

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

CHHS Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

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

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Khavul
Absent: None

Deans:

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

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi

Students:

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

ENGR Representatives:

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

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, McKee, Kitajima, Coelho
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:

Present: McClory

SCI Representatives:

Present: White, Cargill, Kim
Absent: French

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

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

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Higgins, Masegian, Monday
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 SI6-8, 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 GVAR 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 GEAR courses from BOGS and transfer it

to the University Writing Committee (UWC), but the UWC policy recently passed specifically states that the review of GVAR 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 GVAR 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.