2019-2020 Academic Senate

MINUTES
December 16, 2019

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

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

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

Deans / AVPs:
Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao
Absent: None

Students:
Present: Kaur, Gallo, Trang Birrer, Roque
Absent: Delgadillo (AS excused)

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
Present: McClory

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley

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

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

COB Representatives:
Present: He
Absent: Khavul

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Marachi
Absent: None

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

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

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

SOS Representatives:
Present: Peter, Hart, Lombardi, Jackson
Absent: Wilson (Jury Duty)

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– The Senate minutes of November 18, 2019 were unanimously approved as written.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Mathur announced that the President could not be here today due to a scheduling conflict.

About a month ago the Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU met and developed a resolution regarding the implementation of an Ethnic Studies system requirement. Our CSU Statewide Senator Julia Curry distributed this to our Senate on behalf of the CSU Statewide Senators and she also noted that campuses needed to provide individual feedback. At this past Thursday's CSU Campus Chair's meeting, Catherine Nelson,

the ASCSU Chair noted that Senates should and could provide feedback regarding this resolution. Chair Mathur asks that you provide feedback before January 10, 2020. This will allow our campus Senate to provide more directed information to the ASCSU regarding that resolution.

There are still lots of opportunities to provide input to the search for a new Chancellor. Please check out the Chancellor's website for ways to provide information to the search committee.

As a reminder, Vice Chair McKee has sent out a "Save the Date" for Senate Retreat on January 31, 2020.

There are cupcakes and cider in the back of the room in honor of the winter break.

Questions:
Q: First take on last Friday's GE meeting?
A: It was very successful day. Over 70 faculty attended on a final's day. The morning was focused on the revision of the program learning outcomes for the GE program. We got lots of feedback. The afternoon session focused on area learning outcomes. This session provides a lot of great feedback for C&R to move forward with revising the 2014 GE Guidelines. The Provost gave a presentation on the future of GE and GE innovation at SJSU. This generated a lot of interesting discussion. The Director of General Education at CSU East Bay and also Chair of the General Studies Committee, Caron Inouye, was a facilitator. We had representation from every college. It was impressive to see that many faculty members show up during finals. Day two of the summit is coming up on January 24, 2020. This summit will be held in the Student Union Ballroom, and will focus on assessment. It will also be open to the entire campus. There will be at least one or two assessment experts as facilitators on this day as well.

Chair Mathur wished everyone a wonderful holiday season and said we will all meet again at the Senate Retreat on January 31, 2020.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
Executive Committee Minutes of November 4, 2019- No questions
Executive Committee Minutes of December 2, 2019- No questions

B. Consent Calendar:
Consent Calendar of December 16, 2019. There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:
Chair Mathur presented *AS 1761, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Celebrating 20*

Years of Service-Learning at San José State University (Final Reading). **The Senate voted and AS 1761 passed unanimously.**

V. Unfinished Business:

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

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

Senator White presented *AS 1760, Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Students Earning Graduate Credit (First Reading)*. C&R is recommending rescinding S89-2 and replacing it with this policy. As C&R went through the old policy there were a lot of edits and C&R thought it best to rescind and replace.

Questions:

Q: Three questions regarding part 3, when you refer to the 30-unit requirement for the bachelor's degree, I'm assuming you are referring to the requirements in the major of the degree and not the 120 units?
A: It is 30 units needed to complete the degree.
Q: Why not 15 or 17 units given the number of 4-unit courses that are taught?
A: We got no feedback on that and that was what was in the original policy.

Q: I have a question about number 2. It says students will have applied to graduate from their baccalaureate program prior to enrolling in a graduate level course. What if you have a brilliant junior who wants to enroll in graduate course for enrichment and the instructor and adviser think that is a great idea, why would that person be restricted from enrolling if they haven't applied to graduate?
A: Great question, C&R did not consider it. I will take it back to the committee.

Q: Are there situations where an undergraduate student might be taking graduate courses that are required for their minor as a baccalaureate student that would then not be able to be counted in the graduate program?
A: We will consider this.

Q: In 3c. it talks about a GPA of 2.75 or better in all work completed while in upper division standing, what does upper division standing mean? Is it everything the student has taken since they hit 50 units? There is no place in MySJSU that calculates that GPA. You would have to go in and calculate that GPA course by course.
A: Upper division standing for us means 100 units, but this needs to be clarified.
C: Yes, that needs to be clarified. That is extra work for the advisers to calculate the GPA as well.
A: The committee will consider this.

Q: My question pertains to number 4. For an undergraduate to get graduate credit what would the minimum GPA be for those 15 units?
A: An undergraduate student could transfer in a course with a "C" provided their overall graduate GPA was a 3.0 or better.

C: We have graduate programs that have varying GPAs for admission into a graduate program. It is a little bit concerning to me that students are being held to a higher standard in order to do that in their last semester than it would require to get into the graduate program.
A: This policy is about students who want to earn credit in a course that will get graduate credit. There are different places on the transcript for different types of courses. You can take a graduate course and not have it count as part of the graduate record. This policy will allow undergraduates to take a limited number of courses that could be used for graduate credit should they go on for their master's degree. This policy is about courses taken for graduate credit. The GPA requirement and unit limit are interpreted to protect the undergraduate student from biting off more than they can chew.

Q: There is confusion between the title and number 1. Earning graduate credit is different than petitioning to take graduate level courses. Is there a way to simplify some of this to get to the point, clean up number 3? The larger issue is what is credit.
A: The committee will clarify.

C: Under the old policy students could only take graduate courses when they had 15 or less units to complete in the baccalaureate program. Often graduate students have to take certain courses every other semester. The idea was to open this up so that students could take courses during their last 30 units.
Q: Should there be some parameters for which courses can be taken? Does it fall under the department's purview which courses can or can't be taken by a student?
A: I will take that back to the committee.

Q: In item 1 it says they will petition to their major advisor, is that their undergraduate major advisor?
A: That is correct.
Q: Is the major advisor recommending to that graduate program that the undergraduate student be allowed to take the course?
A: I think that is part of the discussion we need on this.

Q: When the graduate advisor is signing off on candidacy forms, how does the graduate adviser know which graduate courses were used towards the baccalaureate degree?
A: It does not show on the transcript, but when they apply to graduate they have to list the courses they plan to take for the undergraduate degree and that creates a contract between the university and the student. If that course is not on the contract, it will still go on the transcript but not count towards the degree.
Q: How does the graduate adviser know when looking at the candidacy form which classes may have been used for baccalaureate degree?
A: They would work that out with their adviser. That is the reason we are recommending they go through the adviser as well.

Q: Lots of departments are going online and not using major advising forms in hard

copy. It may not be easy to always tell so can you check on this?
A: We talked to the Registrar's Office about this, and they do that evaluation. This would also only be for SJSU students. C&R will verify.

C: One of most important people to sign off on whether the student could be successful in taking the course would be the faculty member. Why have a 2.75 GPA, we should make this clean. I would simplify the language in 3 and make sure the faculty member has a say in this.

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1741, Policy Recommendation, English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU Applicants (First Reading).*** The main thing to note here is that this recommendation establishes standards for both baccalaureate students and post baccalaureate, or graduate students. It also allows students to request a waiver through their department.

Questions:
Q: Where it talks about "alternative methods" on line 67, you might say "alternative methods and task report."
A: There are consistent parameters set across those tests on the website. We elected not to put it in here, because we opted to list only the primary test and not all of them. We went with the standard, and then you can find a comparable.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1759, Policy Recommendation, Student's Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (First Reading).***
We did not want to put a specific timeframe on what timely feedback is because it varies. We felt that we would make a framework that suggests that faculty should establish a timeframe on when students should expect feedback.

Questions:
Q: F13-1 rescinded F68-18, if you rescind F13-1 do we need to go back and make sure F68-18 goes away?
A: We will take a look at that.
C: A policy is like a living being in that once it has been killed it can't come back.

Q: Should we consider norms? If we allow the teacher to say I'll give it back to you on this date, what if the professor puts that date at the end of the semester?
A: We have to give faculty the benefit of the doubt. The rule of thumb is kind of 2 weeks, but it doesn't always fit. We talked about this at length and elected not to put a time frame in here. We can reconsider this, but we did discuss it at length.

Q: F13-1 was a little more specific in terms of what kind of feedback to give e.g. to know their scores, to review their graded work, etc. What was the committee's reason for eliminating the examples? Also, what was the committee's discussion along the lines of reasonable times and perhaps making some suggestion of what reasonable

time is?
A: We did have a discussion on trying to define feedback. We did have a representative on the committee from the Student Fairness Committee who gave good information. We elected to lean on the side of feedback as being an indication of a grade standard. We felt feedback was descriptive enough for a grade on an assignment. We elected to remove the norms of the typical two-weeks. It just didn't pan out for a lot of faculty situations that faculty reflected about.

Q: Listening to the comments, have there been egregious comments in the past that have led us here? Also, who adjudicates this if the student finds this intolerable?
A: Yes, there have been instances of faculty not holding up their end. The Student Fairness Committee (SFC) is the place where students can grieve this. There is a policy that says students should first go to the instructor, then the department chair, next the dean, and finally the Student Fairness Committee. Students do have a grievance process for this.

Q: On line 52-54 it states faculty should indicate the expected time frame and students should be notified of if there is a new timeframe.
A: There is also a place on the SOTEs for students to indicate their feedback.

C: There were egregious cases of students not getting any materials back until after finals. That is the reason we had to have a policy. In regards to F13-1, the committee thought it would be a gigantic undertaking to combine all policies on grading, syllabi, and grading into one policy at that time but now that F18-5 has passed, would I&SA consider?
A: I did discuss this with Senator White, but C&R did not feel like it fit the structure of F18-5.

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
Senator Peter presented ***AS 1756, Amendment B to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (First Reading).***
This has to do with two paragraphs in the RTP policy that describe what the standards are for the various levels of achievement. In particular, this has to do with the minimum level of achievement needed to earn tenure. We aren't suggesting changes to what an excellent or good rating would be, but only to what the baseline minimum standard would be. The problem originated when we learned that the norm for the SOTE survey sometimes reached down to 4.0. The norms are established by the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB). The norms currently are in the 20th through the 80th percentile. A lot of people get confused by this and think the average is the norm. The norm is a range. Teaching as a whole in the university is pretty good. Which means some people are below the 20th percentile and are still earning a 4.0. A 4.0 on the current instrument means the students agree with the statement the teaching was effective. It seemed inappropriate to us to punish faculty by saying they

don't meet our standards even when students are saying they are effective. What kicked this off is that there are effective teachers who are falling below the norm who are then not eligible for promotion to Professor. We need to find a way to stop the harm. PS did consider a baseline without a norm, but did not go that way. As we began to look at the problem overall, we also became aware teaching is not always being evaluated as holistically as the policy calls for. There is a tendency to focus almost exclusively on SOTEs. We were looking for ways to redo this descriptor to make this clear that faculty are being evaluated for their teaching in a wide variety of different forms of information. The rewrite adds a few things. It adds kind of an either/or for qualifying for baseline. The evaluations will either be within the norms or otherwise there is a preponderance of evidence of teaching competence and effectiveness. While almost all of you who have been through the process have submitted syllabi and other materials, the policy doesn't actually require it. We wanted to insert that into the baseline descriptor not to make the process more onerous, but to impress upon the committees that when they evaluate teaching they need to take account of things beyond the SOTEs. We also wanted to insert in the descriptor itself, the same phrase that appears in the teaching evaluation policy about a holistic judgment of teaching effectiveness. There could be some more changes over the next month as we keep crafting this.

Questions:
Q: On line 80, would the committee consider changing, "or otherwise offer a preponderance of evidence…" to "or otherwise offer materials that show a preponderance of evidence…".
A: I see what you are saying. The surveys give evidence beyond those 13 questions. There are subjective answers. We need a better phrase than preponderance of evidence to communicate that. What we want to communicate is that committees need to look at the entire survey instrument, objective and subjective, not just question 13. However, we will find a different phrase to say this. Looking only at question 13 is a shortcut many of the committees take, but it is a bad shortcut.

Q: The narrative might be really glowing in the evaluation, but when it comes to the score it sometimes doesn't reflect that. Reviewers are a little more conservative with the scores as opposed to when they are writing the narrative. Is there a way to have language that guides the reviewers regarding this in the policy?
A: Let me be sure I understand. You are saying the reviewers might say this is an excellent candidate, but then vote baseline?
Q: Yes. I'm not sure how this can be addressed, but it is an issue.
A: The committee will consider it.

Q: Is the goal of this policy to tell evaluators to look at a broader sample, or is it that they didn't achieve the norm so now reviewers need to go a little more in-depth? I'm just curious how we should view the policy and how it is currently phrased?
A: There are two goals for this particular amendment. First, the policy does talk about a holistic evaluation of teaching, and the teaching evaluation policy, which is referenced by the RTP policy and emphasizes that, every measure passed by the

Senate for 30 years has declared that SOTEs are but one component. However, the way in which the descriptors get put together and the way in which committees look for shortcuts can result in a tendency to rely too much on the results of one question in one part of the total evidence assembled, so making it clearer that teaching needs to be judged holistically is a part of the reason for this amendment. There was a very specific problem that kicked it all off. There are effective teachers, at least judged effective by their students, that are falling below the norms and they were not eligible for tenure. That seemed inappropriate to us. We had a positive goal of creating a holistic evaluation, but also wanted to get out of this trap with this weird interaction of norms and the way the instrument is phrased. We have to change this aspect so no one is harmed.

Q: Given that the published research recently suggests that SOTEs should not be used in RTP guidelines, would the PS Committee consider eliminating the word "norm" from the policy completely and just saying that SOTEs should be provided in the dossier?
A: One of the various options that PS has looked at with regards to the baseline was a normless description. It was not the option that the PS Committee chose to go with today, but if you consider the way this amendment is phrased being within the norm is more than one way to establish you are being effective. In a sense, there is no requirement to meet a norm SOLATE to be judged worthy of tenure, so it kind of is a little bit of both. Norms can be a little protective of faculty too. If students have a voice at all, it should be one component and norms are one way of expressing that component.

Q: If norms are going to stay in, would PS consider being a little bit more normal with the norm and indicate that norms are calculated from the entire faculty body. Also, 55% of the faculty are lecturers and that should be referenced in the norms of the tenure/tenure-track.
A: Interestingly, there is nothing in the RTP policy that says which norm should be A, B, C. SERB could establish 100 norms. There could be different norms for lab classes and GE classes. SERB can do as many as they think appropriate and I would encourage them to create norms that reflect the different styles and kinds of teaching. I do believe the SOLATEs are normed differently than the SOTEs. You could have different norms for departments, colleges, and the whole university. There is nothing in the RTP policy that says which of these norms is referenced. We could have lots of different options for this and we probably should.

Q: On line 77, where you say, "take into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, …," could you add "size of classes" also?
A: That's a good idea. That's a phrase that comes from the teaching evaluation policy.

Q: If you are saying the teachers are receiving 4's, but we are saying you are not good enough if you are a 4, but the students are saying we agree with the statement it is such a mismatch. I'd like to see student voices heard, but is there some way to

bring this in alignment?
A: That is what we are trying to do here. It depends on the semester. Some semesters a 4 is below the norm and sometimes it isn't. That is exactly what the problem is now and what needs to be fixed. We will continue to try and refine the language.

Q: At some point would the committee consider talking about the survey both quantitative and qualitative results?
A: We would consider it and will consider it. We are trying to balance a precise descriptor with one that gets overly wordy. I, personally, find qualitative comments to be very useful.

Q: The first part of this paragraph seems like criteria then it takes a side trip into instruction for the people interpreting the criteria. You say by the end of the review period these things support a holistic judgment. Can you tease this out and put it somewhere else? As a candidate, I don't need to see that part.
A: The committee will consider it.

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1755, Policy Recommendation, Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs (Final Reading).***
The Senate voted and AS 1755 passed as written unanimously.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): No report.

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

VII. Special Committee Reports:

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance:

Lots and lots of construction is going on all across campus. The Science building is going up and they are working on steel on the third floor. This project is on budget and on time.

The AS House has been put on its foundation.

The 1,500 car parking garage at South Campus will be done next fall. Most of the infrastructure is in place. We are looking at clearing the hill on the East side of the football stadium. The East side of the stadium will come down. We will then build a 3 story Athletics building with locker rooms, and men's football facilities.

Questions:
Q: I'm concerned about recycling on this campus. We used to have recycling bins

and paper containers about 10 years ago and these have disappeared. Then we used to have cardboard boxes and they are gone now too. Can we get them back?
A: All recycling is being put together now and is separated later so all is well. We are utilizing single stream recycling.

Q: Can you say a little more about the theatre?
A: It is a 120-person two-story classroom theatre. There will be easel boards and academic areas in there. The business school is talking about moving their operations from Santa Clara back on campus. We are trying to find good uses for that space.

Q: What about contamination with the recycling? Is there a way to monitor the old way and the new way?
A: We had to do this same process before, because people did not follow sorting rules even when we had the three boxes.

Q: Can you advertise about this single stream recycling?
A: I will put it in the next newsletter after the first of the year.

Q: We've all heard stories about recycling not going where it is supposed to go. It would go a long way to have you tell people in the newsletter about this.
A: I will make that happen. Happy Holidays.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs: No report.

C. Chief Diversity Officer: No report.

D. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): The CSU Faculty Trustee submitted his report electronically to the Academic Senate.

E. Statewide Academic Senators:
Senator Curry announced three items from the ASCSU:

AS 3403-19 is the recommendation of an Ethnic Studies system requirement. We did send out a notice to you all asking you to tell your colleges and departments to give feedback by the January 10, 2020 deadline.

The Community College Senate UC pathways is an upcoming item to align the transfer preparation for UC and CSU. Senator Van Selst reported in some cases this will make sense and in other cases it will not and would run afoul of the CSU 120-unit limit.

The quantitative reasoning proposal remains on the Board of Trustees Agenda for January 2020. You have all had the opportunity to provide feedback. Feedback is very important. AB 1460, in particular, the Ethnic Studies requirement was very conflicting discussion for some and exciting for other, but it is very important.

Question:
Q: I have heard last week that the Intersegmental Committee removed its opposition to the community colleges offering the baccalaureate degree in particular Nursing and

Occupational Therapy. I'd like to know if the ASCSU has been discussing this and what that means for our Nursing program at SJSU?
A: The original pilots were executed without CSU consultation. The newer proposal is to expand that. The answer was that we already have a CSU system to offer Bachelor's degrees, all we need is funding to expand. There are ways to share resources to offer CSU degrees through community college campuses. That is the most recent proposal I'm aware of.

Q: I've been following the media attention around the quantitative reasoning proposals. What entity proposed the Quantitative Reasoning proposal?
A: The Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce Report from three years ago recommended two changes. One was to remove Intermediate Algebra and the other was to trade that for a broader experience on data communication units. That should have been a one-on-one trade, but the CSU dropped the Intermediate Algebra then waited two years, and then decided to ensure we have numeric fluency. The fourth year of quantitative reasoning is really the replacement to Intermediate Algebra, so the origin of that comes from the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report.

F. Provost:

Thanks to everyone for getting through the semester. Thanks for a great and very kind welcome.

A few key things that are going on and where we are going are tied very much to things I've been learning in my first semester. There has been a lot of conversation going on around the faculty and its organization and how we are going to do that over time. I have some opinions about that. We have to operationalize and to sit down and really have some conversations. What I mean by that is what are the ratios between our tenure/tenure-track faculty and our lecturers. I think this is something we really have to think about. I'll talk about more of this is a second.

I never expected how much time Golden Shores of the CSU would take out of the life of the Provost. I think, by the way, we can drop new now from Provost. I've been worn down some by the CSU system in the sense that I spend a couple of nights a week once a month at least out of town. I did have an opportunity to go to an interesting summit this past week on climate change literacy. I have some strong opinions, having been a K-12 teacher in this state about adding one more thing to the curriculum of the K-12 educators. I'm not a big fan of unfunded mandates even if they have the best intent, so I think there could be some more conversation coming out of that.

One of the big things for me is the investment in the faculty here. I want to acknowledge and hope people are paying attention that need to bring the Op-Ed project here this spring to next fall with the Public Voices Fellowship. I sent a lot of information out on it. If people haven't really looked at it the deadline is in January 2020. This is a really amazing project. This is a whole year where we will pick 20 fellows who will sit down in four day-long workshops over the course of a year and

develop their voices on how to translate their scholarship into public dialogue. The schools that have done this so far are the Stanford's, the Duke's, and Arizona. Among those 20 fellows, the three years I was at Arizona they average 80 to 85 Op Eds included where they were in *Scientific American* and *Wired* magazines. I wanted to bring this project here. There are important people here doing incredible work. We need to do more of this type of thing for our people. This is a first step.

Many faculty have asked me to talk about where we are with regard to Retention-Tenure-Promotion. I'm going to read a little bit of a message that will go out tomorrow regarding faculty recruitment and retention. "Institutions of higher education are built on collaboration, but they also grow through a productive engagement with their tensions. I think it is important for us to discuss some of the conversations that have taken place on the campus regarding faculty recruitment and retention. As I hope everyone can appreciate, privacy protections greatly restrict our ability to talk about individual personal cases even if some of those cases have been involuntarily cast into the public view. Over the past five years, 2014-2019, 96% of the faculty who completed the entire process for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor were successful. Over the same time period, 89% of individuals who applied for promotion to full professor were granted that promotion. These numbers do not include those that applied for early promotion. Early promotion is a more challenging bar. Everyone between 2014 and 2017 who applied for early promotion, when they went up 100% received early promotion. For the tenure promotion data, for those denied over the past five years and not given additional years of probation, 67% were White. At the promotion to full level, 81% of faculty of color that applied for full promotion were granted that promotion. Compared to the 89% overall, you can see that we have a gap. Of those faculty some sought promotion in their first eligible year, while others have taken some time to apply. Outside of these numbers though, I think it is even more important to understand what is going on, because we have faculty who are not applying for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. I apologize that this is focused on tenure/tenure-track faculty, but that is where this conversation is right now. Please don't feel marginalized by this.

This year the campus had 74 faculty eligible to apply for full professor, but only two applied. The majority had been in rank for no more than seven years. Clearly, we have a challenge in the Associate rank. It is a challenge I think impacts the institution in serious ways. I suspect that some of that lies in the guidance and mentorship we give faculty in their departments and colleges. Prior to their promotion to Associate Professor, faculty are given yearly assessments and feedback and protected from work that might drive them away from their goals. At the Associate level, with more flexibility to manage workload, they are invited to take on a lot more and they do. This work contributes greatly to the mission of the university and the success of our students, particularly the underrepresented students. The value of this increased set of responsibilities is not easily represented. In short, the collective group can do a lot more. I'd like to talk about a few things I think we might do.

First, Dr. Wong(Lau) and I are putting together a taskforce on Inclusive Faculty

Success which we are launching this spring and I don't want a think tank to talk about what our problems are, I want a strategy and planning group on how we can better support Associate Professors, because I think we identified the core crux of our challenge here.

Second, I will work with Senior Deputy Provost Carl Kemnitz and Dr. Deanna Fassett on additional programming for Associate Professors in professional development. Of course, Dr. Wong(Lau) will continue to work with Dr. James Lee, Senior Director of Faculty Affairs to ensure comprehensive training on the RTP process."

I was silent during this conversation today, but I actually think this training needs to be mandatory. We cannot just let people go into the RTP conversation with no training. If you cannot contextualize a SOTE then you shouldn't be evaluating your colleagues. I say that with all seriousness. If you can't look at 25 SOTES and say, "Wow, three people hammered this person—probably because they didn't like him," and you can't figure out how to do that then you really need some help. We have got to do this work with intention. We have to look at mandatory training on unconscious bias. We have named it, we've talked about it, and we need to confront it.

We have got to do this work with intention. We need to invite everyone that gets promoted and say, "What is your five-year plan? Where are you going and what do the next steps look like? What are the criteria that are in front of you?" Many people who have talked to me say that the criteria don't match where they want to go and I get that. We have all been there sometimes, but we do have standards set by institutions and you need to understand them. Get all the way up and then you can decide how to change them.

I have had a robust conversation with the deans and I think it needs to go to chairs and school directors. We have a lot of assistant professors coming in who are going to make it to the rank of associate professor if we are consistent, 96% of the time they have been promoted and 40% of our population is in that group in the next five years, that tells you what kind of opportunity we have in front of us to make sure those folks make it to full professor. I do think we need to work on clarity and understand where we are. I'm passionate about this topic. I also know there is a lot of anxiety on the campus and a lot of fear about what is going on. I want to say that we are not just going to name it and walk away. We are going to address it. We will talk about what we need to do. The challenges are across the campus. It starts with how we bring faculty in and then mentor them along the way. I'm incredibly optimistic about this campus. I think the possibilities of what we can do in this place are amazing. These challenges of being promoted from associate to full professor are not unique to San José State University. However, I don't care about anywhere else. I just care about this place.

Questions:
Q: Thank you for your remarks and for the COACHE survey results. This is a little unfair, because you are being picked on about a survey done before you even got here.

(Provost-Yes, it is! Which is OK! Laughter.) One of the things you talked about was recognizing challenges. There are a number of successes reflected in the COACHE survey. There are also a couple things about governance in the survey such as "governance is a shared sense of purpose that is faculty perceptions of actions that foster or undermine relationships between faculty and administration," and then "faculty perceptions of actions taken by senior leadership as well as how senior leadership engages in shared governance." Again, this speaks to before you got here.

A: Yes, first, the perception of senior leadership is actually pretty clear in the survey. There are chairs and deans and then everything above that and that is senior leadership. When I presented this to the senior leadership of the campus, I told them they had better own it. We have to own this. There is a great distance between how we operate and that is a problem. The COACHE survey, in my opinion, was intentional to that radical transparency. It is out there. We have a gap so that is the first thing in terms of where we are. It is pretty bold of senior leadership to say we are going to do the survey, but when it shows a gap we are going to acknowledge it. The next step is what do you do about it. That is the big question. To the other point which was shared governance and general initiative, I think the point is we need a dialogue and conversation. I'm trying to be incredibly active as far as the Executive Committee and in being here. There is a very big event happening right now, but my job is to be in the Senate. I'm all for that dialogue. I came here for a number of reasons and not the least of which was to work with the senior leadership team that I like very much. I've never been given more flexibility in my job in my entire life. There have been so many times the President has said, "You're the Provost. Make your decision and figure out how to operate Academic Affairs." It is really refreshing and really important. Again, I hold an optimism that we can get to the place that turns some of the reds into greens. We need to do the survey again in three years. We need to not just do the survey and not do anything about it. We need to find out how we do. I also think it is open and honest.

Q: Will it be opened up to lecturers in three years as well?

A: I will say that if I had been here last year I would have advocated for lecturers to be included. There are lots of reasons they weren't. Yes, it is very expensive, and it is a good first cut. However, it is obviously not the whole picture. I think everyone recognized that, but it was at least an opportunity. Like this climate survey, you can see a lot about how senior administration are seen, but the President is going to see it the same day you do. We will all be sitting in the room with you when they present the findings. Those I hope will at least open up the willingness to have a conversation. Again, all of these decisions predate me.

Q: Thanks again for the assurance in terms of these new ideas. Is there any data around the difference in how many women faculty are not going up for promotion to full professor?

A: There are, but I haven't pulled all of them. I wanted to acknowledge the 74

people, but we haven't done a demographic analysis of that group yet to figure out how many are still in that rank and for how long. In looking casually at the list, it is barely split. However, I don't know exactly how it is split. There is a data course, especially since there are very few Associate Professors, because I got hired in 2000, which was a massive bubble of new hiring, and now we have full professors and assistants and associates are really stuck and they get overburdened in general. That definitely falls differentially. We have to be able to help our colleagues frame themselves in a way that gets through their career right. I apologize for not having those course data, but I can work on it.

Q: Is there particular language to use to switch some of this anxiety?

A: This is a great question. I think if Dr. Wong(Lau) was here she would say moving to mandatory training for all hiring committees this year was a really nice step. Also, having conversations about this data is good also. We have a retention challenge right now probably due to the housing issue. We are going to start doing exit interviews more formally with faculty as well. This will help us tell our story a little better. The diversity of faculty has changed over time. There are conversations about the AS student body as well that we need to talk about. Only three percent of our student body is African-American. However, our local area does not include East Palo Alto, Oakland, or Hayward. If we could recruit actively there, we could probably change the demography of the campus somewhat, but we are not empowered to do so because of the CSU. I also don't think we share our stories well enough. If we did, we would probably create advocates that senior administration talks about. I read all the transcripts out there and Carl was one of the people doing the public hearings on the change to the local area that we were trying to accomplish last year to expand access that were shot down by a narrow margin. That is a collective challenge that senior administration, faculty, staff, and students could all get behind. These are the kinds of things I'm asking of myself as Provost. I think there is a lot of opportunity for us all out there.

Q: I applaud the direction, but I would also encourage the senior administration to consider the associate professors who are department chairs. It is difficult to quantify our contributions within RTP guidelines. It is more difficult in the new guidelines as opposed to the old guidelines. With COACHE, our peer institutions that were chosen do not appear to be very consistent with us in terms of size and whatnot, how were those institutions chosen and can we get information from other institutions more similar to us to compare with?

A: Great question and Carl can talk at length about this. COACHE is a voluntary survey. There are two comparisons. We are compared to every single other COACHE school during that survey year and then we get to pick 5 peers from the campuses filling out the COACHE survey to compare with us. However, there were hardly any other CSUs doing the COACHE survey. Hopefully next time we will get more campuses to do the survey to compare with. This was one of the challenges. A lot of work went into those choices. We hope in three years there is an expanded list

and we can have a larger conversation.

Q: Thank you so much for doing the diversity analysis for promotion. Would you consider doing a diversity audit for the RSCA grants? I think the mentoring is helpful, but many of us aren't suffering from lack of mentoring. It is more structural inequities.

A: Yes, I think we have to look at all of this stuff. We have to look at it in context and in relation. This is why I'm excited about hiring a new Director of Institutional Research and Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, because we don't have a good understanding of faculty data. I'm all for looking at all these pieces. I have not yet gone through a tenure and promotion cycle as Provost here, so it will be an interesting year as I look at that in relation to the new standards and the way they are written. It does provide some flexibility around the three categories that could produce spaces for some of the things people in this room are talking about. Again, when I sit back and think about this, we could spend the rest of our lives trying to rewrite the RTP guidelines, but what kind of conversation are we having on the front end of the practices that we bring to that, that's the larger issue for me. What are those conversations that are happening? Again, we have to do this with intent and purpose and I'm very committed to that. I think we will get to a place where that will be a part of our regular practice of having those conversations in advance.

Q: So, is that a yes to that?

A: Oh yes, sorry.

Q: The survey of tenure and tenure/track faculty was believed to be phase 1 and phase 2 was going to be this year and was the survey of the lecturer faculty. That needs to happen now, not three years from now. The expectation was that they were going to be surveyed this year. They are a large component and a valuable component and their perspectives shouldn't be overlooked this year and three years from now we will fold them in.

A: I had not heard that. Given the Climate Survey that we are going to launch this year, it would be very difficult to do two this year to be honest. I wouldn't recommend it for someone that is going to do survey work. We have to get to 30 percent to get the results from Rankin. I'm with you. Again, should we do it a year from now or should we wait and do all of it, or should we come up with a different way to talk about some of these issues? Ken and I had a brief conversation about some of the policies when we think about multi-year contracts and other kinds of ways to invest more in lecturers and give them a sense of commitment to their longevity and professional development. I agree with you, but it won't happen this year. If we did the survey next year then we would have one more year before we did the next one. I think we are probably stuck in the cycle we are. That doesn't mean we have to have our feet stuck in the sand waiting for an answer.

Q: The CFA conducted a survey of lecturers last year and had over a 40 percent response rate, would you be interested in seeing it?

A: Yes, absolutely.

Q: I understand that it isn't fair to ask you about the COACHE Survey and what happened before you were here.

A: That's okay, you can ask me.

Q: The COACHE Survey did not include lecturers and is there a reason it was not sent out to all faculty?

A: I actually thought it was. That was probably just a mistake. All the data in on the web and we are not taking it down. I can send out another message. That was an oversight that was not intended. Thank you for pointing that out.

Q: Thank you for your presentation today and for the communication you will be sending out tomorrow. It has been decades since we've had data on our RTP rates, especially data that is available in the categories provided. This has been a subject that Professional Standards has asked numerous administrations for help with. This is the first step of a lot of steps that need to be taken to fix some pretty deep-seated problems that we have here. I'm very encouraged that you are taking that step today. Professional Standards will stand ready to work with you as we discuss matters like mandatory training, specific and intentional mentoring, and programming on unconscious bias. These are all matters that will take a lot of work to implement. If they are going to be implemented in a successful way. So, thank you for initiating a very important conversation that we have needed to look at for a long time.

A: We are not going to undo the systemic challenges in one semester. This is a multi-year project, and the commitment to take up those questions and conversations. This is what the students want. They want mature, sophisticated conversations that reflect on ourselves, so that we can reflect back to them the values they say they want the most. I look forward to working with everyone and trying to figure some of this out. Developing the trust that we can have conversations and we can talk openly about things is key. That means there has to be transparency that we understand what we are talking about collectively. This is not unique to us.

Q: Thank you for your information. I'm dovetailing on Senator Peter's comments about having some information about promotion. I'd specifically like to speak about the associate professors. First, I'd really like to applaud Senator Peter and Professional Standards for creating a RTP policy that we can really look at the three different aspects of a professional career in academics. We have been very fortunate in the Occupational Therapy Department that RSCA release has been given and is a wonderful gift. Yet, we have associate professors that say that they are going to step

up to the plate and say I believe in the institution and take on service responsibility, and then what happens is their RSCA is not valued that highly. The unfortunate thing is that we have these wonderful Associate Professors who have committed themselves to the institution with service in mind. It isn't that their teaching has fallen by the wayside. I'm hopeful that the individual that does take on service can advance to full professor and that that trajectory will be honored.

A: As someone that was an associate professor and chair, I do appreciate the complexities and agree with you. There has to be a way to do this. However, I am going to say something in relation to this that I believe is important for me to say and that is how much service should we be doing as a campus? When you look around and see how much workload we create for ourselves. We don't need to drown ourselves while we are trying to accomplish things. We have to figure out what the right balance is in relation to our overall commitment to the students. I hear committees and how much and for how long they meet and they can go on forever. If someone takes on a responsibility as a Department Chair, should that Associate Professor take on any other service? We have to answer those questions.

C: Some years ago, I proposed a resolution that only full tenured professors be chairs. I was shot down. When I was hired in 1980, I was the first person hired in my department in 17 years. The people who had been here a long, long time had never published anything, because the standards were very different. When I was Senate Chair, one of the things I did was go to New Faculty Orientation. Dennis Jaehne was still Chair of Undergraduate Studies and he came in and talked about aligning your research to the Strategic Plan. I thought, Wow, I wish someone had sat me down when I was a new adjunct and then assistant professor and said, "These are the things you need to be doing and this is the way you should be doing them." Honestly, this was something I had to figure out for myself. I was given administrative responsibilities as an Assistant Professor and one day I went home and said I'm not writing another memo, I'm writing a book and I did. I'm a retired faculty member now so I can speak to this. Having Associate Professors as Department Chairs is not only burdensome for the people who take on those roles, but it is burdensome on the people that are not being mentored by someone who has been through the whole process. I think that it should be mandatory for Department Chairs to be full tenured professors. Secondly, I think you need to have mandatory training for Department Chairs to include how you mentor people. I know being a chair is a nightmare and you are always putting out fires, but personnel is an important area and taking care of people should be your first priority. I also think you need to have mandatory training for Deans. I actually had a faculty member who was appointed as an Assistant Professor, who happened to be an African-American, as an Interim Chair of a fractious department. Mentoring and taking care of people is important. This is a problem for deans to solve. Not a problem for new Assistant Professors to solve.

A: I won't let myself or the leadership team in Academic Affairs off the hook. Conversations have to happen all the way up and down, so I'm with you.

G. Associated Students President:

AS President Parent announced that applications for Student Trustee on the Board of Trustees are due January 8, 2020.

The AS House has been put on the foundation, and hopefully we will be finished soon and can move back in. Half of our departments are still in the SSC and have no windows so they are anxiously awaiting moving back in.

The students on the Senate have had introductions to Course Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC).

AS is helping with promotion and awareness for Census 2020.

AS elections will take place on April 13-15, 2020.

Our new Leadership and Government Coordinator position has been filled.

We are still searching for a new Assistant Executive Director. Hard to get anyone to stay in the position due to cost of housing.

Finals test materials are available from AS for students who need them.

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.