SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2019/2020
Agenda
November 18, 2019, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Engineering 285/287

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

II. Approval of Minutes:
Senate Minutes of October 7, 2019
Senate Minutes of October 28, 2019

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 14, 2019
EC Minutes of October 21, 2019

B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of November 18, 2019

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

V. Unfinished Business:

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)
A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1752, Policy Recommendation, University Governance Award for Students; Student Service (First Reading)

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1756, Amendment B to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (First Reading)

AS 1755, Policy Recommendation, Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs (First Reading)

AS 1753, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding S73-19, Faculty Personnel Records (Final Reading)

AS 1754, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding F85-8, Performance Evaluation Procedures for Employees in Unit 4-Academic Support (Final Reading)

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1735, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge and Responsibilities (Final Reading)

AS 1750, Amendment to Senate Constitution regarding Administrative Representatives (Final Reading)

D. University Library Board (ULB):

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1757, Amendment A to University Policy F18-5, University Grading System (Final Reading)

AS 1758, Policy Recommendation, Transfer Credit for Graduate Programs (First Reading)

VII. Special Committee Reports:

VIII. New Business:

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m., General Education Special Committee Report by Chair Mathur, Past Chair Frazier, Senator White, and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Thalia Anagnos

IX. State of the University Announcements:

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

X. Adjournment

2019/2020 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 7, 2019

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: Rodan, Van Selst, Curry, Frazier, Mathur, Parent
Absent: None

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

Deans:
Present: Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Stacks
Absent: Lattimer

Students:
Present: Kaur, Delgadillo, Gallo, Trang, Birrer, Roque
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
Present: McClory

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Higgins, Masegian, Monday
Absent: None

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

COB Representatives:
Present: He, Khavul
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Marachi

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

H&A Representatives:
Present: Khan, McKee, Kitajima, Coelho
Absent: Riley

SCI Representatives:
Present: White, Cargill, Kim
Absent: French

SOS Representatives:
Present: Peter, Wilson, Jackson, Hart
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The minutes of September 16, 2019 were approved as amended (44-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair Mathur announced that last week that Senators should have received the call for nominations for the faculty awards (Distinguished Service, President's Scholar, Outstanding Lecturer, and Outstanding Professor) and the Wang Family Award. Nominations for the faculty awards are due in the Senate Office by October 31, 2019. Wang Family Award nominations are due in the President's Office by October 23, 2019. Both faculty and staff (Administrator IIIs and IVs only) are eligible for the Wang Award.

The Chancellor has requested that campus presidents provide information on what courses

are currently being taught on their campuses that meet the ethnic studies requirement, and/or actions being taken to establish courses at their campuses. These recommendations are due in the Chancellor's Office by October 22, 2019. Our Senate passed a resolution as a first step in fulfilling the ASCSU promise made during our advocacy over the summer against AB 1460 to take up the Ethnic Studies Task Force Report. This was made in response to legislative pressures to take up the issue and stave off legislative intrusion into our curriculum. The ASCSU met a week ago and announced our window of opportunity to act is this Fall semester, and they wanted to explore what campuses are already doing to meet the ethnic studies requirement and to determine the parameters for moving forward. The ASCSU Chair asked campus Senates and the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies for input on what the parameters of a CSU system wide requirement might look like e.g. learning outcomes, and the nature of the requirement, etc. The ASCSU Chair, Dr. Nelson, asked campuses to provide a list of the courses already offered and the departments they reside in that meet the criteria. Our Senate has taken up the task and is working on preparing a summary document of the required elements. The deadline for submission of this summary document is November 1, 2019. Late last week a drop box was opened for each campus where the summary can be dropped. We have had some discussions about how the ethnic studies requirement might be met through our area S and/or V. We have had discussion about what is being done here and what our best practices are. This needs to be done by November 1, 2019. If you are interested in participating in this working group, please contact Chair Mathur.

Questions:
Q: What is the size of the working group?
A: Depends on how much interest there is.

Chair Mathur announced an open letter was sent to all faculty from Chancellor White about President Papazian's presidential review. Every president gets a review every three years. The Academic Senate will be contacted for feedback and several other groups as well. The deadline to submit letters is November 1, 2019. This feedback will ultimately be given to the Board of Trustees.

President Papazian is out of town. She is a speaker at the World Conference of Information Technology in Armenia today.

Chair Mathur announced that she only has four followers for the Senate on Twitter. She encouraged Senators to join.

B. From the President of the University: Not Present.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Executive Committee Minutes of September 9, 2019

B. Consent Calendar –

There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. Unfinished Business –

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1743, Amendment B to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading).***

Chair Mathur announced that the Provost had discussed the suggested changes with the Vice President of Research and Innovation (VPRI) and he was fine with them. **Senator Shifflett presented two amendments that were friendly to the body. After line 22 insert a whereas to read, "Whereas: the title of the former College of International and Extended Studies has changed, therefore be it further," and after line 51 insert a resolved clause to read, "Resolved, that the title in section 1.3.3 be amended as follows: 1.3.3 Special Procedures for the Dean of the College of Professional and Global Education" (44-0-0).** Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove "therefore be it" in line 21. **The Senate voted and AS 1743 passed as amended (43-0-1)**.

Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.
Professional Standards Committee (PS) – No report.

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1726, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy F12-6, Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty (Final Reading).***

Senator Khan presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "lecturer" in line 96 to "lecturer faculty". **The Senate voted and AS 1726 passed as amended (44-0-0).**

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

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1747, Policy Recommendation, Rescind and Replace SM-F09-2, Charge and Membership of the Academic Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee (Final Reading).***

Questions:

Q: When would these changes be effective?

A: Immediately.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 14 that was friendly to the body to change "S19-2 (which modified SM-F09-2)" to read "SM-F09-2 (which was modified by S19-2)." **The Senate voted and AS 1747 passed as amended (44-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1748, Policy Recommendation, Adding General Unit Seats to the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB), Student Fairness Committee (SFC), University Library Board (ULB), University Writing Committee (UWC) (Final Reading).***

Senator Shifflett presented several amendments. After line 75, add "Faculty representatives must be individuals who teach courses where SOTES/SOLATES

are mandatory." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed (43-0-1). Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike "updated" in line 17-18 so that it reads, "The membership information for the Student Fairness Committee resides in S14-3 (which was amended by S19-2)," and to strike line 117. Senator Masegian presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to ensure the capitalization is consistent throughout the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1748 passed as amended (43-0-1).**

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1749, Amendment B to University Policy S13-9, Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating, Academic Units (Final Reading).*** Senator Coelho presented an amendment to change "best determined in consultation with the affected departments" to "determined in consultation with the affected departments" on line 54. The Coelho amendment passed (43-0-1). Senator Coelho presented an amendment to change "sufficient time" in line 57 to "an approximate minimum of three months" (21-15-1). The Senate voted and AS 1749 passed as amended (41-0-3).

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1735, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies (BOGS) Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (First Reading).***
Changes suggested include in section 1.1, having GWAR courses reviewed by the University Writing Committee (this was already discussed and debated in the recent University Writing Committee policy). In section 1.2, college representatives could be tenure-track or tenured and at-large seats should be filled with lecturers. The data O&G has from Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IE&A) indicates that 75% of the General Education instruction on campus is delivered by lecturers. Next, in section 1.2.1, since this would be an Operating Committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research policy committee, appointments should be made through the regular Committee on Committee's process rather than through college elections. Moving to section 1.2.2, the Chair could be any member of the committee with at least one year of service. In section 1.2.3, the detail regarding voting was deleted. With all of the work in this committee taking the form of recommendations, a split vote was not a concern. In section 2.3, we added explicit information on review of existing general education (GE) courses. In section 2.7. there is information on which groups this group would liaison with. It turns out there was a substantial amount of discussion in the O&G Committee about the connections this group needs, benefits from, connects to and that is where the name change comes in as the General Education Advisory Committee. In section 2.8 is information on responsibility related to program planning, which the GE program goes through, as do other campuses. BOGS has only done their first one, so it is not historically something that has been done on campus, but it meets the guidelines provided in the Executive Order. BOGS has gone through its first full program planning process, so we wanted to make sure it

was reflected in the policy. In section 3.2, we specifically drew out review of new and existing GE courses so that it is crystal clear. In section 4, we provided language to clarify this committee would be involved in assessment at the program level for general education. That is separate from review of new course proposals and existing courses.

Questions:
Q: Given that 75% of the GE courses are taught by lecturers, I'm wondering why college representatives shall be tenure and tenure-track and not lecturer faculty?
A: That is an interesting question and we talked about it at length in O&G. We cannot put into policy a seat for lecturers, they don't have service as part of their assignment. As tenure and tenure-track faculty, you have the expectation of service. O&G's way of bringing in lecturers was the at-large seats, but O&G will discuss this further.
Q: Lecturer faculty serve on committees such as Undergraduate Studies, Institutional Review Board, and Student Fairness as college representatives so in parity it is confusing why on this committee they are being pulled out and are not being considered college representatives whereas on other committees lecturers are college representatives?
A: Point well taken. Thank you.
C: The Chancellor's Office is not using just the Executive Order (EO) number any longer, so you have to refer to the EO and put the date in brackets.
A: Thank you.
Q: On line 224, you say members must know the current guidelines. What guidelines are we talking about here?
A: SJSU guidelines. O&G will clarify.
Q: My question has to do with the relationship of the operating committee to its parent curriculum committee. If you look at Undergraduate Studies Committee for example, there are a number of things that terminate at the Undergraduate Studies Committee and don't go forward to the university curriculum committee, then there are some things that are of such importance that they always go forward to the University Curriculum Committee. What is going to be the dividing line between those issues that terminate at the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) and those things that get passed forward to the University Committee?
A: Thank you. I believe we've got it completely covered. When a review is being made of new courses, 3.2.2. makes crystal clear all final recommendations go to the administrator designated by the Provost to receive those. In 3.3. when it refers to the periodic review of existing courses, it is clear the feedback goes to Program Planning and not to the Curriculum and Research Committee.
Q: How about a brand new GE package?
A: C&R is in charge of this right now. It says that the body charged with the review needs to include consultation with GEAC.
Q: Would O&G consider adding the AS Director of Academic Affairs as another student member to GEAC?
A: O&G will consider it.
Q: Lines 63-66 remove the review of GWAR courses from BOGS and transfer it

to the University Writing Committee (UWC), but the UWC policy recently passed specifically states that the review of GWAR courses will be done by BOGS?
A: O&G is aware of this and that current GE guidelines call for the review by BOGS. O&G realizes there will be some ripple effects and will certainly talk again about the GWAR components.
Q: Would O&G be amenable to arguments from the UWC?
A: Yes.
Q: Good, thank you.

Q: Do you feel that in this new formation, the committee recommends, but the final approval will come from the administration?
A: It is not a change. There aren't faculty groups that make final decisions on curriculum.
Q: My observation is that I would love to have a student member, but it is very hard to get a student member.
A: AS does sometimes struggle to fill the seat, but it doesn't diminish the importance.

Q: In 3.2.1. is a recommended rejection the same as a plan to propose to reject?
A: Yes. O&G will work not to be redundant in that section.
Q: If they do recommend rejection will the recommendation still move forward to the Provost designee? In other words, will it still have a chance to be overturned by the Provost designee?
A: Yes.

Q: I'm concerned about the language that states that at-large seats should, when possible, be filled with lecturers. Could O&G make the language stronger to ensure there would be at least one lecturer representative?
A: O&G will consider this.

Q: Is it possible to use a different acronym instead of GEAC since there is a GEAC at the statewide level and this can be very confusing?
A: O&G talked about this at length and believed that was a positive, because we would have an SJSU counterpart of the same name.

Q: Would O&G consider a name like the GE Program Advisory Committee and shifting the charge to a more programmatic perspective?
A: O&G talked about this at length and the consensus was that this has a component of program level reviews, but also does course level reviews and so this would not be a good modification.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No report.
D. University Library Board (ULB) – No report.
E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – No report.

VII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

A. **Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) –**

James Lee, Senior Director, Faculty Affairs, and CDO Wong(Lau) have completed 14 faculty diversity trainings. The Provost has required all search committee members attend these mandatory training sessions. If they don't attend then they don't have access to the applications and files.

The CDO's Office is providing support for faculty to go to conferences that target underrepresented minority faculty candidates. One of these conferences is the Society for the Advancement of Chicano and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS) and the CDO is sending Monika Kress, from Physics and Walter Adams from Biology. UP is working with the CDO's Office in putting together packets of all of our openings for these faculty to take to the conferences.

The Campus Climate Committee has been working on the survey items for the Campus Climate Survey that will be going out in the Spring 2020. They have also been working on putting together focus groups for October 21, 2019. There will be 24 focus groups. The committee will meet again for 2 days in October and 2 days in November to complete the Survey. The survey will then be sent to the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

The appointment letters for the Committee on Productive and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations will go out this week. There is one more person to confirm. The CDO and the Vice Chair of the Senate, Alison McKee, will be co-chairs of this committee.

Questions:

Q: When you go through the diversity training is it good for just one year, or are you covered for two years?

A: This is the baseline year and the CDO is moving towards saying it will be good for two years, but that isn't just the CDO's decision.

Q: Is the support for faculty to attend conferences an open nomination process, or is the CDO's Office picking those faculty and conferences?

A: Recommendations are received from Academic Affairs and the CDO's Office is trying to bring in faculty that have already attended some of the diversity conferences and have some expertise in diversity in hiring. It is not an open nomination process.

Q: Is there something expected from the faculty that attend?

A: Yes, they are expected to give a report. Sending faculty to conferences was what part of the grant money received from the Chancellor's Office to continue best practices in diversity was used for.
Q: Are you prioritizing who is sent to these conferences based on the degree of need by a particular department?
A: Not necessarily. Generally, it is chairs and faculty that have been instrumental in bringing new practices to their hiring practices with some degree of efficacy. These are the people targeted.

B. **CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation) –**
Trustee Sabalius announced that the last Board of Trustee (BOT) Meeting was at the end of September. Trustee Sabalius is in the process of writing his report and will send it to the Senate next week. Much of that meeting was spent discussing the fourth year of quantitative reasoning as a CSU admission requirement. The argument for it is to better prepare students for college, equalizing opportunities for all students to start in their major of choice, especially the STEM fields, and authentic access. The arguments against it are the concerns about the capacity of the high schools to deliver, and it may disproportionately affect students of color, students from rural areas, and underfunded schools. Our disciplinary faculty are for it. A taskforce on quantitative reasoning was convened in 2015 that supports it. However, the California Faculty Association (CFA) opposes it more on social justice grounds than for pedagogical reasons. Trustee Sabalius sees a chism developing between these two faculty institutions (CFA and ASCSU). Over the last several years these opposing positions have happened more frequently, such as with the fourth year of quantitative reasoning, AB 1460, or the GE Taskforce. I urge the CFA and faculty at SJSU to strive to work together and set a good example.

The BOT talked about the budget. The budget request from the BOT will be much more robust this year. The other part of the budget discussion was about AB 48 that passed. The K-12 system will get $9 billion and CCC, CSU and UC systems will get $6 billion ($2 billion each) if the measure will be approved in the March election. Although it is a non-partisan bill, we, as CSU employees, cannot advocate for it.

Trustee Sabalius attended the Intersegmental Committee on Academic Senates (ICAS) meeting. This is the Executive Committees of the UCs, Community Colleges, and the CSU. They met in San Mateo two days ago. Trustee Sabalius announced that the East Bay President is retiring and he may be asked to sit on the search committee. Also, please provide feedback on President Papazian to the Chancellor's Office for her three-year review.

Questions:
C: I am aware of strong opposition to the fourth year of quantitative reasoning. That is because there is unequal access. My recommendation is for the ASCSU to do a feasibility analysis. They need to ensure these courses are taught by qualified

teachers and ensure they do not become watered-down online courses. This is also a concern for Ethnic Studies courses.

C. **CSU Statewide Academic Senators –**
The CSU Statewide Senators submitted a report to the Senate on September 23, 2019.

There was a workshop on *Interrupting Racism* that was run collaboratively by CFA leadership.

At the last ASCSU meeting they discussed quantitative reasoning, AB 1460, and the ASCSU Leadership Retreat that had a theme of *Inclusive Excellence in Practice and Educating Students to be Informed Citizens.* Another item addressed at the assembly was the Land Recognition Policy Statement. This needs to occur at every public meeting we are engaged in.

D. **Provost – Not Present**

E. **Associated Students President –**
AS President Branden Parent announced that AS just hired their AS Leadership in Government Coordinator, Samantha Quiambao. Samantha is coming to AS from East Bay and will start in December. She will help with the AS Board and also advising for students.

Homecoming is next week and the AS President will be in the Golf Cart Parade. Other events include the *Fire in the Fountain*.

AS President Parent will be attending the 2025 Grade Symposium in Sacramento next weekend.

AS is still looking for student college representatives for their Academic Affairs committee. If you are a chair or dean of a department or college, please reach out to Senator Anoop Kaur. She is the Chair of this committee. AS would really like the chair and dean input.

AS will be attending California State Student Association (CSSA) on October 19 and 20, 2019.

Questions:
Q: What is the golf cart parade about?
A: Basically, AS decorates golf carts and they drive around in a parade.

Q: What is the 2025 Graduation Symposium?
A: It is part of the 2025 graduation initiative. Each CSU chooses a number of students to go with the administrators.

Q: How can students apply for the Academic Affairs Committee?

A: If they go to the AS website there is an application form and description of the committee as well as the qualifications that AS is looking for.

F. **Vice President for Administration and Finance –**
VP Faas announced that even though PG&E has an advisory out, as of about 15 minutes ago it isn't going to impact SJSU. It is mostly in the hills. The administration will be putting out an announcement for Wednesday that SJSU will be open. You might not have power at your house, but we will have power here.

If something does change, we have back-up generators. However, there are a few buildings on campus that are not connected to our Cogen Plant and these are Joe West Hall, the Dining Commons, and Washburn. For these buildings we have back-up generators. If the electricity was off for a while then we would prioritize where the power went.

On October 28, 2019, VP Faas will give the Senate a presentation on the budget. VP Faas announced he thought everyone would be pleased.

Questions:
Q: It has been several years since we've had a campus planning report, and I was wondering if we could get one of those?
A: I'm sure we can set that up.

Q: I noticed the statistics on rape on the security report that went out to the Senate, can you give more details?
A: More than zero is too many. When you look at this past year there are a number of things to look at. First, we had Kathy Wong(Lau) here and it is her fourth year on campus. People are becoming more comfortable with Title IX and coming forward to her. We have had several instances of prior year concerns that came up this year. VP Faas went back and looked at four or five universities about our size and our statistics are in the same ballpark as the others. However, any more than zero is not acceptable, but we are not seeing any patterns here except people are feeling more comfortable reporting issues.

Q: There have been a number of alerts recently and it seems, at least in my department, that the notifications are uneven. Even when we checked to be sure people were signed up it was still uneven based on who received notification. Has this been addressed?
A: Yes, there are a couple of things going on here. We have an opt in alert system which is totally backwards. It should be an opt out. Too often we are hearing that people didn't know about alerts and it is because they didn't sign up. If you aren't signed up today, take two minutes and sign up for the SJSU alerts. However, VP Faas and his team are going to fix this and switch it around so you don't opt in, you have to opt out to not get alerts. Secondly, we want to make sure if something happens in the MLK Library we can get information back to people that we are on top of it what the situation is. We want to come out with a better channel to get that

information out to people. Maybe that is through Twitter or something else. We will have a way to get that information out and where to go for that information. This is the same thing we want to do with the PG&E situation.
Q: Some faculty were getting the notices and now are not. Can you test the system periodically?
A: We did just test it last week, but VP Faas will personally take a look to see if Senator Chin is on it.

G. **Vice President for Student Affairs – Not Present.**

VIII. Special Committee Reports –

Vice President of University Advancement, Peter Smits, gave a presentation on ***The Comprehensive Campaign.*** On July 31, 2019, SJSU launched a $350 Million fundraising campaign. The question is what are we going to raise the money for. When VP Smits arrived there were no priorities established to raise money for. VP Smits visited the Provost and the Deans across campus to decide what the process should be and what we should be raising funds for. This campaign will last for eight years. VP Smits began with the priority-setting process. It is important when we meet with donors and prospects that we talk to them about things that are important to the university. We need to try and talk to them about things that are important to them as well.

The campaign will span out over eight years and there are three different phases we will go through. The first phase is to decide what the priorities are and develop campaign leadership. We don't have campaign committee yet and probably won't until the first part of next year. It is important to the deans and especially the people in Academic Affairs, to decide what we want to raise money for. We have asked the deans (who are now working with their faculty, chairs and directors) to come up with three to four big ideas that will transform their college forever. Some of them are talking about projects between $10 and $25 million. There is one that has a campaign goal of $120 million. That is about the most ambitious I've heard of, but it is interesting and relates to Moss Landing. We are asking the deans to come up with three ideas that are multi-million dollars and will transform Academic Affairs and Student Affairs for the rest of our lives. They are in the process of doing that now. We are meeting with all the Deans and Associate Deans and the President's cabinet at a retreat later this month to talk about what these big ideas are. By the time this little retreat is over, we will have 8 to 12 top fundraising goals for Academic Affairs and probably Athletics as well. We will probably also end up with three to four university-wide campaigns.

Of the $350 million, I believe 80% to 85% will be for Academic Affairs. Athletics will be a minor part of this campaign in my opinion between $25 to $40 million. We won't know for sure until the retreat is over. After the retreat is over, we will put all the main ideas into a report and take a feasibility study to our largest donors in the area to see what they think of the ideas in early January. We will test the ideas on about 50 to 60 donors. About a couple weeks after we have tested these ideas on donors, we will bring back the results to the campus. After that we start the process of raising the money. Quarterly fundraising reports will be submitted after that.

When VP Smits was at Fresno State, he conducted an $210 million fundraising campaign. He was often asked how faculty could help. Here is a story of how faculty helped.

A faculty member and his wife liked to RV. They met two brothers and their spouses. One brother was from Hayward, and the other was from Pleasanton. The brother from Pleasanton owned 200 acres. Whenever our faculty member would go RVing with him, he would bring food from the agriculture farm that the campus grew. The brothers began giving scholarships to students. When the two brothers passed away, one of the spouses was appointed the Executor of the estate. VP Smits never forgot the day the administrator told them that the two brothers had left the university $29.4 million to build a new building for AG Science. The funny thing about this is that those two brothers had never stepped foot on the campus. Their entire relationship was with this faculty member. The faculty member is now 96 years old. This just goes to show you the role of the faculty in these campaigns.

Questions:
Q: Senator Lessow-Hurley commented on the fact that faculty are only mentioned once in the documents handed out and that donors need to know what faculty are doing or are involved in at SJSU. There was a faculty member from Engineering, Essam Marouf, that received the Distinguished Service Award when Senator Lessow-Hurley was Senate Chair. Essam Marouf helped design the satellite that looked at Saturn and the Moon. Senator Lessow-Hurley suggested that VP Smits consider building into this plan that kind of communication about the type of work faculty are doing at SJSU. This is the type of thing donors really like to hear about.
A: VP Smits completely agreed with Senator Lessow-Hurley.

IX. New Business –
Senator Curry presented a Senate Management Resolution from the floor of the Senate, ***Formulation of a Response to Statewide Resolution AS-3397-19/AA, "Towards Implementation of a System-wide Ethnic Studies Requirement" (Final Reading).***
Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike "and implement" on line 28. The Senate voted and the resolution was approved as amended (40-0-4).

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

2019/2020 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 28, 2019

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Associate Vice Chair Roxana Marachi. Forty-five Senators were present.

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

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

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

Students:
Present: Kaur, Delgadillo, Gallo, Trang, Birrer, Roque
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:
Absent: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
Absent: McClory

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Higgins, Masegian, Monday
Absent: None

CHHS Representatives:
Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Chin
Absent: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett

COB Representatives:
Present: He, Khavul
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Marachi

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

H&A Representatives:
Present: Khan, McKee, Kitajima, Coelho
Absent: Riley

SCI Representatives:
Present: White, Cargill, Muller French
Absent: None

SOS Representatives:
Present: Peter, Wilson, Jackson, Hart, Lombardi
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
There were no minutes for approval.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Reminder to participate in President Papazian's performance review, Chancellor White previously sent information to the campus about how to submit a letter for the review.

Chair Mathur encouraged Senators to nominate their colleagues for one of the four faculty awards. The call for nominations for these awards has been sent and nominations are due to the Senate Office by October 31, 2019.

B. From the President of the University:
Trustee Jane W. Carney is on campus today. It is a great experience getting to meet and take the Trustees across campus.

Chancellor White has announced his retirement sometime next year. The exact date is unsure. The trustee search committee has already been formed and our faculty trustee Romey Sabalius is on that committee.

Senators will be receiving an announcement about staff awards soon. There will be three awards and they were developed by the staff. When you see that announcement, please nominate your extraordinary staff.

Questions:
Q: Thank you for the staff awards.
A: This was something discussed by the Senate leadership and I'm glad this has finally emerged. These are the first ever staff awards given out campus-wide. They will be given out at the Staff Service Recognition Event in March 2020. We may decide to add other awards next year.

[Addendum to the minutes: Chair Mathur has expressed her thanks to the Senate Administrator and the Professional Standards Committee (PS) for their efforts surrounding Staff Awards. The Senate Administrator made two referrals over the course of several years asking the Professional Standards Committee to look into establishing staff awards similar to the faculty awards on campus. The Chair of the PS Committee spoke with two different Chiefs of Staff over the course of two years and presented her with samples of staff awards from other campuses to assist in establishing staff awards.]

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

B. Consent Calendar –

There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

V. Unfinished Business –

VI. 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) – No report.
C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) – No report.
D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No report.
E. University Library Board (ULB) – No report.

VII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

A. Vice President for Student Affairs – Not Present.
B. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) – No Report.
C. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation) – (Report distributed electronically)
D. CSU Statewide Academic Senators – No Report.
E. Provost – No Report.
F. Associated Students President – No Report.
G. Vice President for Administration and Finance – No Report.

VIII. Special Committee Reports –

IX. New Business –

Vice President Charlie Faas gave a presentation on the University Budget for 2019-2020. This has been a fantastic year and probably as good as it gets budget-wise. We have parceled out the funds consistent with our Strategic Plan. One of things we have been trying to do on this campus for the past three years is a multi-year budget. The CSU CFO has been trying to push the governor to go this way, but the governor has been reluctant and still wants a yearly budget. The good news is that Governor Newsom is a lot more positive about the CSU and that is why this year we have seen a lot more funding this year than we have seen in the past. The other side is that with the climate the way it is in the business world right now, the recession is kind of out there. No one is sure when it is going to hit, but we know that it will. That is why we are keeping some reserves. With this governor being more financially conservative, he will probably give out more one-time money over the next couple of years than base money and given where the recession is, maybe that isn't such a bad thing.

I started last year's budget presentation with some pictures and thought I would do so again this year. The Science Building is happening and is on budget and on schedule. Dean Kaufman is very happy about it. To do this, we had the AS House moved from one end of campus to the other and that was a feat in itself. We broke ground on the South Campus Parking Garage and the new Athletic Field two months ago. This will be a welcome addition to parking. We are anxiously awaiting the handover of the Ahlquist Building. All these new buildings equal our strategic plan. It is about research space and new academic space. Also, more parking means better access for all. Finally, the Ahlquist Building means affordable housing for faculty and staff.

We did a three-year budget. The reason you do a three-year budget is that when you start with a group like Research and hire a VP of Research and Innovation, he then hires an admin so maybe this year his organization is small, but next year it will grow and the year after it will grow more. If we aren't keeping an eye on what we say yes to this year and what that means in year two, three, and four, we have a problem. With Transformation 2030, we are making sure everything is part of the 10-year plan. Funding faculty startups means making sure that is within the base budget. Research growth means making sure it is funded.

There were a lot of things that used to be funded in Academic Affairs through salary savings. Last year we changed the way we did the budget. This year we put those funds in a holding area and now what you are seeing is the fruit of those efforts as we begin funding things.

Graduate Studies involved getting those doctoral programs funded. We have also carved out funds to improve spaces on campus. Data Analytics has a small amount we are funding this year ($50,000), but this will increase next year.

The philosophy is you fund the positions with O&E and that 5% is all that will remain in the divisions. The divisions can do what they want with that.

We have $20 million of new base funding. Most of that is compensation and benefits. However, part is for enrollment growth and increasing graduation rates.

We have $250,000 to study the Ahlquist Building to see how we can best build there and how we can make it low cost housing for faculty and staff.

The way we added funds to this year's budget is by adding goals. In goal one is the graduation initiative, faculty startups, and establishing a research division. We also have a net of 23 faculty positions being added.

The second goal is to excel and lead. This includes the graduate and doctorate programs, acquiring the Ahlquist building, looking at our fundraising campaign and ensuring it is funded while in the quiet phase, and adding to the IT Infrastructure. We are also getting our message and branding awareness out there. We will be getting streaming equipment for our football and other athletic teams. In addition, installing coordinating cameras that interact with each other. Today, we have nine different camera systems around the campus. For deferred maintenance, we put in $1 million and we get $20 million back from the Chancellor's Office.

We have added $400,000 this year, next year and the year after we will add about $800,000 to $900,000 to the mix. We have to get the Audiology lab started this year. We have $750,000 that was part of our base budget this year that goes toward refreshing, updating, and modifying classrooms. We added about 50% to that budget and hopefully another 50% in a year or two. We are continuing to refresh all our classrooms. We have

a lot of campus infrastructure that has aged and we need to do some fixing up until we are able to build new buildings.

Academic Affairs has 62% of our budget and the rest goes to the other divisions. We have a base or operating budget of $400 million, but with the auxiliaries and all other funds it is about $700 million. This is about a 5.5% increase year over year. Salary and benefits are 77% of our budget. We have very little wiggle room when it comes to changes here.

We have an aging campus. We are proud to be the first CSU Campus and the oldest campus in the West, but that comes with a little bit of a price. In the past few years, we have built the new Student Union, the Spartan Recreation and Aquatic Center (SRAC), Campus Village 2 (CV2), and a new Science Building. However, there are so many really old buildings and labs, etc. Our next step is to get campus-wide input to determine what our master planning should be. There are many buildings built between the 1910 to 1960 including Dudley Moorhead and the Engineering Building. We have a limited amount of funds coming from the Chancellor's Office to help us from a facilities perspective. We have the bond that will be on the ballot. Hopefully, that bond will pass and there will be about $2 billion that will be divided among all the campuses, but we need a lot more than that. The Event Center is a 1980's building. We just got $8 million over 20 years for a naming rights partner and that will give a facelift to the building, but when I look at Sweeney and MacQuarrie Halls, they need help also. The Master Plan will tell us what spaces we need and what spaces we need to grow.

Questions:
Q: I'm very glad to hear about the Ahlquist Building and affordable housing, but I have junior faculty in my department right now that are facing serious hardship in terms of being able to afford housing. Some are living on campus, but they are concerned that on campus housing is priced at market value. Is there any room in the budget for housing allowances to help junior faculty that are here and to attract stellar candidates?
A: There is a long and short answer. This is clearly a priority for me and the administration. We recognize what is happening in the valley now is off the charts ridiculous. When you ask someone making $80,000 to $90,000 a year to afford to live here it is very difficult. That is why we are trying to go as fast as we can with the Ahlquist Building, but we have to be careful that if we give discounted rates to someone it becomes a taxable event. We are open to looking at everything. VP Day and I will be looking at things we can do. We will be looking at rates and what we have available and making sure those rates are set not based on the market, but to keep pace with our expenditures.
Q: Keep in mind that we only had a 2.5% cost of living increase last year.
A: Understood.

VP Faas introduced and thanked the members of the Budget Advisory Committee and Co-Chair McKee.

Q: I think you are overlooking the impact this has had on lecturers. In a recent Lecturer Council Survey, lecturers overwhelming talked about what terrible pay they had and how it has impacted their lives. They talked about not being able to marry and have a family. People are living in terrible circumstances, but their commitment to the students keeps them working here.
A: When I spoke about faculty and staff housing, that meant all faculty.
Q: I think when I saw the prices for housing it was about $2,000 to $3,000 a month which is way beyond a lecturer's wages.
A: Okay.

Q: As we build new buildings, do we increase our base budget?
A: It is never enough, but yes.
Q: One of the concerns I have about our Strategic Plan is that it really doesn't speak to the hard times, which is not very strategic. I'm wondering if there is anything built into this budget so that if there is a turn in the economy and our budget, people aren't being laid off and construction isn't stopped and the lights permanently go out?
A: If we have as big a recession as we had the last time, it would be very, very difficult. Part of what my team has been pushing for has been putting money away for a rainy day. Last year we had a state audit that said you are putting away too much money and accused us of hiding things. The analysis turned out to be only a few month's worth of reserve. If there is a major recession, then the CSU is going to have hard things to deal with. We are ready to deal with those, but we can never say we're protected. That would be irresponsible of me to say that.
Q: Is there an order of priority if we have to deal with things like that, or will it be across the board?
A: I'm sure it will not be across the board.
President Papazian: We will be very strategic about it, but will prioritize people and programs.

Q: My question is about the pie chart on the salaries, it shows salaries at 52%. Can you give me a breakdown of where those percentages are as far as faculty, staff, and administrators?
A: I don't know, but we will get the answer for you. The bulk of that is faculty.

Q: Why does most of the SSETF fee go to Athletics? I find that very odd. Very little of that goes to Student Success.
A: It is the same percentage that has been going there for years.
Q: I find it odd that we get about $21 million and almost half goes to Athletics, and it grows each year?
A: About $8 million goes to Athletics and it grows by whatever the percentage is that goes to Athletics with any increase in funds. It is the same number it has been.

Q: Is there any auditing on the purchase of cameras, because I have noticed several cameras in the same hall that don't have different angles and I'm wondering what safeguards there are to ensure there is useful spending?

A: Once a month on Friday afternoons, I get a band of people together from all divisions, IT, and the police force to talk about campus security including the different things needed, things being done, policies, what cameras are needed, and where they should be placed. Those two cameras may look like they are aimed the same, but one may be aimed on the line in the student union and the other on the cash register. What we want to make sure is that we have consistent quality in all the cameras.

Q: Looking at the spreadsheet on spending and comparing it to last year, there is one division that had less money allocated to it this year than last year and that was Student Affairs. It appears that we made up for it in total funds from other areas like SSETF and housing funds. Can you comment on the rearrangement? Can you explain to the Senate what housing funds are as well?
A: The Student Affairs area includes the base budget, housing, wellness, and other satellite areas. Those funds don't get to comingle. For instance, housing funds go to housing and that is around $50 million. That $50 million, and it goes up about 3.5% per year, is based on occupancy, tenancy, and sometimes it is triple or double occupancy or open occupancy so the actuals will change versus what the budget is, but 3.5% was the raise in costs we did year over year in the housing space.

SSETF and its volatility does not impact the base budget for Student Affairs. Pat (VP Day) and his team make sure they ask for what they need. They had some base reserves and they didn't have to ask for as much. There was also a little bit of rearrangement when it came to Student Success.

Q: On page 11, there is a very useful chart that compares expenditures across five campuses like us in size. This chart is very useful. However, the title of this chart hasn't been changed for several years, so it says "Comparison of CSU expenditures 2017 and 2018." Then at the bottom it also has 2017 and 2018 SSETF, so has this data been updated since 2017-2018?
A: This is the last data that we have been able to access for the campuses from 2017-2018. The information from 2018-2019 is not ready yet.
Q: I was impressed that we are almost in line with these other institutions. However, what is institutional support? This is the one area we are significantly different than other campuses. What is it and why are we different?
A: This is direct costs and overhead for IT.
Q: So, it's good we are low?
A: Yes.

Q: My question pertains to security. Last year or the year before you said we were looking at facial recognition technology. Given how controversial it is, are we going along with it, and if we are can you give us an update on it?
A: We're nowhere with it. There are uses for it and applications we could use, but right now there is enough concern that we are not going to go down that path until we have a good technology base to go off of and the public perception has improved. We are not going to lead on this one.

Q: Is there one point person on this campus for which security is their main task?
A: You could start with me (VP Faas) or drop down to the Chief of Police.
Q: I'm asking more about purchase of and placement of cameras?
A: A couple years ago we had major problems in our parking garages, and one of the first things I did was put up cameras in all our parking garages.
Q: I'm not questioning what you did. I'm just wondering if there are people with special expertise in these areas of placing cameras?
A: Of course, but that goes back to the team that meets every Friday afternoon. We have the Chief of Police in there, our IT people, our emergency operations, and facilities teams, etc. That groups works together to decide where the most optimal place to place the cameras is. This is based on actual and perceived data. We also work with our communications team.
Q: I'm wondering if there are other areas, such as purchasing, that have oversight to ensure there isn't overspending?
A: Sure. Kathleen Prunty is responsible for outsourcing on our campus. She is tasked with making sure that no one else is going out and purchasing cameras for our campus. She makes sure we get the best prices we can get. She makes sure there is no single source and we are getting the best value for our money.

CDO Wong(Lau): I just wanted to respond to the question about expertise. When we need outside expertise we are quite comfortable bringing in outside help.
A: (VP Faas). Thank you. Whether that is sourcing a food service group, or building a new dorm, or faculty/staff housing. Last year we brought someone in to look at housing to see where our security issues were.

Q: We have cameras in the classroom and no one seems to know whether they are being tracked, but that isn't my main question. There was an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education about what Sacramento State is doing in terms of tracking students just last week. Apparently, they have a system that actually tracks students on campus. There was a lot of discussion in the article about using this for analytics and for understanding what student success means, and so forth. It is an opt in system, but nevertheless it is a third-party managed program. It uses the student's phones to track them. Are we considering anything like this?
A: No, we are not.
Q: Okay, because there were a lot of questions about what was being done with the data.
A: Of course, and whenever results like that are coming in you want to own that as much as possible. You don't want someone else selling to your students and your population. You don't know who is getting that information. We have no plans for anything like this.

Q: Do you have a ballpark figure of how many cameras we have on campus?
A: Well over 1,000. The only time I'm aware we have any cameras in classrooms is if there is high value equipment in that classroom, e.g. smartboard. The camera is trained on the equipment and not the students or the instructor.

Q: I think we are not talking about security cameras here, but Cisco Systems cameras?

A: Cisco ones are totally different than something like a whiteboard or smartboard camera technology.

Senior Vice Provost Carl Kemnitz gave a presentation on the budget of Academic Affairs.

We are going to focus on three areas. The first is what is new this year. What are our priorities and highlights or objectives for this year. The second part will be where I try to give you a big picture of where the bulk of our money is being spent, which is in enrollment funding and what we are doing with it there. The third part is about how we are investing in faculty.

The new investments for this year include assigned time for the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA). The second item involves changes in the way we are doing budgeting this year. In the past, in many of the colleges we always budgeted to the bottom line. We didn't really care whether expenses fell under Operations and Expenditures (O&E) or personnel expenses, since we were just paying attention to the bottom line. One of the things that we knew from some of the colleges was that the way they were able to get startup funds for new faculty was to scrape together whatever they could by saving money from vacancies. When the budget changes occurred last year, many of the colleges were differentially impacted. Those that were very careful in making sure they put money exactly where they spent it, found there wasn't much differential. However, those that did not were heavily impacted, and we found they did not have funds for startups. We have moved this year to a system where the operating expenses for startups are in a dedicated fund assigned to each faculty member. We put in extra funds to ensure that money is there.

In the third item, we were able to do an analysis of the last five years of expenditures and the money that was transferred between O&E and personnel accounts to true up some of the colleges and division operations. We then have a couple of things that started earlier, but are accruing new expenses. Last year we started the College of Graduate Studies and the investment there in order to build that out is seen in the line items.

The Doctorate in Nursing Practice has been a joint program up until this year when it started as a solo doctorate program so there are additional costs there. Then we are doing a search for a Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics soon. That person won't be starting until summer, but then we will be making an investment into data analytics and making sure we have the information we need to make sound decisions. That will be in the outer years of the three-year plan.

The last thing is the $150,000 for library acquisitions. What is new there is that we are setting aside a dedicated fund to protect library acquisitions. That is an increase of 5% over last year's spending. That is dedicated funding and will increase over time.

These are the big picture new items for AY 19/20.

Questions:
Q: Research comes with lab facilities which is woefully lacking in Engineering. Often times the question is what can be done with the faculty assigned time if the labs are in such poor condition. I believe in terms of investment moving forward in the next five years, we should consider investment in the infrastructure. What are your thoughts on this?
A: I agree 100%. I think VP Faas was alluding to the investment in infrastructure as being a part of building that out. Not to mention that over time in building in funds for new faculty startups, we could build in funds for some of the lab facilities for someone new. This is something just starting now.

Q: I would like for you to consider allowing departments or colleges to have more than single year budgets, because that would allow departments to do a little bit of strategic planning. A large purchase for updates could be scheduled and planned out for over a three-year period.
A: Duly noted. Something I will add is that part of that true-up process is that we will be meeting quarterly with deans and their finance people to uncover those type of things. We have already had discussions about large equipment type purchases that need funds devoted to them, budget busters so to speak, and are trying to come up with processes to address this. Thank you for bringing this up.

What makes this a good budget year in part is that we had an enrollment increase of 570 FTES and that is where we have the richest funding, because we get funds from both the state and student tuition. The amount we got there goes into base funding. Beyond that we generally assign a goal and give the funding in advance at $2,800 per FTES to the colleges. Even those colleges that go beyond goal, we always assure that they are going to get at least the $2,800 per FTES. That is a student success measure. That will pay for the replacement rate to hire an additional lecturer to teach a course. The base funding takes care of both the lecturer and the tenure/tenure track faculty that have the full complement of teaching responsibilities.

Here is how this broke out by colleges. The three asterisks indicate colleges that have had a department move between them. We are handing out close to $2 million additional dollars for that 570 FTES growth. Most of that is operations funds, but we also have CERF (now PACE), SSETF, and Lottery Funds. All that money is in the acquisitions budget. Most of the operations funds is just passed directly on to the colleges in terms of enrollment funding.

Moving towards last year, we dropped the line down between personnel costs and operating funds. However, as you can see the bulk of our costs are personnel costs as you can see. This slide shows the difference last year between what we had budgeted and allocated which was only 5% O&E and what was actually spent in expenditures. That true-up expense was really to bring that regularize to O&E, so that the allocations we now hand out to the colleges are more like what they are expected to be spending.

There are also Tower funds and Research Foundation and I've grouped together the direct expenditures and the F&A returns that comes back to the colleges.

Questions:
Q: On both of those slides, Engineering on the prior slide and Social Sciences on this slide are both way out of proportion with the other colleges. What is the reason for this?
A: This one I can answer off the top of my head. The Human Factors grant and there are related grants in Social Sciences. These are by far the largest grants in the university. That is why those colleges are off the charts. In the Tower Foundation funding, I don't know the specifics, but again that is a named college with a lot of interest from donors. It doesn't surprise me that it is larger.
Provost Del Casino: The other thing on the Research Foundation is that Social Sciences collect a higher indirect rate and typically get federal grants that pay the higher indirect rate. Some of the Sciences get barely anything on a federal grant, while in Social Sciences a lot of the grants are getting 48%. Their average is 24% over all, whereas some of the others like Education are single digits or just barely over double. That drives some of the differences in this chart. Also, this is just main campus only.

I wanted to wrap this up with investments in faculty. I have this broken down by college so you see where most of our faculty are. We are continuing the course with the RSCA Assigned Time program. This year it is a joint effort between Academic Affairs and the Division of Research and Innovation. All the money is spent in the colleges. Year one was last year in which all probationary faculty and 15% of tenured faculty got the RSCA Assigned Time program. This is the second year, and we have continued with all probationary faculty and increased the tenured faculty to 34% and then of course this spring we will have another cycle where we increase the number of tenured faculty one additional notch. I wanted to mention that this funding we had earlier is only for this year, because we won't incur the costs for the spring cycle.

We had a number of incoming faculty. I was surprised at how many were not specified which was a large number. Also, under the two or more ethnicities, Peoplesoft now allows for more than two designations. This is the first year we have more female faculty starting in May. Over a 15-year span we have moved from being 60 percent male and 40 percent female, to nearly 50/50 this year.

For next Fall, we are doing 73 searches. In fact, we talked about going to 75 this morning. However, we are still not making a lot of progress on tenure density. In fact, tenure density is expected to go down ever so slightly this year. One of the measures we can look at is the number of FTE students relative to the number of tenure-track faculty. That is a measure that takes into account that we are hiring more and more tenure track faculty. We have an increasing number of tenure-track faculty, but we are hiring a number of lecturers as well.

Questions:
Q: There is a slide that shows the percent of faculty by ethnicity and I'm wondering how does that map in comparison with the student population?

A: The point where I think we have the greatest discrepancy when reflecting our students is that only 17% of our students are white, while there is a much larger amount of our faculty who are white.

Q: If we are hiring somewhere around 60 to 65 tenure and tenure-track faculty each year, but our percentages of tenure and tenure-track faculty are going down is that because we are hiring even more lecturers?
A: Yes.
Q: What is the tenure density like for other campuses that are doing something like our RSCA?
A: We are in the norm. I haven't looked recently at San Diego State, but we are in the norm for the CSU. Our RSCA assigned time program is broader than some.
Q: We used to be the lowest in tenure density in the CSU when that study was done five years ago?
A: I can tell you we are in the norm now. We are not the lowest.

Q: When you look at the white faculty trending down, which I think is great, but the black faculty are staying stable, can you speculate as to why? Also, why are you not looking at long term lecturers in terms of ethnicity?
A: That is a good point. I do not want to speculate about why the African-American faculty numbers are not going up.
CDO Wong(Lau): She knew for a fact that some faculty identify as being part African-American and part Caucasian, but do not appear to show up in these numbers, and while the numbers show only three African-American faculty hires, she knows of at least five. Our system only allows a person to be identified with one category.

Q: Is there a way we can make attractive housing packages for recruitment? I mean affordable housing?
Provost Del Casino: I wish I could say there is a way and I could pull it out of my back pocket. The commitment is there and clearly we need to find a way where faculty who want to be here can be here. We need to be investing in that.

Q: Can some of that money be put towards impacted classes?
Provost Del Casino: First, we are putting a real emphasis on eliminating bottleneck classes. Before I got here, we were given a target and a goal and you were chastised for going over target and goal. We told students they couldn't go into those classes, because the college would go over target and goal. We did away with that and gave funding to open additional classes. Unfortunately, there are other constraints other than money that are part of this all. Believe it or not, money is the easiest of these problems to solve. Often it involves finding a qualified instructor, and sometimes we don't have the facilities. One of the things I will note in terms of the teaching is that we have had a 15% increase in faculty with only a 2% increase in students so we are hoping we have the faculty we need in place. (Provost Del Casino) One of the things we are asking the colleges to think of this year is a three-year hiring model. In areas that are typically bottlenecks, we can start thinking about hiring faculty and building us out. Part of the piece of the puzzle is to look at where we are growing and going.

Q: When we are talking about the problem of growing tenure and tenure-track faculty, have we looked at how many are leaving because of the lack of affordable housing or other issues?
Provost Del Casino: The problem of having to re-recruit people after recently hiring is huge, whether it is because of a lack of affordable housing or other issues. We are just now trying to determine this. We know from the COACHE survey that housing for faculty was a real issue.
Q: How does SJSU compare with other CSU campuses in terms of affordable housing and homelessness?
Provost Del Casino: The system is finally starting to produce that data so we can look. We went up in the number of Assistant Professors.
Q: How do we compare to the other campuses?
Provost Del Casino: We are just starting to look at that.
A: I just looked at that data this morning. We are about 2% higher in terms of Assistant Professors who leave compared to the CSU system as a whole.
Provost Del Casino: I can't think of a single priority higher than making progress on faculty and staff housing. This is number one on my list.

Q: I'm looking at the fulltime lecturers and wondering why there aren't more fulltime lecturers? I began as a lecturer.
A: There is nothing preventing lecturers from being given a full load. The resistance to lecturers being full time isn't coming from the Provost's Office.

Q: Thank you for the hiring breakdown by diversity categories. Is there any kind of a parallel analysis of people leaving by diversity categories?
A: We don't have graphs, but we have recently started to drill down and look at this data. Going forward the plan is to be able to graph that data.

Q: I'm looking at tenure density system-wide and it has dropped about 11%. What is an ideal tenure density?
Provost Del Casino: I don't know the exact answer to the question. Given the structural challenges to higher education, it is hard to imagine getting 75% tenure density, which is why I think the question might be what is our full-time faculty equivalent? I 100% agree with you about the conversation. What is our strategy in relation to whether or not our full-time faculty teach 5/5 or they teach 4 and have a service obligation. I would like this to emerge organically from the conversations that I'm having with deans and department chairs about what that mix looks like. What are the gives and takes when you make those switches? If we decide to increase the number of full-time tenured faculty, but keep them at 12 WTU, what are the implications for student-faculty ratios? What are the implications for housing? The same applies whenever we increase tenure and tenure-track faculty at 25 additional faculty per year. What does that mean relative to that other pool of people and how do we balance that out? Different colleges have different strategies and different demands. The big challenge we have is that it isn't like we have a massive infusion of dollars into the institution. However, I will say we have not talked enough today about potential revenue streams. That's why when Carl and I

put this together I wanted to paste in this is why the development money is there, this is why the research money is there, etc. If we had a real degree completion strategy at the undergraduate level and can grow our undergraduate students by 10 to 15% through self-support programs, how is that funneled into the overall teaching strategy on campus. That is another piece of all of this conversation. It is an important philosophical question to which I don't have an answer, but what I will say is that we are asking people to think about what is the right mix and how we balance that for different colleges.

Q: I wonder if it would be useful to have information on how many faculty wanted to take the job, but couldn't because off the level of compensation and cost of housing, etc.? Provost Del Casino: We are putting back into the tables this year for every hire, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd asked and why they didn't take the job. We are going to try and figure that out so we can make an argument to the cabinet that we need to increase the startup funds.

C: I thought about this a lot and it seems to me the question is what does the University need? When you have this category of full-time lecturers that are hired for three years and they have been here 20 years, the question becomes what are we doing here? Then you have 1,074 part-time faculty. It would seem to me a university would want to have a fairly large tenured faculty. Perhaps that 1,074 people would be people from the community who have specific expertise and it would be worthwhile to have them come in and teach one class, but not specifically make it a day job. All those people that have been here 15 or 20 years and have a full-time load should be in the tenured ranks. When you ask about what is the ideal number for tenure density it is 100%. That is a philosophical answer.

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Executive Committee Minutes
October 14, 2019
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

1. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of September 23, 2019 unanimously (12-0-0).

2. Kathy Lemon was added to the consent calendar of September 23, 2019 as a removal from the Organization and Government Committee. The consent calendar of September 23, 2019 was approved (12-0-0).

3. The Call for Nominations for the four faculty awards (Distinguished Service, Outstanding Professor, Outstanding Lecturer, President's Scholar) has gone out along with the Call for Nominations for the Wang Award. Please consider nominating qualified individuals for these awards.

4. Update from the President:

   Questions:
   Q: Will Amendment A to University Policy S18-3 be approved any time soon?
   A: President Papazian and the Senate Chair will discuss.

   Q: Is the move into Clark Hall for the President and cabinet still going to happen?
   A: Yes, most likely next May or June.

5. The Executive Committee discussed a letter from the Sustainability Board requesting that their membership be changed back to allow for a faculty member from each college as opposed to five faculty-at-large members beginning next year. The members of the Organization and Government Committee were unanimous in their decision to change the membership from faculty representatives from each college to five faculty-at-large and had substantive discussion around this issue. The Sustainability Board believes this change will inhibit the board's ability to fulfill its reporting requirements and assess sustainability in each college. Chair Mathur will meet with President Papazian and then update the co-chairs of the Sustainability Board.

6. The Curriculum and Research Committee submitted a referral asking the Executive Committee for assistance with the review of the General Education (GE) Guidelines and Program Outcomes. A GE Summit will be held either at the end of this semester on December 13th or on January 24, 2020. The President had previously suggested that the Provost and VP Day should be involved with

the discussion as general education is also part of goal 1 of Transformation 2030. The committee discussed and some suggested that the GE Summit should not be held during finals week. Some committee members discussed getting started with a smaller meeting for a targeted group in MLK 225/229 on December 13, 2019. The issue is finding space that is available and large enough. There is a working group that is being established including the Provost, VP, Student Affairs, Chair of Curriculum & Research, AVP, Undergraduate Education, Interim Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies, Senate Chair, and the faculty member who wrote the campus GE Task Force report. This group will consider content and logistical issues around the summit.

7. SJSU must respond by November 1, 2019 to the ASCSU about Ethnic Studies in the curriculum. The Provost provided the committee with a spreadsheet of classes being taught on the campus that include diversity in the curriculum. The committee discussed submitting this as part of the package of what is submitted to the ASCSU on behalf of SJSU. Committee members noted that there should be coordination around our reporting efforts on Ethnic Studies.

8. Updates:
    a. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):
    The VPAF will give the annual University Budget Report to the Senate on October 28, 2019. He will also explain how it dovetails with our strategic plan. VP Faas will also discuss the work being done by FD&O across campus and where we are going with the campus master plan.

    Questions:
    Q: What happened to the bill requesting funding for K-12 and higher education?
    A: It was shrunk way down to $15 billion and will be on the ballot in March 2020. However, only $4 billion would go to the CSU if we get it and that would be further broken down across the campuses. We need a half a billion for SJSU alone in repairs and upgrades.

    b. From the Associated Students President (AS):
    This is Homecoming Week. The Golf Cart parade will be on October 16, 2019 at 12:30 p.m. Come see AS President Parent ride the golf carts. There will also be the Fire on the Fountain event on October 17, 2019 from 4 to 9 p.m. At the football game, the homecoming royalty will be announced.

    AS is also hosting a disability awareness fair on October 24, 2019 from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. The AS president hopes that there is good attendance at this event and encourages all to attend.

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

VP Day spoke about enrollment planning progress and priorities for student success. Achievement rates are the measured part of the graduation initiative.

Spartan Palooza is coming and will create a sense of belonging and engagement for our students.

VP Day is working on creating one advising system that works together. Right now, one adviser doesn't know what a different adviser is doing. A student should not need five separate logons for five systems. The transition may be painful for some staff and faculty, but in the long run will greatly benefit students.

d. From the Provost:
The main focus of the Provost's office right now is on Ethnic Studies. As noted earlier, efforts are being made to collect substantive efforts on Ethnic Studies already being done on our campus. SJSU is in great shape and has a strong focus on Ethnic Studies.

Question:
Q: Will you release the COACHE Survey data soon?
A: The data have been shared with the deans, some of whom have shared with their respective chairs. Soon this data report will be sent to the campus. We are working on building a web interface soon where feedback can be given.

e. From the CSU Statewide Senators:
The ASCSU discussed the English Council Report and had an update on AB 1460.

A memo on campus course admission for course match which will be sent by the Provost by October 18, 2019.

Questions:
Q: I watched the legislator's session where they discussed AB 1460. Can any of our statewide senators go speak about the work already being done in the CSU?
A: At the annual ASACSU meeting we can submit input and express faculty voices by giving evidence and examples. We need to do a better job of this.

f. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
The PS Committee has 11 items on their agenda today. Next week they will be working on the Lecturer Policy. There are some obsolete policies dating back to the 1970's they will be rescinding.

The PS Committee received a referral from the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) today and will be collaborating with the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee. The PS Committee has received some concerns regarding implementation of the university Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policy during last year's cycle. They will have an initial discussion regarding implementation in today's meeting.

9. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on October 14, 2019. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 19, 2019. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on October 19, 2019. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on October 21, 2019.

Executive Committee Minutes
October 21, 2019
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Curry, Del Casino, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, Shifflett, Papazian, Parent, Peter, Sullivan-Green, White

Absent: Day, McKee, Wong(Lau)

1. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of October 14, 2019 unanimously (12-0-0).

2. The Consent Calendar was approved.

3. Reviewed a statement for a faculty-at-large seat on the Accreditation Review Committee. Reviewed a statement for the University Library Board.

4. Update from the President
   Graduation Initiative 2025 – Graduation rate trends were reviewed for entering freshman and transfer students and we have increased our graduation rates. Student success team is developing strategies to provide supports for advising. We still need to make progress on closing achievement gaps for our URM students. This will require collective commitment and ongoing conversations this year. We need to come up with sustainable strategies and to put the infrastructure in place for ongoing success.

   Opening session was on the Future of Work, thinking differently about the lifelong experience of learning and being more innovative about interdisciplinary work and some of our approaches to general education. The discussion reminds us that we are on the right track to consider how we keep the core values of GE, the things that really need to be there, critical thinking/writing, at the same time meeting students where they are. Skills/ knowledge are only as good as the discipline for a few years. We need to foster a lifelong perspective and support relationships with the students not just for the time they are here but to continue to engage with us as the economy changes. Another priority emphasized at the summit was the importance of degree completion. A number of students have credits but no degree in hand. We need strategies to bring some of those students back. Also considering work and other constraints, we need to think differently about the kind of degrees they're going to receive and meet them where they are. If we don't do it, it will be done by the Arizona States. ASU just signed a $2.2 million agreement with a college just outside of Sacramento to provide online instruction for degrees. We need to reduce the barriers. This is really going to be in the Provost's bailiwick.

There are some other issues on the curricular side. Ethnic Studies, which we have talked about in the past, and the proposal about fourth-year quantitative reasoning requirement. The Ethnic Studies bill is now a 2-year bill. We respect the spirit behind the bill – looking closely and making sure students are getting what they need but also thinking more broadly about how they create the cultural competencies. This work is parallel to what the Senates are doing. This is all good information and will push us as an institution to ensure students are having the kind of experience we want them to have. We don't know where that will go but if we've responded both as an Academic Senate and institution, that can go a long way to ensure we are truly committed to meeting this goal.

On fourth year quantitative reasoning proposal, most of our students are already coming in having completed the 4th year. Data show that those who come in without it are tending to drop out at higher rates. This is a fraught issue with concerns raised about possibly limiting access to the CSU. We need to move the dial to think about access vs. thinking about completion. There will be a six-year runway to build up to the requirement and it will be important to support schools. If you think about the disciplines that are closed off to you if you don't have the 4th year requirement like nursing, science, engineering, we are limiting student's choices for degrees. The discussion is ongoing.

Concerns have been about access at the high school level, shutting out access opportunities if schools are not equipped to meet the 4th year quantitative courses. This will depend on levels of resources and the idea of the six-year runway is that things will improve as there will also be more teacher and course development. Interest is not to reduce access but to increase access that is meaningful for success. Also there's a need to work with community groups. Getting buy-in would be important if this is to succeed. Some trustees were concerned about the requirement being too broad, but very few high schools don't offer the courses.

There are other externally facing issues. We are working with VTA to get them to understand that we live here and are part of San José. Design of transportation systems need to include input from SJSU community. The names of stations need to reflect two main institutions, City Hall and SJSU.

The President will be forming a Staff Leadership Council and initiating a process for Staff Awards. Anyone will be able to nominate staff members. The nature of the individual awards will be what matters most to staff. Staff (including MPPs and auxiliary staff) will be eligible for these awards. The awards will be conferred at the Staff Service Recognition Luncheon and they will be different from the Faculty awards.

On housing and related trends, there was a discussion about the expansion of Arizona State University and their strategies related to land, research partnerships, brand equity, and enrollments.

Related to external outreach, there will be lots of work coming in related to the Census. We will be responsible for counting students who are in residence halls here. We may have a number of students who have jobs with the Census. Dollars from the census count will be going to provide services, so being counted will be important.

C: It was noted that San Diego State also has staff awards, and SJSU may want to look at what they have

Q. Have we been connecting with community organizations to get the message out about the Census?

A. Yes, the most effective way is to have members of the community to speak about it with others.

Q: Regarding Google coming into the San José area, many students live within three miles of campus. When Google moves in that is going to increase housing costs, rents, specifically for students. How will we respond to support faculty and students?

A: We have many people actively working with Google on many initiatives. There are talks about a building that may be available for faculty/staff housing. We're in the planning stages for CV3 which will replace Washburn Hall. We need to ask what our needs will be for Freshmen, for Sophomores, and upperclassmen regarding housing. We are also looking at the Ahlquist building where we can build housing.

Final announcement is about IBM Partnership, the first of its kind on the west coast. There will be high value with a skills academy that will provide certifications, this alone is worth about 5 million dollars. We will have access to all kinds of equipment and tools. This is high performance, with focus on Watson, Blockchain, and Cybersecurity. We will have an institute powered by IBM. The great thing is that we'll be able to keep the data even though it's gathered on their platform. We would be the portal to the CSU. Other campuses would have to go through the SJSU portal. We will be able to contribute to colleagues across the state.

5. Policy Committee updates

a. Curriculum & Research:

There are continuing efforts related to the GE Summit. The first meeting on October 25th will be for the planning team. May be bringing amendment for November 18th. The committee will be reviewing old policies from 20 and 30 years ago. Curricular reviews will be of focus of C&R for the next few weeks.

b. Organization & Government:

O&G is making progress on the policy related to the charge, membership, and responsibility for BOGS. There will be a joint meeting for O&G and BOGS on Thursday October 24th. Many groups have already been consulted for feedback including UCCD, Associate Deans, Undergraduate Studies, Program Planning Curriculum and Research, and Lecturers leadership council.

Membership on Senate and Exec Committee was discussed at length, related to inclusion of a seat/voting rights for Vice President for Research and Innovation and potentially removing the VP of Administration and Finance. Discussion included possibility of Senior Director of Faculty Affairs and an additional Staff seat to be added to the Senate. O&G was thinking about adding an administrator without necessarily increasing the size of the Senate. VPRI seat may be proposed to replace seat for Office of Research.

Several members expressed strong support for keeping VP of Admin & Finance on both Senate and Exec Committee, highlighting the importance of someone who knows the budget and who is working closely on campus safety issues, and to address questions that may arise. Past few years have been positive with the visible presence of the VP of Admin & Finance who has increased transparency and communication. There was also support for including the Vice President for Research and Innovation. Being inclusive to VPRI does not need to come at a cost of reducing role of the VP Admin and Finance.

Discussion continued to include analysis of the pros and cons of adding or removing seats from Senate. It was noted that we are large right now and that engagement can diminish as size grows because it's easier to fall into the background. Other members noted that other, smaller campuses have larger senates and that our campus has grown. Deeper, more thoughtful discussion is needed before too many changes to senate membership are made.

Provost added that there may be solutions related to presence vs. voting rights of administrators and encouraged the importance of including staff voice. Having only one staff member is not a representative voice. If we go this route of adding members, we need to add more opportunity for staff voices.

Some senate exec members noted that changing voting structure of the Senate requires substantive discussion before a movement forward is made. It should be a deliberative process and have wide discussion.

c. Instruction & Student Affairs

ISA committee is working on a syllabus website that is currently out of date. They plan to bring 1-2 policies for next meeting including University Governance Award and revision of the Timely Feedback to Students policy.

6. Remaining committee reports (including Professional Standards) will be carried over to next meeting and/or updates provided via email.

7. Meeting adjourned at 1:30pm.

These minutes were taken by the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate on October 21, 2019. The minutes were transcribed by the Associate Vice Chair, Roxana Marachi, on November 1, 2019. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on November 1, 2019. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 4, 2019.

Consent Calendar
SJSU Academic Senate Meeting
November 18th, 2019

Add to Committee	Last/First Name	Zip	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Accreditation Review Committee	Han, KyungMo	0054	2020	43041	Seat S – Faculty At Large
Graduate Studies and Research	Lee, Edwin	0128	2020	46244	Seat 1 – Graduate Student
Graduate Studies and Research	Mills, Alayna	0128	2020	46244	Seat 2 – Graduate Student
International Programs/Students	Wong, Michael	0128	2020	46244	Seat 2 – Student
Institutional Review Board	Kahlil, Manaar	0128	2020	46244	Seat M - Student

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1735**
November 18, 2019
Final Reading

Amendment A to University Policy F15-13 Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

Legislative History: F15-13 (Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities) rescinded S96-9 and S02-7 and is our current policy articulating the membership, charge, and responsibilities for the Board of General Studies (BOGS).

Whereas: Location of the committee reviewing proposals for GE (General Education) courses within the infrastructure of university committees has been reviewed by the Organization and Government Committee; and

Whereas: The membership and responsibilities of such a committee indicates it is best situated as an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Committee; and

Whereas: This change is consistent with EO 1100 (revised 8/23/17); therefore be it

Resolved: That F15-13 be amended as provided in this recommendation; and be it further

Resolved: That the name for the group responsible for matters related to GE be the General Education Advisory Committee; and be it further

Resolved: To ensure the broadest possible input on changes to the GE guidelines, the group charged with review of the GE guidelines will confer broadly across campus with groups including faculty (lecturers and Tenured/Tenure Track) teaching American Institutions (AI) courses and a broad range of GE courses, the Program Planning Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, associate deans, and the General Education Advisory Committee; and be it further

Resolved: That for AY 2019-2020, proposed updates to the current General Education Guidelines take into consideration SJSU's GE Assessment Task Force recommendations and reflect the changes documented here; and be it further

Resolved: That the Senate initiate a process for subsequent reviews of SJSU's GE Guidelines at least every five years. Subsequent reviews will be conducted initially by a task force chaired by the Senate's Vice Chair and include representatives from the Program Planning Committee, Undergraduate Studies Committee, the General Education Advisory Committee, and faculty (including lecturers) teaching AI and GE. The recommendations from this task force will be forwarded to the C&R committee for final review.

Rationale: The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is presently constituted as a committee under the category "other" with no direct reporting responsibilities to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Neither its membership nor its responsibilities call for the board to reside outside the infrastructure of university committees. With one representative from each of the academic colleges, a student, and appropriate ex-officio members it is comparable to other operating committees reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee.

With respect to future reviews of SJSU's GE guidelines, a task force with broadly representative membership will be an important component of campus-wide consideration of future changes to the GE program.

Approved:	11/4/19
Vote:	7-1-1
Present:	Altura, French, Grosvenor, Higgins, Millora, Okamoto, Shifflett, Gallo, McClory
Absent:	Jackson
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	Additional coordination between the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate and the GEAC chair; Decrease in workload for college offices that would otherwise conduct elections.

Reference information for the Senate:

http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/F15-13.pdf
http://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/ge/guidelines/index.html
https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/6741976/latest/ (see section 6.2.2 & 6.2.5)

~~Board of General Studies~~ General Education Advisory Committee
Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

1. ~~Board of General Studies~~ **General Education Advisory Committee**

The General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) shall be an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Executive order 1100 (revised 8/23/17) ~~(which superseded EO 1065)~~ provides guidance on a range of issues including implementation and governance pertaining to CSU General Education Breadth Requirements. Specifically, section 6.2.2 ~~3~~ notes that "The effectiveness of a campus GE program is dependent upon the adequacy of curricular supervision, internal integrity and overall fiscal and academic support. Toward this end, each campus shall have a broadly representative GE committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty and shall also include student membership. The committee will provide oversight and make recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct, and evaluation of requirements specified in this executive order. As a companion to the GE committee, a campus may choose to establish a GE program assessment committee to conduct the work described in 6.2.5 of this executive order."

1.1 Charge

~~BOGS~~ The GEAC ~~receives and solicits courses and~~ reviews curricular proposals designed to satisfy General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI) graduation requirement, and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirements (GWAR) from all colleges and departments of the University; provides support to departments seeking to develop GE, AI, or GWAR courses; ~~reviews,~~ recommends approval~~es, and authorizes~~ of new ~~courses and~~ curricular proposals for purposes of GE, AI, and GWAR; reviews the GE portion of materials submitted in the program planning process; and, evaluates ~~the courses and~~ curricula ~~proposed it has approved~~ according to ~~procedures described in~~ the current ~~2014~~ GE Guidelines. The ~~Board~~ GEAC evaluates modifications requested by degree programs in accordance with the current ~~2014~~ Guidelines.

1.2 Membership. Faculty appointments should be made on the basis of interest, competence, and experience teaching General Education curricula. The at-large faculty seats should be used to provide the committee with expertise in areas of general education not covered by college faculty representatives. Tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty are all eligible to serve.

~~AVP Graduate &~~ Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education ~~Studies Programs~~ or designee (EXO, non voting)
Director of Assessment (EXO, non voting)
1 faculty Business
1 faculty Education
1 faculty Engineering
1 faculty Health and Human Sciences
1 faculty Humanities & the Arts

1 faculty Science
1 faculty Social Sciences
1 to 3 faculty-at-large (GE area representatives)
~~1 Student~~ 1 AS Board member

1.2.1 ~~Election and~~ Appointment of Members

1.2.1.1 ~~The faculty members of the Board shall be elected by the faculty electorate in each college in an election administered by the Dean's office. Each department in a college shall be informed of a pending election and shall nominate one tenured faculty member.~~

Each non-ex officio faculty member will initially serve a 3-year term renewable for one additional 3-year term. Faculty can return to serve in future years (after a break in service) when a seat becomes available. Student members serve a one-year term and can be re-appointed. Recruitment of applicants to serve on the GEAC will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for a faculty member and student. Each person interested in serving on the committee shall prepare a brief statement summarizing her/his experience (including GE area of teaching) and interest in General Education.

When there are multiple applications for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will recommend individuals to serve. Selection of faculty shall be based on interest, competence, and experience teaching in the General Education curricula; selection shall also consider the need to have GE areas represented. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest, experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of academic excellence.

When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical or leave of absence) 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.

~~1.2.1.2 Prior to the departmental nomination, each person seeking nomination shall prepare and circulate to the department faculty a brief (not more than 100 words) statement summarizing her/his experience and objectives in General Education.~~

~~1.2.1.3 The college curriculum committee shall select not more than three of those nominated to place before the college electorate. The college curriculum committee may choose to meet and consult with the Provost (or designee) prior to making the selection.~~

~~1.2.1.4 Selection by each college curriculum committee shall be based on interest, competence, and experience in the General Education curricula; the statements prepared by departmental nominees shall be considered.~~
~~1.2.1.5. Faculty shall serve three-year staggered terms. When a full-term vacancy is to be filled, or a vacancy for an unexpired term of more than one year, applications shall be solicited from the college, and an election held as provided above.~~

~~1.2.1.6. Vacancies of one year or less shall be filled for the balance of the unexpired term. The college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean shall select a member to fill the vacancy. Consideration shall be given to, among others, those who applied for the last vacancy for which college-wide solicitation was required.~~

~~1.2.1.7. A faculty member of the Board may be granted a leave for one semester. A one semester interim appointment may then be made as provided in 1.2.1.6.~~
~~1.2.1.8. If a college is unable to elect a faculty member to the Board, then the position will be filled for one year by the college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean.~~

~~1.2.1.9. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest, experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of academic excellence. Student members of the Board shall be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Executive Committee and the Associated Students President.~~

~~1.2.1.10. Student appointees shall serve one-year terms and may seek independent study credit by working with the Chair of BOGS.~~

1.2.2 ~~The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the Board. College faculty representatives through a vote will select the chair from among those with continuing appointments before the end of the spring semester for the subsequent year.~~ The chair ~~shall~~ will be a faculty member from the committee, with at least one year of service on ~~the Board~~ GEAC, selected each spring by faculty members with continuing appointments for the subsequent year.

1.2.3 Ex officio members will be non-voting members. ~~with the exception that in the case of ties, the AVP or his/her designee to the committee may vote.~~

1.2.4 If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year the chair of the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the ~~election~~ appointment of a new member for the remainder of that seat's term. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ may request that the Associate Vice

Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the appointment ~~election~~ of a new member for the remainder of that seat's term.

~~1.3~~ 2.0 **Responsibilities of the General Education Advisory Committee** ~~Board of General Studies~~

~~1.3.1 The Board shall report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.~~

2.1 ~~1.3.2~~ Members are expected to be familiar with ~~know~~ the current SJSU Guidelines for GE, AI and GWAR.

2.2 ~~1.3.3~~ As needed, the GEAC ~~Board shall~~ may ~~actively~~ solicit ~~courses and~~ curricular proposals ~~designed~~ to satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and departments of the University. It shall review and, where appropriate, make recommendations to the Provost's designee related to the approval of new ~~courses and~~ curricular proposals. The GEAC will also, following review the GE portion of materials submitted in the program planning process, provide its recommendations, in writing, to the Program Planning Committee and the relevant department. ~~for purposes of General Education, and shall evaluate existing GE, AI, and GWAR courses and curricula~~ in a timely manner.

2.3 ~~1.3.4~~ The committee ~~Board~~, in consultation with the appropriate college deans and department chairpersons, shall provide for and ~~approve~~ recommend to the Curriculum and Research Committee modifications to requirements requested by degree programs in accordance with the ~~2014~~ current GE Guidelines.

2.4 ~~1.3.5~~ Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the Academic Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R). The Organization and Government Committee shall present policy proposals relating to the charge, membership, and responsibilities of the GEAC ~~BOGS~~.

2.5 ~~1.3.6~~ Annually, early in Fall Semester, the ~~Board~~ GEAC chair will provide for the Senate and the Curriculum and Research Committee a written report on its activities for the preceding academic year.

~~2.7 1.3.7 In accordance with the 2014 Guidelines, BOGS is responsible for the assessment and continuing certification of GE, AI, and GWAR courses.~~

2.6 The GEAC shall liaise with SJSU GE coordinators, college curriculum committees, and the CSU GE Advisory Council to facilitate communication as needed.

2.7 As part of its program planning process, the GEAC shall solicit input from campus stakeholders and take into consideration the feedback from previous institutional accreditation reviews, the GEAC's previous program plan and related reports. Any

proposed modifications shall be forwarded to C&R for final review, and consideration by the Senate, before implementation.

2.8 The GEAC will participate in the periodic review of current GE guidelines.

3.0 ~~1.4~~**Procedures**

~~The following shall apply to the proceedings of BOGS:~~

3.1 ~~1.4.1~~ Meetings of the ~~Board~~ committee shall be open to the campus community, except in cases where the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ elects to conduct votes in closed session.

3.2 ~~1.4.2~~ Review of New GE Course Proposals. Departmental representatives (normally the faculty who developed/teach the course ~~coordinators~~ and chairs/directors) shall be invited in a timely manner by the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ to attend, as needed, ~~Board~~ meetings at which their course(s) will be discussed. No vote to recommend rejection of a proposal shall be taken until departmental representatives have been invited to a discussion of their proposal.

3.2.1 ~~1.4.5~~ If the GEAC ~~Board~~ plans to ~~proposes to~~ reject ~~denies~~ ~~certification~~ of a new course proposal, it shall provide the department chair ~~course coordinator and C&R~~ with written feedback, explaining the reasons for a recommendation ~~decision~~ not to approve and an opportunity for department representatives to meet with the GEAC to discuss the recommendation and provide additional documentation as needed. ~~Denial. If the Board recommends to the Curriculum and Research (C&R) Committee that a course be decertified, it shall provide C&R and the course coordinator with written feedback explaining the reasons for the recommended decertification. For both new and continuing certification,~~ The GEAC ~~Board~~ may not raise, in subsequent proceedings on the same course, additional objections, except those that apply to new materials submitted.

3.2.2 All final recommendations from the GEAC pertaining to new curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the administrator designated by the Provost to receive recommendations regarding new GE curricular proposals.

3.3 Periodic Review of Existing GE Courses. GE courses will be periodically reviewed by the GEAC as called for in SJSU's Program Planning Policy (S17-11). Following its review of the GE materials from a department's program planning documentation, the GEAC will forward its written recommendations to the Program Planning Committee and the relevant department.

3.4 ~~1.4.3~~ At the committee's ~~Board's~~ discretion, discipline-specific faculty will be invited to participate in discussions concerning new curricular proposals when the GEAC ~~board~~ determines additional expertise is needed.

3.5 ~~1.4.4~~ The GEAC ~~Board~~ may appoint ad hoc General Education Review Panels (GRP) ~~Advisory Panels (GEAPs).~~ Each GRP shall be focused on a specific curricular

requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the GEAC ~~Board~~. The creation of GRPs shall be at the discretion of the committee ~~Board~~, except for the American Institutions GRP which is required. A GRP may be ~~an ad hoc group~~ constituted for the short duration needed to review and subsequently advise the GEAC ~~Board~~ on specific proposals. ~~pertaining to certification or continuing certification~~.

3.5.1 ~~1.4.4.1~~ Purpose. A GRP shall provide the GEAC ~~Board~~ with advice drawn from disciplinary expertise and may assist the committee ~~Board~~ with the workload associated with reviewing ~~and assessing~~ new courses associated with a particular curricular requirement.

3.5.2 ~~1.4.4.2~~ Membership. The membership of Review ~~Advisory~~ Panels shall be determined by the ~~Board~~ GEAC but shall be no less than three persons, and shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience relevant to the particular curricular requirement. The GEAC chair will work with the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate to organize outreach to constitute a GRP.

3.5.2.1 ~~1.4.4.3~~ American Institutions. The American Institutions ~~GEAP~~ GRP shall include, at a minimum, a representative with a doctorate in Political Science who specializes in American and California Government, a representative with a doctorate in History who specializes in United States History, and a representative who has taught American Institutions requirements in an interdisciplinary context outside of the Political Science and History departments. The AI review panel may advise the GEAC ~~Board~~ on the GE content of curricular proposals that seek to meet both AI and GE requirements, and it will advise the GEAC ~~Board~~ on the AI content of all curricular proposals that seek to meet AI requirements. The GEAC ~~Board~~ will strongly consider the panel's advice. In the event that the GEAC ~~Board~~ rules differently than the AI panel, the GEAC ~~board~~ will provide the rationale for its ruling and members of the review panel may appeal the ruling to the Curriculum and Research Committee for a final decision.

3.6 ~~1.4.6~~ If the GEAC ~~Board~~ would like to propose modifications to the GE guidelines regarding criteria for approval of GE courses ~~certification or continuing certification~~ in addition to those prescribed by university policy, the~~se~~ proposed changes to the guidelines shall be submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee for policy review and, if approved, will subsequently be made available to all course coordinators and department chairs.

3.7 ~~1.4.7~~ The GEAC ~~Board~~ may make additional rules for the conduct of its proceedings, but they must be consistent with university policy.

4.0 ~~1.5~~. **Assessment of the General Education Program**

4.1 ~~1.5.1~~ The GEAC will be consulted when GE program-level learning outcomes are developed or modified.

4.2 In collaboration with the Provost's designee, and any other entity charged with assessment of the General Education Program overall, GEAC, as needed, will be consulted regarding plans for assessment of the GE program as expressed in EO 1100 section 6.2.5.

~~5.0 2. Subsequent Review~~

~~The Academic Senate, in AY 2019-2020, should direct the Board of General Studies to conduct the next full review of the Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.~~

General Education Advisory Committee
Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

1. General Education Advisory Committee

The General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) shall be an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Executive order 1100 (revised 8/23/17) provides guidance on a range of issues including implementation and governance pertaining to CSU General Education Breadth Requirements. Specifically, section 6.2.2 ~~3~~ notes that "The effectiveness of a campus GE program is dependent upon the adequacy of curricular supervision, internal integrity and overall fiscal and academic support. Toward this end, each campus shall have a broadly representative GE committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty and shall also include student membership. The committee will provide oversight and make recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct, and evaluation of requirements specified in this executive order. As a companion to the GE committee, a campus may choose to establish a GE program assessment committee to conduct the work described in 6.2.5 of this executive order."

1.1 Charge

The GEAC reviews curricular proposals designed to satisfy General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI) graduation requirement, and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirements (GWAR) from all colleges and departments of the University; provides support to departments seeking to develop GE, AI, or GWAR courses; recommends approval of new curricular proposals for purposes of GE, AI, and GWAR; reviews the GE portion of materials submitted in the program planning process; and, according to the current ~~2014~~ GE Guidelines. The GEAC evaluates modifications requested by degree programs in accordance with the current Guidelines.

1.2 Membership. Faculty appointments should be made on the basis of interest, competence, and experience teaching General Education curricula. The at-large faculty seats should be used to provide the committee with expertise in areas of general education not covered by college faculty representatives. Tenured, tenure-track, and lecturer faculty are all eligible to serve.

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education or designee (EXO, non voting)
Director of Assessment (EXO, non voting)
1 faculty Business
1 faculty Education
1 faculty Engineering
1 faculty Health and Human Sciences
1 faculty Humanities & the Arts
1 faculty Science
1 faculty Social Sciences

1 to 3 faculty-at-large (GE area representatives)
1 AS Board member

1.2.1 Appointment of Members

Each non-ex officio faculty member will initially serve a 3-year term renewable for one additional 3-year term. Faculty can return to serve in future years (after a break in service) when a seat becomes available. Student members serve a one-year term and can be re-appointed. Recruitment of applicants to serve on the GEAC will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for a faculty member and student. Each person interested in serving on the committee shall prepare a brief statement summarizing her/his experience (including GE area of teaching) and interest in General Education.

When there are multiple applications for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will recommend individuals to serve. Selection of faculty shall be based on interest, competence, and experience teaching in the General Education curricula; selection shall also consider the need to have GE areas represented. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest, experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of academic excellence.

When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical or leave of absence) 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.

1.2.2 The chair will be a faculty member from the committee, with at least one year of service on GEAC, selected each spring by faculty members with continuing appointments for the subsequent year.

1.2.3 Ex officio members will be non-voting members.

1.2.4 If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year the chair of the GEAC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the appointment of a new member for the remainder of that seat's term. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of the GEAC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the appointment of a new member for the remainder of that seat's term.

2.0 **Responsibilities of the General Education Advisory Committee**

2.1 Members are expected to be familiar with the current SJSU Guidelines for GE, AI and GWAR.

2.2 As needed, the GEAC may solicit curricular proposals to satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and departments of the University. It shall review and, where appropriate, make recommendations to the Provost's designee related to the approval of new curricular proposals. The GEAC will also, following review the GE portion of materials submitted in the program planning process, provide its recommendations, in writing, to the Program Planning Committee and the relevant department in a timely manner.

2.3 The committee, in consultation with the appropriate college deans and department chairpersons, shall provide for and recommend to the Curriculum and Research Committee modifications to requirements requested by degree programs in accordance with the current GE Guidelines.

2.4 Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the Academic Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R). The Organization and Government Committee shall present policy proposals relating to the charge, membership, and responsibilities of the GEAC.

2.5 Annually, early in Fall Semester, the GEAC chair will provide for the Senate and the Curriculum and Research Committee a written report on its activities for the preceding academic year.

2.6 The GEAC shall liaise with SJSU GE coordinators, college curriculum committees, and the CSU GE Advisory Council to facilitate communication as needed.

2.7 As part of its program planning process, the GEAC shall solicit input from campus stakeholders and take into consideration the feedback from previous institutional accreditation reviews, and the GEAC's previous program plan and related reports. Any proposed modifications shall be forwarded to C&R for final review, and consideration by the Senate, before implementation.

2.8 The GEAC will participate in the periodic review of current GE guidelines.

3.0 **Procedures**

3.1 Meetings of the committee shall be open to the campus community, except in cases where the GEAC elects to conduct votes in closed session.

3.2 Review of New GE Course Proposals. Departmental representatives (normally the faculty who developed/teach the course and chairs/directors) shall be invited in a timely manner by the GEAC to attend, as needed, meetings at which their course(s) will be discussed. No vote to recommend rejection of a proposal shall be taken until departmental representatives have been invited to a discussion of their proposal.

3.2.1 If the GEAC plans to reject of a new course proposal, it shall provide the department chair with written feedback, explaining the reasons for a recommendation not to approve and an opportunity for department representatives to meet with the GEAC to discuss the recommendation and provide additional documentation as needed. The GEAC may not raise, in subsequent proceedings on the same course, additional objections, except those that apply to new materials submitted.

3.2.2 All final recommendations from the GEAC pertaining to new curricular proposals shall be forwarded to the administrator designated by the Provost to receive recommendations regarding new GE curricular proposals.

3.3 Periodic Review of Existing GE Courses. GE courses will be periodically reviewed by the GEAC as called for in SJSU's Program Planning Policy (S17-11). Following its review of the GE materials from a department's program planning documentation, the GEAC will forward its written recommendations to the Program Planning Committee and the relevant department.

3.4 At the committee's discretion, discipline-specific faculty will be invited to participate in discussions concerning new curricular proposals when the GEAC determines additional expertise is needed.

3.5 The GEAC may appoint ad hoc General Education Review Panels (GRP). Each GRP shall be focused on a specific curricular requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the GEAC. The creation of GRPs shall be at the discretion of the committee, except for the American Institutions GRP which is required. A GRP may be constituted for the short duration needed to review and subsequently advise the GEAC on specific proposals.

3.5.1 Purpose. A GRP shall provide the GEAC with advice drawn from disciplinary expertise and may assist the committee with the workload associated with reviewing new courses associated with a particular curricular requirement.

3.5.2 Membership. The membership of Review Panels shall be determined by the GEAC but shall be no less than three persons and shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience relevant to the particular curricular requirement. The GEAC chair will work with the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate to organize outreach to constitute a GRP.

3.5.2.1 American Institutions. The American Institutions ~~GEAP~~ GRP shall include, at a minimum, a representative with a doctorate in Political Science who specializes in American and California Government, a representative with a doctorate in History who specializes in United States History, and a representative who has taught American Institutions requirements in an interdisciplinary context outside of the Political Science

and History departments. The AI review panel may advise the GEAC on the GE content of curricular proposals that seek to meet both AI and GE requirements, and it will advise the GEAC on the AI content of all curricular proposals that seek to meet AI requirements. The GEAC will strongly consider the panel's advice. In the event that the GEAC rules differently than the AI panel, the GEAC will provide the rationale for its ruling and members of the review panel may appeal the ruling to the Curriculum and Research Committee for a final decision.

3.6 If the GEAC would like to propose modifications to the GE guidelines regarding criteria for approval of GE courses in addition to those prescribed by university policy, the proposed changes to the guidelines shall be submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee for policy review and, if approved, will subsequently be made available to all course coordinators and department chairs.

3.7 The GEAC may make additional rules for the conduct of its proceedings, but they must be consistent with university policy.

4.0 **Assessment of the General Education Program**

4.1 The GEAC will be consulted when GE program-level learning outcomes are developed or modified.

4.2 In collaboration with the Provost’s designee, and any other entity charged with assessment of the General Education Program overall, GEAC, as needed, will be consulted regarding plans for assessment of the GE program as expressed in EO 1100 section 6.2.5.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1750**
November 18, 2019
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Amendment to Senate Constitution Regarding Administrative Representatives

Legislative History: This proposal, if subsequently approved by the full faculty, would modify the Senate's constitution related to administrative representatives by adding the Senior Director, Faculty Affairs, a staff member, and Vice President for Research and Innovation.

Whereas: Administrative and structural changes at SJSU call for a reconsideration of administrative representatives to the Senate; and

Whereas: Representation from the office of research and innovation is important; and

Whereas: Update of the constitution is needed so the membership section is focused on representatives, leaving procedural matters to Senate Bylaws; therefore be it

Resolved: That Article II, section 2 of the Senate Constitution pertaining to administrative representatives be amended as follows:

ARTICLE II -- MEMBERSHIP

Section 2. Administration representatives shall consist of the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, the Vice President for Student Affairs, ~~and~~ the Chief Diversity Officer, the Senior Director of Faculty Affairs, the Vice President for Research and Innovation, all ex officio; and two ~~four~~ ~~(4)~~ ~~academic~~ college deans. ~~at least two of whom shall be deans of colleges, elected by the academic deans for staggered two-year terms.~~

Rationale: This modification allows for the appointment of administrators to the Senate whose expertise would be particularly valuable in the context of the University's changing needs over time without increasing the number of administrative representatives. Historically, substantive benefits to the Senate have been realized due to the fact that our Senate is an Academic Senate inclusive of administrative representatives who can be engaged in discussions at the starting point regarding the formulation of university policy proposals. Adding the Vice President for Research and Innovation

and Senior Director of Faculty Affairs, as well as removing the constraint of 'academic' deans, highlights the Senate's need for collaboration with individuals engaged in a wide range of leadership responsibilities.

The change also keeps this section of the constitution focused on membership.

Approved:	10/21/19
Vote:	9-0-0
Present:	Altura, French, Gallo, Grosvenor, Higgins, Jackson, McClory, Okamoto, Shifflett
Absent:	Millora, Korani
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	None

San José State University
Academic Senate **AS 1752**
Instruction and Student Affairs
November 18, 2019
First Reading

Policy Recommendation

University Governance Awards for Students; Student Service

Rescinds: S97-4

Whereas: Many students work very hard as volunteers to support the governance of San José State University, and

Whereas: The university wishes to honor these students for the contributions they make to the campus, and

Whereas: Recognizing the efforts of these students will encourage other students to become involved in SJSU boards and committees, and

Whereas: Most of these students serve without any financial or other benefits, therefore be it

Resolved: That the attached policy be implemented.

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AWARDS FOR STUDENTS; STUDENT SERVICE

1. University Governance Awards

This award shall fall under the auspices of the Academic Senate Office and is designed to recognize students who have contributed to the University through engagement with university governance. This is not an academic honor, nor is it tied to academic performance.

1.1. Eligibility

1.1.1. Students who serve as members of the student government, student Senators, and students serving on University or Academic Senate boards or committees shall automatically be granted the award if they attend at least 80% of the meetings of the committee/board to which they were elected/appointed, for the term of appointment. Associated Students and the Academic Senate Office will collaborate to establish a final list of eligible students that will be forwarded to the Registrar's Office.

1.2. Recognition

The University will recognize eligible students in the following ways:

1.2.1. Notation of "University Governance Award" will be placed on the student's transcript. This will be noted at the end of each academic year for which the student qualifies;

1.2.2. Students serving on the Academic Senate and its policy or operating committees will be presented with a certificate at the last Senate meeting of the Academic Year.

2. President's University Governance Award

The President's University Governance Award will be awarded annually to recognize a student who has demonstrated exceptional leadership in support of the university's governance.

2.1. Eligibility

2.1.1. Students who receive a University Governance Award are eligible for the President's University Governance Award for that same year;

2.1.2. Any member of the Academic Senate, Academic Senate Committees, or Associated Students Board may submit a nomination to the Academic Senate Office for consideration by the Senate Executive Committee and the President.

2.2. The Senate Executive Committee will recommend finalists to the President, who will make a final determination for the award.

Approved:	November 4, 2019
Vote:	11-0-0
Present:	Delgadillo, Haight, Honda, Johnson, Khan, Kitajima, Muller, Roque, Sen, Sullivan-Green, Trang, Wilson, Wolcott
Absent:	Hill, Parent, Rollerson, Sorkhabi, Walters, Yao
Financial Impact:	None.
Workload Impact:	Little to none. The proposed work is similar to that already being done.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
November 18, 2019 **AS 1753**
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Rescinding S73-19 "FACULTY PERSONNEL RECORDS"

Resolved: That S73-19 be rescinded and S12-2 be corrected to indicate that it "replaced" rather than "amended" S73-12.

Rationale: S12-2 updated this 1973 policy but mistakenly said it "amended" S73-19 instead of stating it was "rescinding and replacing" the policy. Professional Standards has researched the two policies and determined that the newer version (S12-2) was indeed intended to replace S73-19 in toto.

Approved: October 14, 2019.

Vote: 10-0-0

Present: He, Riley, Chin, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer

Absent: None

Financial Impact: No direct impacts

Workload Impact: No direct impact

San José State University
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
November 18, 2019 **AS 1754**
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Rescinding F85-8 "Performance Evaluation Procedures and Criteria for Employees in Unit 4 - Academic Support"

Resolved: That F85-8 be rescinded.

Rationale: F85-8 is a rather basic set of evaluation procedures and criteria for members of Unit 4, some of whom happen to be classified as members of the General Unit of the Academic Senate. Since this policy was implemented in 1985, however, Unit 4 has collectively bargained system-wide evaluation procedures and criteria that supplant any previous local policies. Furthermore, there is no provision in the Unit 4 CBA (as there is in the Unit 3 CBA) for Senate involvement in recommending implementation policies. Therefore, F85-8 has been defunct for a very long time, and its presence "on the books" is confusing at best and deceptive at worst.

Professional Standards would have liked to consult, if only as a matter of courtesy, the affected staff before recommending the appeal of this old policy. However, we were informed that any effort to reach out to Unit 4 to seek their input on evaluation procedures "would be considered direct dealing/bargaining with represented employees" and thus a violation of their CBA.

Approved: October 21, 2019.

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: He, Riley, Chin, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer

Absent: Riley, Kemnitz

Financial Impact: No direct impacts

Workload Impact: No direct impacts

San José State University
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
November 18, 2019 **AS 1755**
First Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs

Resolved: Bylaw 15a shall be used to editorially correct university policies that contain obsolete references to the Academic Vice President for Faculty Affairs (AVP FA), to the Office of Faculty Affairs, or to other obsolete variations of those titles; be it further

Resolved: The title replacing the various versions of the AVPFA will be either the "Senior Director, Faculty Affairs" (SDFA) or "Provost or designee" depending upon whether the policy reference concerns primarily the implementation of policy (SDFA) or whether it concerns primarily the creation of policy or occasions when academic judgment is required (Provost or designee), respectively; be it further

Resolved: The Professional Standards Committee shall collaborate with representatives of the Provost and UP Faculty Affairs to recommend a list of titles that should be changed to the "Provost or designee." Upon approval of this list by the Provost and the Senior Associate Vice President for University Personnel, bylaw 15a shall be invoked and the titles on the list changed to "Provost or designee," with all other AVPFA references changed to "Senior Director, Faculty Affairs;" be it further

Resolved: References to title of the office (e.g., "Office of Faculty Affairs") will be handled in the same manner as references to titles of the officer.

Resolved: This policy will expire immediately after the title changes referred to above are complete.

Rationale for the Recommendation:

The reorganization of the Office of Faculty Affairs from the Academic Division to University Personnel came with changes in the title of the officer in charge of the organization as well as a change in title to the organization. Unfortunately, there are more

than 200 references to the titles and offices in policy that were made obsolete by the reorganization. Editing policies to conform to the new titles is possible under our existing bylaw 15a. However, there are a few functions of the old AVPFA that need to be under control of the Provost, according to the division of labor between policy matters (Provost) and implementation matters (SDFA) as we understand it. For example, “Provost or designee” should be used where academic judgment is required. So while use of bylaw 15a is desirable, care must be taken to be sure the old responsibilities get distributed to the appropriate new officers. This recommendation seems to us the most efficient way to take care of the problem.

Approved:	November 4, 2019
Vote:	8-0-0
Present:	He, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer
Absent:	Riley, Chin
Financial Impact:	No direct impact
Workload Impact:	No direct impact

San José State University
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
November 18, 2019 **AS 1756**
First Reading

Amendment B to University Policy S15-8 Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards

Resolved: That S15-8 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline of the excerpted policy.

Rationale: Professional Standards has become aware that, in some cases, a SOTE evaluation of 4.0 is "below the norm" as set by the Student Evaluation Review Board. However, according to the SOTE instrument, a "4" means that the student agrees that the instructor is "effective." Thus, faculty who are judged to be "effective" by their students are sometimes judged to be "below the norm" with important negative consequences for their professional advancement.

This amendment supplies a common sense remedy to the situation by establishing that either being judge to be effective or being within the norm is sufficient to achieve the most basic level of teaching competency. After all, if the quality of teaching continues to improve to the point where every faculty member is an excellent teacher, there would by definition always be those below the ever increasing norm.

Approved: November 4, 2019.

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: He, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer.

Absent: Chin, Riley

Financial Impact: No direct impact

Workload Impact: No direct impact

Amendment B to University Policy S15-8
Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards

….

3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and appropriate for the catalog description. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations. Recent direct observations are supportive. Student evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, are either generally within the norms by the end of the review period or indicate effective teaching in survey components, particularly for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically identified in the appointment letter.

….

San José State University **AS 1757**
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
November 18, 2019
Final Reading

Amendment A to University Policy F18-5

University Grading System Policy

Legislative History:

Whereas: A discrepancy exists between S73-23 and F18-5 with respect to the number of Credit/No Credit units that a student may apply toward a graduate degree; therefore, be it

Resolved: That S73-23 be rescinded effectively immediately; and be it further

Resolved: F18-5 Section 4 be changed to read as follows:

"4. A graduate student may accumulate a maximum of ~~30%~~ 40% of the total units required to graduate as Credit/No Credit grades toward the master's or doctoral degree."

Rationale: Title 5 does not stipulate the number of units in a graduate degree that can be Credit/No Credit, allowing each campus to determine what is appropriate for the respective campus. S73-23 was overlooked in C&R's review of policies relevant to the University Grading Policy System. Amending F18-5 and rescinding S73-23 will solve the discrepancy that existed between these policies. In discussions, C&R decided to maintain the original 40% because there was no justification for reducing it to 30%.

Approved: 10/21/2019

Vote: 10-0-0

Present: Thalia Anagnos, Raquel Coelho, Marc d'Alarcao, Tabitha Hart, Cara Maffini, Kelly Masegian, Anand Ramasubramanian, Pam Stacks, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, and Brandon White

Absent: Anoop Kaur, Susana Khavul

Workload Impact: None anticipated

Financial Impact: None anticipated

San José State University **AS 1758**
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
November 18, 2019
First Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Transfer Credit for Graduate Programs

Whereas:	Title 5 Section 40510 refers to the "Master's Degree" and indicates that no fewer than 21 units shall be completed in residence; and
Whereas:	SJSU currently does not have a policy indicating the number of units that a student could transfer into to a graduate program; therefore, be it
Resolved:	That units taken in residence are defined as units taken by a matriculated student in a graduate or post-baccalaureate program at SJSU; and be it further
Resolved:	That a student may transfer up to 30% of the graduate degree program provided that department approves the course(s).
Rationale:	Title 5 does not stipulate the number of units in a graduate degree that can be transferred. It does define that "not less than 21 semester units" must be in residence.

Approved:	11/04/2019
Vote:	11-0-0
Present:	Thalia Anagnos, Marc d'Alarcao, Anoop Kaur, Susana Khavul, Cara Maffini, Kelly Masegian, Anand Ramasubramanian, Pam Stacks, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, and Brandon White
Absent:	Raquel Coelho, Tabitha Hart
Workload Impact:	None anticipated
FTES Impact:	A graduate program that allows students to transfer units into the program may generate a lower number of FTES.
Financial Impact:	There may be a decrease in student fee revenue due to students transferring in degree units.