student lives that we are affecting and every year that they stay past four means lost opportunities and affects housing, etc.

We are trying to bring attention to the graduate student population. You can see there are a number of students that are first generation college students that are attending graduate school. Nearly 20% of our undergraduate students are first generation and minority students. We know that underrepresented minority students can become a problem to graduate. We have the Under Represented Minority (URM) Achievement Gap and we are working really hard to find ways to combat this.

Questions:

Q: I find it very disheartening that there is no Asian or Asian-American/Pacific Islander Student Success Center. We have an African-American and Chicano/Chicanx Student Success Center. We have a huge Asian-American student population here.

A: I can't address that. That is a cabinet decision I believe.

A: The categories that AVP Olin has to deal with are those handed to him nationally. While, we could probably be more sensitive in terms of how we report data on the campus, AVP Olin has national data to work with.

Q: She is asking about an Asian-American Student Success Center on campus, will there be one?

A: This is being addressed at the cabinet level. There is a team that includes faculty and staff (MPPs) working on a taskforce to put together support for all Asian-American students.

There is a shift based on changes to our admissions policy and the Santa Clara new Frosh number is starting to cross over in proportion to other areas. That is because we are giving preference to our local service area (Santa Clara County) first. Our admissions policies have changed and we are seeing this in this cohort. Our largest segment of students is directly from Santa Clara County.

On the faculty diversity side, our incoming cohort of 2018/2019 shows that we are

making some progress in this area. There were 12 Asian, 3 Black, 10 Hispanic, 27 White, 2 (identify in 2 or more groups), and 7 not specified.

Budget Overview

We get a target enrollment from the state (25,306 this year) and anyone we teach in excess of that target, we only get to keep the tuition revenue. We have roughly 1250 students that we are going to be teaching with only tuition revenue this year. It used to be that the Chancellor had a strict cap on enrollment and the campuses were penalized if they went over that target by more than 3.5%. Since 2015, the Chancellor's Office has relaxed that ceiling. However, having it kept the legislature from coming back and saying you don't need state support you can do it on your own dime. What the Chancellor's Office has come up with is that we are helping our students get through faster by opening more sections, eliminating bottlenecks, and encouraging our students to take 15 units a semester. There is a one-time investment that the CSU secured from the legislature to use directly for instruction, such as hiring lecturers. We can't use one-time money to pay for tenure/tenure-track faculty. That is risky business. Right now we are at 106% of target.

Division Budget:

We are primarily operating fund supported (\$144 million or 76%). However, we also have lottery funding that supports library acquisitions (\$1.9 million or 1%), and then a small amount of SSETF (\$8.7 million), and CERF funding (\$35.9 million or 19%).

Questions:

Q: On the tenure density slide, I wasn't sure what you said can you clarify?

A: Sure, do you want to know the amount spent on searches this year? There were 69 searches and 14 new searches. Tenure density is the ratio of tenure/tenure-track faculty to lecturers. The denominator is lecturers and the numerator is tenure/tenure-track faculty. As we bring in lecturers to cover additional FTES, then the denominator is moving alongside the numerator making it hard to push that number up. This is what the Chancellor's Office is using, but about a year ago they commissioned a study that showed this number is becoming decreasingly relevant because there are so many mitigating factors. They even suggested that campuses come up with their own measures in lieu of just using tenure density.

Q: I have a problem with that. It doesn't make sense mathematically.

A: It actually does, because at the system level they are moving away from the concept of tenure density because there are so many mitigating factors as AVP Olin said. The bottom line always will be how you mount your instructional program and who is the person you get to do that for you and how you manage that budget hill. What is happening is that at the system level they are saying that the formula AVP Olin just described with tenure/tenure-track over or under lecturers may or may not be a useful data point to try to understand how many tenure-track faculty are involved in the institution and that coupled with the

pressure to grow your enrollment means you are always going to be a little behind in terms of the hiring of tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Q: I guess I'm a little concerned with the work being on both the tenure line faculty and the lecturers.

A: I understand what drives the question. I'm trying to describe it as the variables at play in terms of making decisions on where you put your money in order to deliver the instructional program. From my perspective, the end point is always when students come in can they get the courses they need to get out. How do you manage that against some of those decisions that have to be made related to money.

Q: With more and more faculty applying for RSCA, who will be teaching those classes? Will additional lecturers be hired?

A: As more and more faculty become RSCA active, some of them will buy themselves out so there is a projection (over three years that the previous Provost did) that institutionally we can afford to do that, preserve faculty hiring, and deliver the institutional program as best as we can. Will there be some give and take in that? Yes, there will be. The projection is to create a cadre of tenure track faculty that are RSCA and grant active that provide us with a self-sustaining financial mechanism that will continue to provide the release to faculty as we move forward. Does that mean that there will not be increases in lecturer hiring? I don't know the answer to that, but the goal would be to keep it stable. The answer is that on a year-to year basis that is probably going to change here and there. We can't know that going forward.

Q: If you have more and more faculty on assigned time, then who is teaching?

A: Okay, I'll try it again. What we are going to try and do is those faculty who are scholarly and research active will have other kinds of opportunities some of which will be funded, which will give us some of the funding we can use to move forward with our instructional program. Some of those lines will be lecturers and some will be an increase in the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty.

Q: Yes, but the tenure/tenure-track faculty hires won't keep up with the need, so it seems to me that we will be hiring more lecturers?

A: Possibly. I can't say yes or no. I don't see it being a whole lot different than what we have now.

Q: I am concerned with the term and maybe the concept of "no limit enrollment." The reason we didn't have it before, as you pointed out, was to militate with the legislature to increase funding and the legislature had a long pattern of expecting us to take more enrollment and then not appropriating funding to cover it. I can't imagine what would happen if someone in the legislature starting talking about the CSU's new policy of "no limits enrollment." That would be catastrophic for our budget. Maybe I'm not interpreting or understanding this correctly. Is this something just at SJSU, or is it throughout the CSU? Where did this term come from?

A: We were sort of pioneers. My predecessor, Marna Genes, was instrumental in

petitioning the Chancellor's Office to allow us to go above our target. Other campuses have blown past their target without asking permission, but we got the green light. The expectation was not that we would always be overenrolled, but that as we were able to graduate more students we could enroll more students. We are just now starting to see this effect by seeing our students taking 15 units or more. As these students graduate out, we should be able to take in more.

Q: Just from a standpoint of public relations, couldn't we keep it a secret?

A: I hear you, I don't like the phrase either. It makes me nervous. On the other hand, if we are attentive to the issues of progress to degree and attention to getting students in and out. This is a good concept for who we are and what we see in our mission, but practically and operationally I think it is a little uncertain.

Q: Can we call it something else?

A: Yes, I think we can. It is an internal term. However, where the term came from is that there were students that were told that they couldn't get a seat even when a professor had a seat open, because the professor was told not to go over his limit. The student would then go to the Chair who then said it came from the Dean, and the Dean said it came from the Provost. No limits meant no artificial limits. No telling students they can't take a class for a reason that makes no sense. If you have a size limit, or other legitimate limit then that is fine. We can change that phrase, but the intent is that if the student needs the class and we have the space then we will take them. The Graduation Initiative of 2025 lists six focus points and one is increasing unit loads, so it is actually sanctioned by the Chancellor's Office at this point.

C: There is another side to tenure density, and I understand all the mitigating factors that you claim. If we can never move the marker so that there are a greater proportion of tenured faculty then tenured faculty will always bear a load that is unsustainable, because the service is done by the tenured faculty, the shared governance is done by the tenured faculty, at the same time they are teaching a full load. We are now also moving tenured faculty out of teaching and moving in lecturers. If we can't move that marker long term, it is not a profession we can recruit people into.

Q: On the slide with the SSETF of \$8.7 million, I thought it was higher than that?

A: This is the base budget and doesn't include any one-time funds.

Q: So if you included the one-time funds it would be \$9.8 million.

A: It would be larger, but I don't have the exact number.

Q: Thank you for the presentation, and really appreciate the RSCA movement. Some of the assigned time comes from coordinating programs, so I'm wondering if any thought has gone into how that fits into RSCA and whether there would be monies that fund these RSCA activities that might just cutoff those kind of coordination decisions and certain departments require release time for coordination so wondering how that fits in?

A: That is not a question for AVP Olin. What we have asked all the deans to do is step back and take a look at what all their needs are and what they need to run

their divisions, where there are accrediting requirements, etc. There are some important activities that need assigned time and some places where it can even out a little. This is the administrative responsibility of the chairs and the deans.

Q: Having access to tenured faculty is one of the things that leads to higher graduation rates as well as having involvement in research, and our lecturers typically aren't involved in research so maintaining an awareness of tenure density actually will have an impact. If you look at graduation rates across the CSU and you look at tenure density, those tenure density rates do predict graduation rates.

A: I think it is just the use of the nomenclature. I don't think there is an argument about the value of having tenure/tenure-track faculty.

Q: I think what people are reacting to is the idea that we don't have to worry any more about tenure density. The language could have improved in this presentation, but also there is the reality that tenure density actually does play a role in graduation.

Q: Looking ahead, there are two bills that just passed, SB 838 and AB 2658, which enact the ability for block-chain credentials to be used in the work force as a proxy for education credentials. There will be competition to provide these badges. My question is has the CSU been approached already, and if so what kind of opportunity would those of us that have studied this technology have to offer insights on the impacts for higher education?

A: No, it has not crossed my desk. However, the Dean of IES may be reviewing it. She is in charge of dealing with special session credential offerings that respond to market demand.

Q: Sandy Hirsh has been doing some work on this and I think it is very serious policy issue that we should be looking into.

A: The curriculum remains in the hands of faculty whether it is stackable or unstackable. Block theme is a technology that is coming into the educational sector right now and we should be paying attention to it. It puts the power in students' hands how they want to use their credentialing and how they want to port it across institutions.

Q: There are some questions about assessment and quality of the actual credential since it is a ledger system where information can be entered and can be undone, but it is never really gets deleted so those kind of things long term can end up being problematic.

C: AVP Olin thanked his staff for putting together the presentation for him for the Senate.

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

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

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

Executive Committee Minutes
October 8, 2018
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Frazier, Shifflett, Peter, Day, Sullivan-Green, Ficke, Marachi, Manzo, Faas, White, Mathur, Wong(Lau), Riley, Papazian, Lee

Absent: None

1. The Executive Committee approved changes suggested to the Executive Committee minutes of September 10, 2018 at the Academic Senate meeting on October 1, 2018. [These minutes were previously approved by the Executive Committee on September 24, 2018.]
2. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of September 24, 2018 as amended by Senators Manzo and Wong(Lau).
3. There was no dissent to the consent calendar of October 8, 2018.
4. Updates:

- a. Updates from the Chief Diversity Officer:
The CDO just finished providing faculty diversity training for faculty search committees.

The CDO just hired a new Diversity Trainer.

A town hall meeting is scheduled regarding domestic violence, sexual assaults, and sexual harassment on Thursday, October 11, 2018, from 4 to 5 p.m. in IRC 101.

Different student organizations will be wearing costumes that say, "My Costume isn't my Culture" for Halloween.

- b. Updates from the President:
The Silicon Valley Organization organized an annual study mission to enable leaders (city, business, university) to come together to learn about other city's successes and challenges. This year it was in Seattle, and the President and Vice President for Administration & Finance attended. Seattle's downtown is growing faster than any other downtown, and the city has similar issues such as homeless/housing and affordability, transit, etc. They have, however, been able to reduce the number of people driving, and there are a number of lessons for San José to learn from Seattle. The President was also able to get valuable one-on-one time with city leaders.

SJSU is still active in conversations on the community impact of Google's expansion downtown.

The Provost search has been launched. Work will begin shortly on the VP of Research and Innovation position.

- c. Updates from the VP of Administration and Finance:
The Cabinet will attend crisis management training tomorrow.

The Administration and Finance group will not be moving to 4th street from the 5th floor of Clark Hall. Another option that is cheaper has appeared off Market Street. The Cabinet will then be able to move to the 5th floor along with the Senate Chair.

A member suggested that when UPD issues an email about bomb threats, they advise the preschool on campus to shelter in place. CHAD received numerous calls from parents of the children in the preschool after the recent bomb threat message went out.

- d. Updates from the Associated Student President:

AS will be participating the "Ballot Bowl."

Applications have been distributed for AS Government spring elections. This year the seats will be different with the reorganization of the AS Board.

AS is participating in the 2025 Graduation Symposium.

- e. Updates from the CSU Statewide Senate:
Shared governance continues to be a topic of discussion at the ASCSU. One member pointed out that it does not violate HEERA for senates to discuss issues that have been bargained through the collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Academic senates can discuss bargained items.

- f. Updates from the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):
CSU VPs of Student Affairs, at a recent joint meeting, had a very broad conversation about basic needs of students at the CSU system level and what is achievable.

Super Parents weekend is coming as well as weeks of planned activities around Homecoming.

Safety of the residential quad continues to be prime issue. A safety and security audit team recommended not having access to multiple buildings when you live in one or the other, as well as desks staffed by students during the day, but professional staff at night. The VPSA is continuing to check with other institutions for ideas.

- g. Updates from the Provost:
Faculty that have expressed distress over the recent U.S. Supreme Court appointee are encouraged to use the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).

Faculty that have submitted RSCA requests will have their answers by November 16, 2018.

We need to give more attention to our graduate offerings.

- h. Updates from the Senate Chair:
The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) met today. The SPSC will be submitting the draft strategic plan to the President soon.

- i. Updates from the Instruction and Student Affairs Office (I&SA):
I&SA is working on a referral on grading standards and grade symbols.

I&SA has broken into subcommittees to try and sort through the 18 referrals from O&G they received last Spring.

I&SA will bring a resolution to the Senate regarding military requirements.

- j. Updates from the Professional Standards (PS) Committee:
The PS Committee will be bringing a Sense of the Senate Resolution regarding bullying to the Senate by the end of the semester.

- k. Updates from the Organization and Government (O&G) Committee:
O&G is still reviewing all policies regarding the charge and membership of committees. O&G asked for suggestions regarding what to do when they encounter a committee and cannot find the original policy and membership list that established the committee.

- l. Updates from the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R is working on the 4+1 Curriculum Model and Grading policies.

- 5. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 8, 2018. The minutes were edited by Chair Frazier on October 15, 2018, and approved by the Executive Committee on October 22, 2018.

Executive Committee Minutes
October 22, 2018
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Frazier, Shifflett, Peter, Day, Ficke, Marachi, Manzo, Faas, White, Mathur, Wong(Lau), Riley, Lee

Absent: Sullivan-Green, Papazian

Guest: Tsugawa

1. The Executive Committee approved changes suggested to the Executive Committee minutes of October 8, 2018 as written.

2. Policy Committee Updates:

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

C&R will discuss the 4+1 blended curriculum model today.

Mexican American Studies (MAS) is requesting a name change to Chicana/Chicano Studies.

C&R is working on updating and merging five grade policies into one policy.

Committee members noted that it is important for C&R to connect with our statewide senators and other GE experts to keep track of changes in general education coming from the Chancellor's Office.

b. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS has a full committee, with the addition of Deputy Provost Kemnitz to the roster, and even one additional faculty member.

PS will bring a Sense of the Senate Resolution on bullying to the Senate, and is also considering creating a taskforce to look at the issues across the campus. At SFSU bullying is handled out of the Title IX Office. The committee discussed if it would be appropriate to have the same setup at SJSU. A member suggested a taskforce could develop a guide for department chairs on how to handle bullying.

PS is working on the President's requested revisions to the Academic Freedom policy.

PS received a referral in 2017 to look into creating staff awards that mirror the annual faculty awards, such as distinguished service, outstanding performance, etc. PS developed a policy proposal that would have combined the faculty and staff awards into one policy. PS discussed this with the President's Chief of Staff; however, nothing has been done to date. PS recently received another referral asking them to reopen the original referral, and urged the administrators to take action on this. Currently, the only staff award is the Wang Award, but

eligibility is limited to Administrator III's and IV's. The Provost will look into this. (The Provost also reminded faculty that the Academic Affairs staff appreciation breakfast is next week.)

PS is discussing an issue with who can serve on retention-tenure-promotion (RTP) committees. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) prevents anyone being considered for promotion from serving on the RTP Committee of someone being considered for promotion to that rank. This can result in faculty from other departments judging whether a faculty member from a different discipline and department gets promoted. Some faculty have gone so far as to delay putting in for promotion until department faculty can be a part of the committee.

- c. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing a resolution with updates to the charge and membership of committees to the Senate.

O&G requested information on how to make changes to the charge and membership of a special agency created with a presidential directive. The Executive Committee suggested O&G coordinate with the President's Office.

O&G is also working on a referral to look at the title, charge, and membership component of a policy recommendation related to the Writing Requirements Committee and will be reviewing that today.

- d. CSU Statewide Senator:
The Executive Committee discussed the Academic Affairs Budget Presentation at the Senate on October 15, 2018. A member asked for clarification of the statement at the Senate that any salary funds not spent are brought back.
Answer: Those funds are being used for things such as funding Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) along with salary and benefit increases. This is a form of zero-based budgeting. Another member commented that in his/her department there is no money for items like computers, etc.
Answer: The deans were asked to provide the Provost with what extra funds would be needed for their operating expenses so that those costs could be allocated in their O&E budget, instead of departments relying on salary savings.

The committee discussed tenure density and concerns were expressed that it is being brushed off and ignored by the CSU with the focus on Complete College America and the push to raise graduation rates. The committee discussed Georgia State and how they raised graduation rates. What SJSU has already accomplished with regard to increasing graduation rates is substantial, but more can be done.

The ASCSU is concerned that there is movement towards faculty deciding only what is in the major and minor, and the administration controlling the rest of the curriculum.

3. Updates from the Administrators:

a. From the Chief Diversity Officer:

The CDO introduced the new Title IX Officer, Tracey Tsugawa. Ms. Tsugawa spent three years as a Title IX Officer at UC Santa Cruz, and has 30 years of teaching experience in Asian-American Studies and Environmental Justice.

b. From the Provost:

The Provost urged faculty to put in their colleagues for the faculty awards. Nominations are due 10/31/18.

RSCA requests are due by 10/22/18 to the Office of Research. The Academic Affairs Leadership Team is looking into department chairs eligibility for RSCA for the next cycle. A member suggested an earlier date for RSCA submissions so that chairs can better schedule classes.

The Provost and Chair of C&R will be meeting to discuss the 4+1 Blended proposal. The Provost is concerned that one size does not fit all with combo degrees.

The Provost is still waiting for the final report from the Deans of Graduate Schools that were invited to the campus to review our Graduate Programs. They visited the campus on October 1, 2, and 3, 2018. The Provost was very pleased with their visit.

c. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):

The VPAF will participate in the Safety Walk on South Campus tonight (10/22/18). Everyone is welcome to join him at 7 p.m.

The Administration and Finance group will move from the 5th floor of Clark Hall to 60 S. Market Street at the end of January. Then plans can begin for the movement of the President's Cabinet and the Senate Chair to Clark Hall.

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

Shaun King will be speaking as part of the Spartan Speakers Series in the Student Union Ballroom on October 24, 2018 at 5 p.m.

The VPSA and other members of the Executive Committee attended a recent Student Success Symposium. SJSU has had some success in increasing graduation rates and reducing the gap in minority graduation. However, there is more work to be done and areas for improvement. Georgia State University was showcased and had substantial growth in their graduation rates. SJSU needs to find ways to work together better to increase our graduation rates, though there

is a recognition that it is not a quick process. (Georgia State University had a 10-year journey to get to where they are.)

Questions:

Q: What are some of the touch points on our campus?

A: Our student orientation for one. The way we bring students into the university and how their first six weeks are structured is another. We also need to look at what kind of freshmen seminars we have, and we need to evaluate the way we capture data.

The committee addressed other problematic aspects of Graduation Initiative 2025 and agreed on the need to continue this critical discussion.

e. From the Associated Students President (AS):

The AS Executive Director's last day is this Friday. A search committee has been established and a faculty member has been appointed, Ellen Middaugh. The AS President and Sonja Daniels will also be on the committee.

AS is participating in the voter Ballot Bowl. AS is currently in 5th place and is continuing to move up.

The AS President attended the Student Success Symposium 2025, and it was a great event.

4. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 24, 2018. The minutes were edited by Chair Frazier on October 24, 2018, and approved by the Executive Committee on October 29, 2018.

Consent Calendar
Committee

5-Nov-18

Last Name/First Name Zip Term Phone College/Seat

ADD:

REMOVE:

	Program Planning Committee	Duckor, Brent	0074	2019	43342	J/CoED
	GS&R	Badawy, Mohamed	0084	2020	43924	H/CoENG

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 November 5, 2018
5 First Reading
6

AS 1713

7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **University Writing: Requirements/Guidelines and Support by the**
9 **University Writing Committee**

10 **Legislative History:** Rescinds S94-7, S95-5, and F15-6

11
12
13 Resolved: That [S94-7](#), [S95-5](#), and [F15-6](#) be rescinded and replaced with the
14 following, effective immediately.

15
16 Resolved: That the currently titled "Writing Requirements Committee" be renamed
17 "University Writing Committee."
18

19 *Rationale:* *Writing requirements and guidelines at the university level are currently*
20 *contained in three policies: S95-5, F15-6 (an amendment to the previous),*
21 *and S94-7 (for graduate-level writing), as well as in the overall [GE](#)*
22 *[guidelines as per S14-5](#). In addition, SJSU is obligated to abide by CSU*
23 *policies, specifically [Executive Order 665](#).*

24
25 *This policy proposal encapsulates requirements and guidelines in all of the*
26 *above-mentioned except the overall GE guidelines. A single policy is more*
27 *easily accessible and digestible to the campus community. For this*
28 *purpose, prior policy is kept largely intact. However, after extensive review*
29 *by the current Writing Requirements Committee about its own charge and*
30 *membership, some changes have been made. In brief:*

- 31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
- *New name for the committee: University Writing Committee (UWC).*
 - *New committee status: reporting directly to the Senate Curriculum & Research Committee, rather than the Board of General Studies (Sec. 1.b).*
 - *Committee membership updated to include the Writing Center Director and Coordinator of Multilingual Writing Support Services (Sec. 1.b).*
 - *Committee mission: Formerly a body charged largely with 100W course certification and re-certification via BOGS, the UWC will now*

41 *be an overseeing / consultative / advisory committee, in keeping*
42 *with its actual practice in recent years (Secs. 1.a and 2.c.ii-iii).*

43
44 *Undergraduate-level writing requirements (Sec. 2) are mostly the same*
45 *(with minor changes to office titles, etc.) as in S95-5, except for the section*
46 *charging the UWC with approval of courses (Sec. 2.c.ii). Graduate-level*
47 *writing requirements (Sec. 3) are mostly copied directly from S94-7, a*
48 *policy drafted according to Chancellor's Directive AA94-15, which appears*
49 *now to be defunct or at least superseded by Executive Order 665; with the*
50 *exception of additional language around doctoral programs and the*
51 *elimination of the waiver examination option.*

52
53 ***Student success orientation:*** *the above-described modifications to the*
54 *committee charge partially de-centralize the responsibilities for teaching*
55 *writing, allowing departments and colleges to make their own pedagogical*
56 *decisions around that teaching. This move is grounded in the principle that*
57 *the personnel actually doing the teaching are better equipped to assess*
58 *and serve their students and therefore better able to help students*
59 *succeed.*

60
61 *This draft was passed unanimously by the Writing Requirements*
62 *Committee on October 5, 2018 for referral to the Senate.*

63
64 Approved, Part I (O&G): 10/22/2018
65 Vote (Committee Name & Membership): 10-0-0

66
67 Approved, Part II (O&G): 10/22/2018
68 Vote (Purview of Committee): 4-3-3

69
70 Approved, Part III (C&R): 10/29/2018
71 Vote: 8-0-0

72
73 Present: Scott Heil, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Susana
74 Khavul, Cara Maffini, Anand
75 Ramasubramanian, Toby Matoush, Gwendolyn
76 Mok, Brandon White, Cynthia Fernandez-Rios

77
78 Absent: Thalia Anagnos, Pam Stacks, Peter Buzanski,
79 Lynne Trulio

80
81 Workload Impact: None anticipated

82
83 Financial Impact: None anticipated

84 **UNIVERSITY POLICY**

85 **University Writing: Requirements/Guidelines and Support by the**
86 **University Writing Committee (UWC)**

87
88 **1. Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), undergraduate level.**

89 a. Demonstration of competence in written communication shall be a
90 requirement for graduation with any bachelor's degree. Competence shall be
91 demonstrated by satisfaction of the General Education requirement for
92 Written Communication II (Area Z). Students shall satisfy the Written
93 Communication II requirement either by passing a course approved as
94 provided below in (c), or, if permitted by the requirements of their major, by
95 passing at the designated level the Writing Skills Test (WST) provided for
96 below in (d), or by satisfying the CSU Graduation Writing Assessment
97 Requirement (GWAR) prior to matriculation at San José State University.
98 Completion of General Education lower-division requirements for written
99 communication and passage of the WST shall be prerequisites for taking the
100 Written Communication II course.

101
102 b. Normally, students shall satisfy the General Education Written
103 Communication II require-ment as soon as possible after completion of 60
104 units. The Provost shall take appropriate measures to assure that students
105 satisfy the requirement before completion of 90 units. In exercising this
106 authority, the Provost may allow satisfaction of the requirement after
107 completion of 90 units if s/he finds that curricular patterns and requirements
108 in particular majors justify the postponement and also give adequate
109 assurance that the requirement will be duly satisfied.

110
111 c. Courses fulfilling GE Area Z (Written Communication II):

- 112 i. Every department (or equivalent unit) responsible for an
113 undergraduate degree program shall either offer an upper-division
114 writing workshop (Written Communication II) course for its majors
115 or designate for its majors, by agreement with that department,
116 such a course offered by another department. College deans shall
117 coordinate department offerings to assure that students will be
118 accommodated. The primary responsibility for offering such
119 courses is that of the major department and college. A department
120 shall not designate a course in another college without notice to
121 and consent of both college deans.
- 122 ii. Courses satisfying the Written Communication II requirement are
123 submitted for approval to the Board of General Studies in the same

manner of all other GE and SJSU Studies courses. For approval, the Board must be satisfied that the proposed course will require substantial appropriate writing, that a high standard for successful completion of the course will be maintained and that the course complies with all other applicable General Education criteria. The Board shall periodically review all approved courses and may recommend withdrawal if, in the Board's judgment, sufficiently high standards have not been maintained or the course has otherwise become deficient. The University Writing Committee (UWC) shall be consulted for advice at the Board's request.

d. Writing Skills Test (WST):

- i. If permitted by the requirements of a major, the Writing Skills Test referred to above in (a) may also serve as a waiver examination for Written Communication II. The UWC shall designate the score on the WST necessary to satisfy the Written Communication II requirement.
- ii. The specific form and content of the WST and the minimum passing score shall be as approved by the Board of General Studies on the recommendation of the UWC.
- iii. The WST shall be administered by the Testing Office at least twice a semester and once each summer. Students taking the WST shall pay a fee sufficient to cover the costs of providing, administering, and grading the test.
- iv. The Provost shall appoint a faculty member recommended by the UWC as Writing Skills Test Coordinator. The duties of the Coordinator shall include appointment and training of faculty or other readers for the essays.

2. Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), graduate level.

- a. The establishment of English competency shall be a requirement of classified graduate students as a condition necessary for advancement to candidacy for the award of the graduate degrees. Master's and doctoral degree requirements may be considered separately.
- b. Competency shall be established by:
 - i. Satisfactory completion of the CSU baccalaureate graduation requirement of competency in written English; or
 - ii. Satisfactory completion as a graduate student of the San José State University's undergraduate upper-division writing requirement

- 164 by completing satisfactorily a writing workshop (Written
165 Communication II); or
- 166 iii. Satisfactory completion of a graduate course of at least three units
167 in which a major report is required (such report to be valued at a
168 minimum of 30 percent of the course grade). The courses meeting
169 this requirement shall be evaluated by the Graduate Studies
170 Committee for the amount of writing and the level of competence
171 required; or
- 172 iv. Approval by the Graduate Studies Office of a professional
173 publication for which the candidate was the sole author; or
- 174 v. Satisfactory completion of an upper-division writing course at
175 another university judged by the Graduate Studies Office to be
176 equivalent in content and writing requirements to SJSU's 100W.

Commented [1]: Eliminated here was the following from prior policy: "passing the writing workshop waiver examination or."

The WRC felt strongly that merely a high score on the one-off Writing Skills Test was not a sufficient indication of a student's mastery of writing at the graduate level.

177

178 **3. University Writing Committee (UWC).**

- 179 a. Charge: The charge of the UWC shall be to develop and support writing
180 instruction at SJSU. To do this, the UWC shall study and support the
181 teaching of writing at all levels, all across the curriculum. The UWC shall
182 be a resource for the teaching and learning of writing all across campus, in
183 support of student writers' university careers from beginning to end.

184

185 Members of the UWC serve a vital role as representatives of their colleges
186 and departments. UWC members shall communicate with faculty
187 members in their home colleges and departments, keeping them informed
188 of the activities of the UWC; act as conduits between their colleges and
189 departments and the UWC, helping the committee understand the various
190 (and varied) needs of departments and programs on campus; and help
191 develop policies and programs to address these needs.

192

193 The UWC may sponsor workshops and training programs for instructors of
194 approved courses and shall use these and other appropriate means to
195 provide guidance on the uniformity of composition standards throughout
196 the University

Commented [LT2]: This portion represents the revised understanding of the committee's function.

- 197
- 198 b. Committee membership.
- 199 i. The University Writing Committee (UWC) shall be special agency
200 reporting to the Curriculum & Research Committee, and be
201 composed of the following 19 members:
- 202 • College dean (EXO; UWC Chair; Appointed by the Provost)
 - 203 • SJSU Writing Programs Administrator (WPA) (EXO)

- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213
- 214
- 215
- 216
- 217
- 218
- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223
- 224
- 225
- 226
- 227
- 228
- 229
- 230
- 231
- 232
- 233
- 234
- 235
- 236
- 237
- 238
- 239
- 240
- SJSU Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Director (EXO)
 - Writing Center director (EXO)
 - Coordinator of Multilingual Writing Support Services (EXO)
 - AVP, Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or designee (EXO)
 - Director of Testing (EXO; non voting)
 - AVP Office of Student and Faculty Success or designee (EXO; non voting)
 - 2 faculty, Humanities & the Arts, with one from the Department of Linguistics and Language Development
 - 1 faculty each from all other colleges
 - 1 faculty, University Library
 - 2 students (undergraduate or graduate) who have satisfied the Written Communication II requirement, one of which shall, preferably, have experience with ESL learning.
- ii. Recruitment and appointment of members. Faculty members will serve a 3-year term with the possibility of renewable for one additional 3-year term if selected. Student members will serve a renewable 1-year term. Recruitment to serve on the UWC will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty members and students. When there are multiple applications for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential UWC members, attention should focus on the person's experience and engagement in activities related to student writing.
- iii. Interim appointments. When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical) an interim appointment can be made following normal Committee on Committee processes. Any seat that will be vacant for a year or more will require a replacement for the remainder of the term associated with that seat.
4. Replacing members. If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year, the chair of the UWC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of the UWC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement.

Commented [3]: These positions are added.

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 November 5, 2018
5 First Reading

AS 1714

6 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
7 **University Grading System Policy**
8

9 **Legislative History:** Rescinds S73-24, S83-15, F88-6, S99-6, S10-2, S11-5

10 **Whereas:** EO1100 designates the minimum grade requirements for general
11 education courses English language (A2), oral communication in the
12 English language (A1), critical thinking (A3), and mathematics/quantitative
13 reasoning (B4), (Title 5 Sections 40803, 40804, 40804.1), and

14 **Whereas:** EO1100 allows each campus to establish the minimum grades for
15 satisfactory completion of the remaining general education breadth
16 courses, and

17 **Whereas:** There are current 6 university policies that discuss various aspects of the
18 university grading system making it difficult to answer questions relevant
19 to grading. Therefore, be it

20 **Resolved:** That S73-24, S83-15, F88-6, S99-6, S10-2, S11-5 be rescinded, effective
21 immediately, and be it further

22 **Resolved:** That ASXXXX be adopted as university policy

23 **Rationale:** In bringing SJSU university policies in alignment with EO1100, the
24 Curriculum and Research Committee felt that having a single policy that
25 addresses grading requirements for undergraduate and graduate degree
26 programs was appropriate and would be easier for faculty and
27 administrators for consulting.

28 **Approved:** 10/29/2018

29 **Vote:** 8-0-0

30 **Present:** Scott Heil, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Susana Khavul, Cara Maffini,
31 Anand Ramasubramanian, Toby Matoush, Gwendolyn Mok,
32 Brandon White, Cynthia Fernandez-Rios

33 **Absent:** Thalia Anagnos, Pam Stacks, Peter Buzanski, Lynne Trulio

34 **Workload Impact:** None anticipated

35 **Financial Impact:** None anticipated

36 The Grading System of SJSU

37

38 1. Plus/Minus Grading is required for all undergraduate, graduate, and professional
39 courses using the A through F letter grading system as authorized in Title 5,
40 Section 40104.

41 a. For computing purposes, the plus adds a 0.3 value and a minus subtracts
42 a 0.3 value from a letter grade assigned on a 4.0 scale.

43 i. An A+ will still be calculated as a 4.0 per Title 5, Section 40104.

44 ii. There shall be no plus/minus associated with a grade of F.

45 b. Some undergraduate courses shall be restricted to a minimum grade of C-
46 for the award of credit as specified in EO1100.

47 c. In any situation regarding undergraduate courses wherein a substitution
48 has been allowed for written communication in the English language (A2),
49 oral communication in the English language (A1), critical thinking (A3), or
50 mathematics/quantitative reasoning (B4), such substitution - whether it be
51 for an individual or a program - shall also be passed at the level of C- or
52 higher in order to satisfy the General Education requirement.(Title 5
53 Sections 40803, 40804, 40804.1)

54 2. Exceptions to 1 will be for courses that apply Credit/No Credit. These courses
55 may consist of:

56 a. Fieldwork, Practicum, and Internships,

57 b. Multi-Semester linked courses where grade is assigned at the end (e.g.
58 Stretch English and Statway)

59 c. Projects, Portfolios, Individual Studies, or Directed Reading,

60 d. Clinical Rotation,

61 e. Course credit received by challenge examination,

62 f. Activity and Laboratory Courses,

63 g. Workshops,

- 64 h. Selected Seminars (Colloquia), and
- 65
- 66 i. Thesis and Dissertation courses
- 67

68 3. A graduate student may accumulate a maximum of 30% of the total units
69 required to graduate as Credit/No Credit grades toward the master's or doctoral
70 degree.

71 4. An upper-division undergraduate student shall have the option of taking and
72 applying to the undergraduate degree a maximum of 12 semester units outside
73 the major, the minor and general education on the basis of Credit/No Credit for
74 courses normally graded using the plus/minus grading system as described in
75 section 1.

76 a. The student shall elect this option at the registration period and may within
77 the first four weeks of instruction change the option from Credit/No Credit
78 to a traditional grading system

79 5. Any exceptions to the policy for a student to complete their course of study and
80 their degree requirements must be approved by the Provost or designee before
81 they can be accepted.

6
7 **Senate Management Resolution**
8 **Creating a Task Force for a Supportive Workplace**
9 **And Calling Upon Our Community**
10 **To Preserve Civility and Combat Bullying**
11 **At San José State University**
12

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

17 **Whereas:** The SJSU Academic Senate reiterates its commitment to SS-S05-1 which
18 supports UP S01-13's "commitment to creating a diverse community
19 guided by core values of inclusion, civility and respect for each individual"¹
20 and S99-8 which directs faculty members to "avoid exploitative, harassing,
21 or discriminatory behavior;"² and
22

23 **Whereas:** The SJSU Academic Senate recognizes that SJSU has taken preliminary
24 steps to identify and define bullying among its student population;³ and
25

26 **Whereas:** The SJSU Academic Senate acknowledges the importance of the "CSU
27 Safe and Healthy Workplace Environment," a report which evaluates the
28 issue of workplace bullying at San Francisco State University, surveys the
29 CSU system for best practices, and makes recommendations to the
30 campus community for action;⁴ and
31

32 **Whereas:** The SJSU Academic Senate endorses the California State University's
33 call in AS-3246-16 which "urges CSU campus senates and administration
34 to develop and implement strategies to redress, remedy, and mediate
35 workplace bullying;"⁵ and
36

37 **Whereas:** The SJSU Academic Senate notes the need for a working definition of
38 bullying to open discussion of the problem of workplace bullying, and
39 suggests the University of California Berkeley definition as a starting point,
40 as follows:
41

42 Bullying is a pattern of **repeated behavior** that a **reasonable person**
43 would find hostile, offensive, and unrelated to the University's legitimate
44 business interests. Bullying behavior may take many forms including
45 physical, verbal, or written acts or behaviors. Workplace bullying often
46 involves an abuse or misuse of power. A single physical, verbal, or written

47 act or behavior generally will *not* constitute bullying unless especially
48 severe and egregious.

49
50 Examples of bullying may include:

- 51
- 52 • persistent or egregious use of abusive, insulting, or offensive
- 53 language directed at an employee;
- 54 • spreading misinformation or malicious rumors;
- 55 • behavior or language that frightens, humiliates, belittles, or
- 56 degrades, including criticism or feedback that is delivered with
- 57 yelling, screaming, threats, or insults;
- 58 • making repeated inappropriate comments about a person's
- 59 appearance, lifestyle, family, or culture;
- 60 • regularly teasing or making someone the brunt of pranks or practical
- 61 jokes;
- 62 • interfering with a person's personal property or work equipment;
- 63 • circulating inappropriate or embarrassing photos or videos via e-mail or
- 64 social media;
- 65 • unwarranted physical contact; or
- 66 • purposefully excluding, isolating, or marginalizing a person from
- 67 normal work activities.⁶

68 and,

69
70 Whereas: Researchers agree that effective ways of dealing with bullying involve ,
71 awareness, education, prevention, and early intervention; and

72
73 Whereas: The California State Legislature provides a helpful description of bullying
74 in Assembly Bill 2053, which the University of California, Berkeley,
75 considered before its adoption of a Workplace Bullying Prevention Policy
76 in 2016;⁷ now therefore, be it

77
78 Resolved: That the Academic Senate shall establish a Task Force for a Supportive
79 Workplace, with the following characteristics:

- 80
- 81 1) Membership. A small (under 10) group of administrators, faculty, staff,
- 82 and/or students, selected for their various kinds of expertise on the
- 83 subject of workplace bullying and their willingness to engage in a
- 84 prolonged reform effort, appointed by the Senate upon nomination by
- 85 the Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the President.
- 86 2) Task. Make recommendations to the President and the Senate of any
- 87 necessary steps to promote an inclusive, safe, supportive, responsive,
- 88 and equitable workplace environment; additionally, make plans to
- 89 combat bullying through education and recommend a formal process
- 90 for addressing bullying when it occurs.⁸
- 91 3) Deadline. Deliver a report to the President and the Senate by
- 92 December 1, 2019.

93
94 Be it further

95
96 Resolved: That, in the meantime, faculty, staff and students who have suffered from
97 bullying are advised that counseling services are available. Faculty and
98 staff may be helped via the confidential employee assistance program
99 LifeMatters by Empathia,⁹ while students may seek help through
100 Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS).¹⁰

101
102 *Rationale:*

103
104 *The culture of the academy generally and San José State specifically holds as one of its*
105 *fundamental tenets the right to academic freedom and embraces principles of*
106 *collegiality and shared governance. However, as Leah P. Hollis points out, “Workplace*
107 *bullying, harassment, and hostile speech chill the environment and motivate those*
108 *facing abuse to withhold valuable contributions. Stating that bullying and coercing*
109 *others is one’s right as free speech is an excuse to sidestep the actions of the bully,*
110 *instead of addressing the impact of bullying on the educational environment” (Hollis*
111 *2018.) A culture of academic freedom cannot thrive in an atmosphere of abrasive*
112 *conduct and incivility—it will thrive in a diverse community guided by the core values of*
113 *inclusion, civility, and respect for each individual.*

114
115 *Approved: (October 30, 2018 by email vote following committee discussion on October*
116 *29, 2018)*

117
118 *Vote: (11-0-0)*

119
120 *Present: Present: (Chin, Kumar, He, Monday, McKee, Cargill, Peter, Hart, Kemnitz,*
121 *Rodriquez, Mahendra)*

122
123 *Absent: (none)*

124
125 *Financial Impacts: There could be financial impact if recommendations from the Task*
126 *Force are implemented. This impact could be positive if the workplace environment*
127 *becomes healthier and therefore less prone to lawsuits, grievances, inefficient work, etc.*

128
129 *Workload Impact: The comment on financial impact applies equally to workload impact.*
130

¹ <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/SS-S05-1.pdf>

² <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/S99-8.pdf>

³ <http://www.sjsu.edu/spartansforsafety/bullying/>

⁴ <http://www.csueu.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/Download.aspx?portalid=0&EntryId=1745>

⁵ <https://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2015-2016/documents/3246.shtml>

⁶ <https://campuspol.berkeley.edu/policies/bullying.pdf>

⁷ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140AB2053

⁸ <https://titleix.sfsu.edu/content/anti-bullying-workgroup-progress>

⁹ http://www.sjsu.edu/up/all/wellness/employee_assistance/

⁹ http://www.sjsu.edu/counseling/students/what_is_counseling/

Preliminary Reading:

The Academic Senate urges the University community to familiarize itself with some of the preliminary readings listed below, particularly those recent sources that address bullying in higher education.

Anonymous Academics. "We need a bigger conversation about bullying in academia" (*The Guardian*, January 26, 2018). Retrieved October 14, 2018. (<https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2018/jan/26/we-need-a-bigger-conversation-about-bullying-in-academia>)

Escalante, Hector. *Incivility and Abrasive Conduct in Institutions of Higher Learning and the Ombuds Role*, University of the Pacific, Dissertation 2018. (https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3115)

Hollis, Leah P, "The Ironic Interplay of Free Speech and Silencing: Does Workplace Bullying Compromise Free Speech in Higher Education?" *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom*. Volume 9 (2018). (<https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Hollis.pdf>)

Keashly, Loreleigh; Neuman, Joel H. "Faculty Experiences with Bullying in Higher Education: Causes, Consequences, and Management." *Administrative Theory & Praxis*. Public Administration Theory Network. 32 (1) 2010: 48–70. (https://web.archive.org/web/20131031193910/http://www.ccas.net/files/ADVANCE/Keashly_Bullying.pdf)

Khoo, S.B. "Academic Mobbing: Hidden Health Hazard at Workplace." *Malays Fam Physician*, 5:2, 2010. 61-67. (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4170397/>)

Twale, Darla J, De Luca, Barbara M. *Faculty Incivility: The Rise of the Academic Bully Culture and What to Do About It*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 2008.

Twale, Darla J. *Understanding and Preventing Faculty-on-Faculty Bullying: A Psycho-Social Organizational Approach*. New York: Routledge, 2018.

1 **SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **November 5, 2018**
5 **First Reading**
6
7

AS 1716

8 **POLICY**
9 **RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment of S96-2 Direct Instruction Obligations**
11

12 Resolved: That F96-2 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline
13

14 *Rationale: This 1996 policy is still in use but contains quotations from an obsolete*
15 *collective bargaining agreement, obsolete titles, and other obsolete language. Many of*
16 *the following revisions were recommended by the Senior Associate Vice President for*
17 *University Personnel. The Professional Standards Committee has additionally edited*
18 *and shortened to reduce this policy to its most essential points.*
19

20 *Approved: October 29, 2018*
21

22 *Vote: 10-0-0*
23

24 *Present: He, McKee, Cargill, Peter, Hart, Rodriquez, Monday, Kumar,*
25 *Kemnitz, Mahendra*
26

27 *Absent: Chin*
28

29 *Financial Impact: No direct impacts*
30

31 *Workload Impact: No direct impacts*
32

33
34 DIRECT INSTRUCTION OBLIGATIONS POLICY AND PROCEDURES

35
36 (Supersedes S 92-5)

37
38 S 96-2

39
40 ~~Whereas, In the CSU and CFA Agreement, it states:~~

41
42 ~~A faculty employee who is assigned temporary substitute duty of a short duration, which~~
43 ~~shall normally be up to eighteen (18) class hours, shall be compensated at the faculty~~
44 ~~substitute rate. Temporary substitute assignments of a longer duration, which shall~~
45 ~~normally be greater than eighteen (18) class hours, shall be compensated by an~~
46 ~~appropriate workload reduction as soon as practicable or, if the employee is not~~
47 ~~employed in the next academic term, the employee shall be appropriately compensated~~
48 ~~upon separation for the class hours taught. For compelling reasons, a faculty employee~~
49 ~~may decline such an assignment. Nothing in this provision shall preclude faculty~~
50 ~~employees from making informal voluntary substitute arrangements of short duration~~
51 ~~with a university colleague. The department chairperson shall be consulted in advance~~
52 ~~about such arrangements; and~~

53
54 ~~Whereas, The chief academic officer title at SJSU has changed from "Academic Vice-~~
55 ~~President" to "Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs"; and~~

56
57 ~~Whereas, That San Jose State University should include the relevant changes in~~
58 ~~governing policies; therefore, be it~~

59
60 Resolved: That the attached document (Direct Instructional Obligations, Policy and
61 Procedures) be adopted as policy.

62
63
64 **Direct Instructional Obligations**

65 **Policy and Procedures**

66 It is the normal obligation of a faculty member to meet each of his/her classes at the
67 scheduled time, ~~and~~ place and manner and to present or have presented to the class
68 material appropriate to the stated subject matter. A faculty member who fails to meet or
69 so instruct a class without justification may be (a) formally reprimanded. ~~and/or (b)-~~
70 ~~officially reported as absent for payroll purposes and be docked all or part of the day's-~~

71 pay accordingly. Repeated failures may be the basis for disciplinary proceedings
72 leading to suspension, demotion or dismissal.

73

74 ~~Failure to comply strictly with the prescribed schedule or to present the usual material in~~
75 ~~the usual way may be justified in terms of instructional innovation or experimentation.~~
76 ~~Such failures may also be justified by special considerations of a personal or~~
77 ~~professional nature. In all such cases faculty members should get approval from the~~
78 ~~department chair well in advance, when planning to depart from the published schedule~~
79 ~~or when contemplating substantial departures from the usual materials. For planned~~
80 ~~absences from instructional assignments, faculty members shall provide the chair~~
81 ~~advance notice of the personal or professional considerations which result in the~~
82 ~~absence and shall consult with the chair about suitable arrangements to satisfy~~
83 ~~instructional obligations. Any substitute arrangements are subject to the approval of the~~
84 ~~chair. As a general rule, there should be no loss of salary or other sanction unless such~~
85 ~~failures have resulted in a loss to the student or to the University of some part of the~~
86 ~~faculty member's time and efforts to which they are entitled. (Justification under this~~
87 ~~statement does not prevent a charge against sick leave where the failure results from~~
88 ~~any cause for which sick leave is available.)~~

89

90 Procedures

91

92 ~~A complaint that a faculty member has failed to meet her/his instructional obligations (as~~
93 ~~defined above) should be made or referred to the department chair. The chair should~~
94 ~~consult with the faculty member named, and if appropriate, investigate more widely.~~
95 ~~After the chair has investigated and determined that a substantial unjustified failure to~~
96 ~~meet instructional obligations did take place, the chair shall summarize his/her findings~~
97 ~~and shall recommend in writing appropriate sanctions to the. This summary and~~
98 ~~recommendation shall be provided to the faculty member and shall include notice that~~
99 ~~s/he has seven days from the date of the notice to respond or rebut to the administrator.~~
100 ~~The administrator may issue an oral or written reprimand in accordance with Article 18~~
101 ~~of the CSU/CFA Agreement and/or may recommend a pay dock to the Provost and~~
102 ~~Vice President for Academic Affairs. In cases of repeated failures, the administrator~~
103 ~~may recommend to the President via the Provost and Vice President for Academic~~
104 ~~Affairs that appropriate disciplinary action be initiated in accordance with Article 19 of~~
105 ~~the CSU/CFA Agreement.~~

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee
4 November 5, 2018
5 First Reading

AS 1717

6
7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Amendment of Bylaw 15a**
9

10 Legislative History: F16-3 which modified bylaw 15c provided for the correction of
11 editorial errors and S16-7 expanded the language of bylaw 15 to allow the Senate Chair
12 to make editorial changes to a Senate document whenever there is an outdated
13 reference to a law, regulation, executive order or Senate document. This proposal,
14 modifying bylaw 15a, expands editorial changes that can be made by the Senate Chair
15 to include more generally changes in designations provided the function,
16 responsibilities, purpose, or content remain the same.

17
18

19 Whereas: University designations sometimes change; and

20

21 Whereas: Changing University policy to reflect such changes requires: a referral to a
22 policy committee; the drafting of a Senate resolution; and its consideration
23 by the Senate; therefore be it

24

25 Resolved That section a of bylaw 15 be modified as follows:

26

27 a) When designations such as the title of related to a university official or ~~of an~~
28 ~~agency or unit of the university appearing in Academic Senate documents~~
29 ~~(including the constitution, bylaws, university policies, and resolutions providing~~
30 ~~for committee membership) is~~ are changed, but the function, responsibilities,
31 purpose or content ~~and responsibilities of the office or agency~~ remain the same,
32 the Senate Chair may approve replacement in the Senate documents of the old
33 ~~title or designation~~ by the new one, as an editorial change. Such changes shall
34 be reported to the Executive Committee of the Senate and recorded in the
35 meeting minutes.

36

37

38 Rationale: Designations change or evolve. This proposal emerged as the result of
39 references in some policies to “200-level courses” (e.g. F08-2) which at
40 the time meant “graduate courses.” But with SJSU’s new doctoral
41 programs, the university now has 500-level courses. Providing the Senate
42 Office with the flexibility to make changes without needing to refer such
43 changes to policy committee and then to involve the Senate will help keep
44 information up to date, reduce service workload for faculty members
45 serving on committees, and enable the Senate to attend to weightier
46 matters.

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Approved: 10/29/18
Vote: 6-0-0
Present: Curry, Gallo, Higgins, Rodan, Saldami, Shifflett
Absent: Bailey, Capizzi, Ormsbee, French, Grosvenor
Financial Impact: None
Workload Impact: The proposed change will not alter the workload of the Senate Office which would ultimately be making the changes, but will reduce the workload of policy committees and the Senate which would otherwise have to approve such changes.