

2020-2021 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 12, 2020

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

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Delgadillo, Mathur Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Smith, Dudley Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Day, Faas, Del Casino, Wong(Lau), Papazian Absent: None	COB Representatives: Present: Rao, Khavul Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Shillington Absent: None	COED Representatives: Present: Marachi Absent: None
Students: Present: Kaur, Quock, Jimenez, Walker, Chuang, Gomez Absent: None	ENGR Representatives: Present: Sullivan-Green, Saldamli, Okamoto Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Walters	H&A Representatives: Present: Kitajima, McKee, Khan, Frazier, Taylor, Thompson, Riley Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: McClory	COS Representatives: Present: Cargill, French, White, Maciejewski Absent: None
Honorary Representative: Present: Lessow-Hurley, Buzanski	COSR Representatives: Present: Peter, Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Masegian, Monday, Lee, Yang, Higgins Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement: Chair Mathur noted the importance and value of a land acknowledgement and also recognized today as “Indigenous People’s Day”. Senator Sen read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of September 14, 2020 were approved (43-0-1).

IV. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:
 This meeting will be recorded for purposes of transcribing the minutes. Only the Senate Administrator and Chair Mathur will have access to it.

Be sure that your full name is shown in your participant listing. Use the chat window for communication. Please ensure you mute when not speaking. If you are having bandwidth issues, please consider stopping your video. Type SL into chat if you have a question or an amendment. If we are in debate, please type SL-Amendment or SL-Debate for the speaker's list. Wait until the senate chair calls on you. Do not post your questions in the chat unless requested. We will vote using the polling feature, only vote if you are a senator. Please note that the Chair can see your private chats in the chat feature.

Chair Mathur reminded Senators that the announcement had gone out regarding the four faculty awards. The deadline for nominations is November 2, 2020. In addition, the call for nominations for the Wang Family Excellence Award has also went out and the deadline is October 28, 2020. Finally, the call for nominations for the Faculty Trustee on the Board of Trustees has also been distributed with a deadline of November 20, 2020.

Chair Mathur gave kudos to Senator Anoop Kaur for being recognized at the 23rd Asian Pacific American Leadership Institute (APALI) Gala for her leadership this summer as a mentor intern in their Summer Leadership Program. If you have additional kudos for other senators, please send them to Chair Mathur. The chair provided thanks and gratitude to all (faculty, students, staff, and administrators) to ensure that the campus makes progress; working with one another and helping one another.

B. From the President:

President Papazian acknowledged "Indigenous People's Day" and noted the key value of recognizing the day itself.

President Papazian commented on the amount of work being done this year looking at systemic racism and inequities embedded into our system. Jahmal Williams was just hired in the President's Office to be our first Director of Advocacy and Racial Justice. Jahmal begins at the end of October and will be joining the Community Relations team. He will be working with local organizations and intersecting SJSU with their work.

There is another position in the CDO's Office and the president will let the CDO speak to that position. In addition, Walt Jacobs is working in the Provost Office as a special advisor and we will be building a space for all of these issues to come to the floor at the university.

President Papazian announced the launch of the Taskforce on Community Safety and Policing led by VP Patrick Day and Edith Kinney. They have already had their first meeting and are well underway. They will be reaching out to a variety of constituent groups on campus.

The President is committed to listening to all the recommendations these groups make and the goal is to create an environment all faculty, staff, and students can thrive in at the end of the day.

Tomorrow is the first of two town hall meetings and another one will be held next week to update the campus community on where we are regarding the Adapt Plan. It is likely that the county will be moving from red to orange tomorrow. Purple is the most restrictive, then Red, then Orange, and then Yellow. Orange will open up a little bit more for us. However, with winter coming there is always the fear we could return back to red.

The President acknowledged the work of the faculty and staff and expressed her appreciation. The stress is real and we know the challenges that many are experiencing, especially our students. Without having a recovery package out of Washington, that has implications for particularly for our students and their families.

VP Faas will be giving the Senate a budget presentation on October 26, 2020. However, the President commented that they have been working very hard to ensure we did not have any layoffs this year. It has taken an entire campus effort to do that. Enrollment is stable and the goal now is to finish up this semester and to be sure to support students to make academic progress so that we can deliver on our mission.

We are undergoing our first ever Economic and Social Impact Study to see what our impact is on the city of San José and the state. We expect to get a preliminary report from the consultants on this by the end of next month, and we've asked them to also include the impact of our alumni. We hope to have something to share by the end of the fall 2020.

The results of the Campus Climate Survey will be out very soon. The CDO will speak to this survey later. This is another survey that is very important to us. We started this prior to COVID, but finished after the start of COVID. It will be interesting to see how that plays out in the survey. The President is committed to implementing the recommendations that come out of this survey.

We are doing our second year of staff awards. The President encouraged faculty and administrators to nominate staff for these awards. We do not always do a good job of recognizing the staff.

Questions:

Q: On Saturday night our students organized a protest and vigil for Gregory Johnson Jr. Were you aware of this and are you doing anything to address their concerns about Gregory's case?

A: Yes, I was aware of it. The president was aware this was an off campus march that was centered near city hall. In cases like this there are things you can and can't say, and there are many things the president cannot speak to right now. However, the President has had conversations with our African-American students and what she can say is that they have looked at all elements of this and wherever it was appropriate to take the next step they have done so. This was a case that was looked at by the District Attorney and even the FBI at the time. For those of you who may not be aware, this was a 2009 incident that occurred. Where it is appropriate to take action, we will. However, at this point we see this a protection of people's first amendment rights.

Q: If congress passes a stimulus bill before the end of the year, how do you see that affecting our budget for next year? My second question has to do with using the Humboldt Football Field. It is my understanding this is costing us \$160,000. Is that money coming from the general fund?

A: A stimulus package could only help us and improve our financial situation. Depending on how that stimulus package is written, it also had funding for states and institutions. On the football team, we have athletic donors who were willing to help us with that funding. Ideally the funds will come out of Athletics. We do not plan on using general funds for this.

Q: Humboldt has a higher rate of COVID-19 patients, so how are we ensuring our students will be safe?

A: Humboldt was Orange when we were Red. The bottom line is that the student athletes are in a bubble within a bubble. Our athletes were tested several times before they left, and are tested several times a week since they have gotten there. They are all well. Humboldt is a closed campus and they have had no incidents there. However, if Santa Clara County moves to Orange tomorrow, our athletes would be coming back.

Q: Can you comment on the shift of the Title IX Office?

A: The CDO and I have had a number of discussions with Jaye about the best reporting line for Title IX. We decided looking at the workload in the CDO's office that this was best situated under the Chief of Staff.

C: I understand the issues, but when it was under the CDO it felt like there was a distance from the President's Office, even though the CDO does fall under the CDO. This move is may make some people very uncomfortable about reporting.

A: It really is the same reporting structure. However, the Title IX Office won't even be located where the President's Office is. It will be located in the Administration Building. It is that same reporting structure. The education piece will remain in the CDO's office and we have strengthened the Title IX office so that it can be moved. There are really clear protocols coming out of the Chancellor's Office to protect people and we are complying with all of those.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of August 31, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of September 21, 2020 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of October 12, 2020—The consent calendar was approved as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Curry and Professor (and Past Senate Chair) Annette Nellen presented ***AS 1786, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring SJSU History: 150 Years in San José to be Celebrated October 20, 2020 as “Heritage Day” (Final Reading). The Senate voted and AS 1786 passed as written (45-0-1).***

Senator McKee presented a **motion to suspend standing rule 7A** to allow the *State of the University Announcements* to be heard prior to the *Policy Committee and the ULB Action Items*. **The Senate voted and the motion was approved with more than a 2/3rds vote (41-5-2).**

VI. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):

VP Day announced that enrollment remains strong. However, our enrollment has changed. There are more California residents, and less International students. As we look toward spring 2021, our applicants are up 102% for frosh students and 17% for transfer students. In terms of overall enrollment, we certainly need to see how many of our students continue from the fall to the spring. Both our International and Graduate students are down in terms of enrollment. The steering committee that VP Day has been working with has a series of recommendations that they will be bringing to the cabinet, and eventually the Senate, regarding the future of enrollment.

VP Day is co-chairing the Taskforce on Community Safety and Policing with Edith Kinney. That group is going to be engaging with the Executive Committee of the Senate as well as hosting at least one public meeting.

VP Day and the CDO are working with a large cross-sectional group that is doing planning for the elections. It is likely that not all issues will be resolved on the day of the election and there may be safety issues and lots of emotions and feelings afterwards. They will be looking at how to prepare for the night of the election and even as far out as several weeks after the election.

Questions:

Q: It is my understanding that if you apply to one impacted program at SJSU, the system locks you out from applying to any other impacted programs. Is this true and is there logic behind this?

A: I don't know the answer to that. It is a wonderful question. I'll try and get the answer if I can before this meeting is over.

Q: I believe this had to do with Computer Science and Engineering. If you applied to one then you couldn't apply to the other.

A: I will follow up.

Q: You mentioned there was a drop in International students. Can you comment on how much? Also, is the university doing anything to try and influence policy on international students?

A: Pretty substantial drop, but not unlike other campuses. As you may know, we have one of the largest international student populations in the CSU. That has fairly significant issues for us when you start seeing the kind of drops that we are seeing. Our International applications are down 31% for spring 2021. There are a couple of issues we have to wrestle with. One is what can we realistically expect in terms of the number of International students that come to the campus? There have been drops in International students long before COVID-19. We also won't know a lot more about this until after the election when we see what our International policies are going to be and whether people can get VISAs. There are also serious concerns about safety. We have some advantage based on location.

[VP Faas] We are about 500 students down in terms of International students and that is approximately the \$8 to \$10 million range. The Provost, VP Faas and others have been working with the International House to ensure they continue to promote excellence in International studies both in the students we send overseas and the students who come here. For the past few years, these numbers have been dropping due to political policies. We were at a high of 13% to 14% with a target of 15%. Right now, we are at the 9% to 10% range.

[Provost] When you hear about the drops in graduates and International students, much of that is combined. Part of that has to do with the fact that people come to work, but if they can't get an internship then there isn't a lot of reason to enroll. We are looking at having hybrid classes this spring so that first time VISA entering people can legally be in the country when they are evaluated by Homeland Security. You have to have at least one class with some face-to-face instruction and it will be legitimate class. We are looking at that. Software Engineering and Computer Science get hammered pretty good. There isn't much we can do about the political policies unless there is a change in the administration.

Q: Concerning the graduate drops are there specific departments where those drops in applicants are occurring, because in Social Work we have not seen those kinds of drops?

A: Where we are seeing it is in Computer Science and Engineering areas. Keep in mind this is 20% of our campus. What we are not seeing is a precipitous decline in other areas. However, we have seen a softening in our frosh students over the last couple of years, and when I say soften I mean not as robust. Our future will likely be more about transfer students than about frosh what with the possibility of free community college. Our balance will probably shift more towards transfer students. We are also anticipating a population decline inside of five years here in terms of traditional aged students.

[Dean d'Alarcao] The decrease in graduate applications is largely due to the International issues and policies. The other point is that we did defer the enrollment of some students from the fall to next spring. We are hopeful that these students may be able to come in the spring. Although, applications for spring enrollment are down, admits are up because deferred students count as being admitted. However, we will see if they get to come. That depends on federal policy.

Q: Can you speak to the programming and outreach that is being done with students regarding the upcoming elections?

A: We are looking at ways we can setup virtual meetups. We are looking at residence hall engagements that will still be primarily virtual as well as virtual meetings for staff and faculty. Making sure that people feel stay safe, but also ensuring that we are supporting all after the election.

Q: Is there any discussion in the CSU about making the temporary suspension of SATs and ACTs permanent like the UC has done? This is important in addressing structural inequalities.

A: In my last council meeting with other VPSAs, this conversation was very much on the table. I'm not sure the UC has made that permanent yet. The Chancellor had asked about creating a working group. It is an open question right now. My read on it is that there is lots of support for making a recommendation not to do it. [Provost] I was shocked when someone suggested the CSU create their own exams. That was shutdown very quickly.

Q: I think I misunderstood. You said undergraduate applications were up by how much?

A: For spring 2021, applications for frosh are up 102% and for transfers 17%. In real numbers that means we have 198 frosh applications this year vs. 98 applications last year. We had 3,257 transfer applications this year vs. 2,781 transfer applications last year. We did extend the deadline due to the fires.

Q: Given the drops we have had in graduate students, are we doing any kind of outreach to our graduating seniors to encourage them to stay and get a master's degree here?

A: That is a great idea. I'm going to yield to Dean d'Alarcao on that question. [Dean d'Alarcao] That is a great question. There are two things we are doing that could make a difference. One thing is partnering with Deanna Peck in doing workshops for current undergraduate students that talk about the process of going to graduate school. The other thing is that we now have a policy that allows us to do 4+1 programs. Which is an appealing option for some undergraduates that want to get a Master's degree in an accelerated time frame. Many departments are working on developing those programs with hopes of launching them next fall 2021.

A: Mode of delivery is something we really need to consider for these programs. Something for faculty to discuss, different ways to offer their programs.

B. Chief Diversity Officer:

The search committee for the Director of Black and African-American Equity just interviewed their last candidate today. The search committee hopes to make a hire very soon.

The CDO has been working with Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success, Magdalena Barrera on RTP candidate training as well mandatory committee training for RTP committee members. This training included a lot of concrete information on how bias and attribution error enters into different ways in which we evaluate candidates and their materials in particular. And there's actually a lot of discussion in it and the social psychological theories that really contribute to making errors in and just the type of things we're talking about in terms of external reviews and other things and minor types of research, etc. There is a lot of positive feedback.

VP Patrick Day, the CDO, and Jen Malutta from Government Relations are chairing an election response committee to support the entire campus community. The committee meets every week and will continue to do so after the elections for 3 to 4 weeks.

The structure of the Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is being vetted with many different groups across campus.

Rankin and Associates will present the results of The Campus Climate Survey at two Town Hall meetings on November 12, 2020 and November 13, 2020 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. There will be a full discussion of the results and then a question and answer session.

The CDO continues to do in-depth training with various units across campus to understand equity issues as they are putting together their strategic plans for equity. Doing some basic training and then some more advanced training in understanding these issues and looking forward to hiring the new trainer.

C. Faculty Trustee:

Trustee Sabalius announced he would like to speak about the new chancellor, AB 1460, the budget, and the faculty trustee position.

Our new Chancellor is Joseph Castro who is the current president of Fresno. He will be the first Chancellor of the CSU who was born in California. He is the first Chancellor of Mexican-American heritage and a first generation student. Both Chancellor White and Chancellor Castro have a long history with California. Chancellor White went to a California Community College, then the CSU Fresno, and ultimately to UC Berkeley. Chancellor Castro has worked extensively in the UC system before becoming the President of Fresno, where he has been for the past seven years. The BOT anticipates a continuation of Chancellor White's course by Chancellor Castro. They are similar in thought. All of the finalists for Chancellor were very capable and it was a very diverse pool.

After the trustees changed Title 5 to meet the Ethnic Studies and Social Justice requirement in July, AB 1460 passed and was signed into law by the governor. The BOT are now working on bringing Title 5 into alignment with AB 1460. Again, the BOT do not deal with curricular issues. The BOT just sets the framework for the Executive Order that will affect the Ethnic Studies requirement. All the BOT will do in November is cutout social justice from the title of the required course. Then it is up to the Chancellor's Office, the ASCSU, and the Council of Ethnic Studies to coordinate and engage in shared governance to come up with the student learning objectives and outcomes, and to discuss to what degree campus practices and included courses will be followed.

The budget proposal from the Chancellor's Office was presented to the BOT in the September meeting. As in previous years, Trustee Sabalius was not satisfied with the budget and made many requests for changes. In short, what Trustee Sabalius asked the BOT to do was request the legislators fund us adequately so we can avoid furloughs. Trustee Sabalius also asked for funding for the implementation of AB 1460, since it was given to us as an unfunded mandate and it will cost approximately \$16 million. Trustee Sabalius also asked for money to train our faculty in online instruction not just for COVID-19, but also should there be campus closures due to wildfires, earthquakes, or other emergencies. Trustee Sabalius is not naïve and is aware of the budget situation next year, but if we do not ask for what we really need in our budget we will never get it. The request is also an instrument of communication to the public about what our needs are and what our priorities

are to fulfill mission. It is important to communicate clearly to the legislators exactly what we need.

The announcement for the next term as faculty trustee has went out to campuses. Trustee Sabalius remains very committed to the job of faculty trustee. He has decided to run for Faculty Trustee for another term and hopes for the support of faculty. In the next couple of weeks, he will send out the nomination petition for faculty signatures. You can also email

Questions:

Q: The new chancellor is getting a \$650,000 salary and an additional \$107,000 for transportation and housing. He is making more than the President of the U.S. and Governor Newsom combined. At this time, with budget cuts, lower state revenues, layoffs, furloughs, what was the rationale behind this?

A: The compensation for the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, and the campus Presidents is discussed in closed session by the BOT and Trustee Sabalius cannot speak to it. However, you can draw your own conclusions if you look at the salary of the Presidents in the UC, which are equivalent to our chancellor position. That salary is roughly \$850,000. The most recently hired CSU campus presidents were getting salaries that were encroaching upon the chancellor's salary. The BOT wanted to make a distinction between the salaries of the presidents and that of the chancellor. It isn't fair to compare the chancellor's salary to that of the President of the United States and Governor Newsom since the legislature is notoriously underpaid and the President has even forfeited his salary, nor would it be fair to compare that salary to CEOs of major corporations where that salary would be woefully lacking.

D. Statewide Academic Senators:

This month Senator Curry is reporting for her and on behalf of her fellow CSU Statewide Senators, Senator Van Selst and Senator Rodan. They serve on the ASCSU Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, and Academic Preparation and Educational Programs Committees. Senator Van Selst also serves as Chair of GEAC.

All three of the CSU Statewide Senators met in committees last week and discussed different aspects of the Ethnic Studies graduation requirement, AB 1460, and the draft Executive Order. Your input is needed on the draft Executive Order by November 2, 2020. There will be an earlier deadline to the committee on campus who will be gathering information. This week there will be a meeting of the Council on Ethnic Studies Steering Committee regarding collaboration and implementation of the new set of competencies that were submitted to the Chancellor's Office. On our campus we have been meeting as a subcommittee of the Senate Executive Committee including various members of the Senate. On October 2, 2020, the subcommittee met

with Ethnic Studies faculty to work on a common path forward towards implementation.

The Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, and Academic Preparation and Educational Programs Committees have also been working on resolutions for the November plenary. Some of these resolutions include work overload, support for faculty-student research (as linked to reassignment time), and early exit discussions. We have a return resolution that has to do with lecture faculty representatives dedicated for the ASCSU that is being developed. This is the third time it will come back to the Senate.

Another important item from Senator Rodan who serves on Academic Affairs has to do with the changes to Ethnic Studies core competencies and suggested feedback for EO 1100. From APAP and GEAC, Senator Van Selst will send you a written copy of his report and items that GEAC is working on. The articulation officer concerns about the potential implementation process and the timelines for the Fall 2021 catalog were of vital importance as well as concerns about building sufficient capacity in instruction to meet the new requirements.

The issues that will continue into November include concerns from the CSU about pass through, articulation, and new laws requiring community college credit by evaluation to be transcribed as coursework, feedback on the Ethnic Studies draft Executive Order, and credit by evaluation processes and policies. Lastly from APEC, Senator Van Selst reports that the committee is working on a resolution for Associates Degrees for transfer students and the need for version control to allow the receiving CSU to know what Associates Degree transfer version the student took, what courses can be relied on as guaranteed present.

Another resolution in the works would identify which version of the CSU's GE is to be certified. Two additional points include continued monitoring of EO 1100 and EO 1110, and teacher recruitment and retention, retirement in the face of COVID-19.

E. Provost:

As was mentioned at the last meeting, we have launched a number of tenure/tenure-track hires. We have also launched two key leadership searches in the Provost Office. One is for the Dean of the MLK Library and three of four candidates have come through and another is scheduled tomorrow. Those open forums are available for people to view. You may also complete the survey until Friday. We have a search for the Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics that we did not move forward with last year and are now moving forward with as well. The search committee has a list of about 10 candidates they are looking at and candidates will be brought to campus in November.

We are partnering with a non-profit called the Op Ed project which launched the Public Voices fellowship this fall. That is going really well. You are going to find a lot of outstanding commentary in some amazing newspapers and magazines by our colleagues and the faculty. SJSU has always been a great place to find experts in a field, but it is happening at an even greater level now.

The first four faculty interviews have been done for the Provost's podcast that will launch next week. The title of the podcast is, *The Accidental Geographer*. The Provost hopes to do five or six of these interviews each semester and to interview faculty from every college. There are so many amazing colleagues on this campus.

We have just received some statements from people who want to be on a taskforce to look at Honors Education on campus.

We are also working on AB 1460. There is a survey that will go out to collect information. This is really a faculty issue so this is going to be a lot of conversation. Our campus has been a leader in this process, but we will end up with some really good outcomes from this process. We need to report back to the Chancellor's Office by November 2, 2020.

Questions:

C: It is surprising that the Chancellor's Office has asked for so much input around AB 1460 from the campuses, there is a genuine concern to get this campus feedback. We should encourage everyone to get involved and complete this survey.

F. Associated Students President:

Happy Indigenous Peoples Day.

AS will host a safe place for students after the November elections, dates and times will be determined soon.

The AS Events Team and the Cesar Chavez Community Action Center are offering student engagement programs which include events, trainings, and student leadership programs.

AS allocated \$70,000 for scholarships for spring and they reached their goal for applicants.

AS is waiting for approval of their occupancy permit to move into the AS House again.
AS is still waiting on approval of their budget from the President's Office.

The AS president wants to acknowledge the event that happened on October 10, 2020 for students who gathered to acknowledge the death of Gregory Johnson, an SJSU student. Please look into this student's story. When we talk about anti-Black racism, graduation initiatives, and student success, we should keep in mind stories of student like Gregory Johnson.

G. Vice President for Administration and Finance:

There is a new group called the *Campus Mobility Group* that is mapping out where people are going on campus, how they are getting around on the campus, what classes are being held on campus, where are potential places COVID could spread, the volume of people on the campus, things we could be doing such as air filtration systems, function and using research space. The group is comprised of faculty and administrators such as Tracy Ferdolage and Dean Ehrman. Glad that our faculty trustee is advocating for more money, appreciate that advocacy.

The University Budget presentation to the Senate is on October 26, 2020.

Questions:

Q: Are any departments receiving less funding than normal as a consequence of the deficit and if so, how are those departments adjusting?

A: Research is the only department getting more money. Every other department and division is getting less money. That said, we are doing everything we said we would do in transformation 2030. Last year we hired 60 faculty members and this year we are hiring 60 to 70 faculty members. We are continuing to fund all the student success initiatives with student advising. The average student load is up from 12 to 13+ units. We are saving salaries by not hiring non-critical positions. We are refinancing debt to lower rates. We went from 4% to 1.8% interest on our loans. There will be a longer presentation at the Senate budget meeting.

Q: What is the difference between the Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee and the Campus Planning Board?

A: They both have different unique roles. The Campus Planning Board meets monthly throughout the year and handles day-to-day campus issues. The Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee meets about once every 20 years and maps out the long term vision of the campus consistent again with Transformation 2030, where we are looking for growth in terms of students in terms of teaching. Once you get those types of pillars then you can look at what we need to do around here, whether in facilities and resources and land in different areas so that we can support the faculty and students.

Q: There used to be ballot drop off boxes scattered around campus, will there be any this season?

A: I'm sure there will be, but they may not be out yet. We are going to have two voting centers. One will be at MLK Library and one at the Hammer Theatre. I'll let you know where the drop off places are going to be.

Q: In homes that are vacant for a little while, where the toilets haven't been flushed and the water hasn't been turned on, there can be a lot of damage from lack of use. All of our water fountains are off and only some of the toilets are being used, so how long can these sit before they show damage?

A: Our Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) team is on campus every day and they are out there monitoring the air and water quality. They test the water around campus on a regular basis, and make sure the toilets are flushed, etc. By no means is the campus closed. There aren't a lot of people here or activity here, but we continue to ensure that maintenance activities get done. In some cases, we are accelerating work, because we can get more done without people on the campus.

Q: We are a cogeneration entity and I'm wondering if we are selling electricity back to PG&E and if the campus gets that revenue?

A: We are not 100% with our cogeneration, we are only 70%. We still have to use PG&E, but are saving some money.

Q: How much are we saving?

A: I'll check and get back to you.

VII. Unfinished Business: None.

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

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

B. University Library Board (ULB): None

C. Curriculum and Research Committee: None

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1785, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors at SJSU (First Reading)***.

I&SA is proposing to amend section 3.0 in University Policy S17-13 to refer to honors in the major as opposed to departmental major honors. This will allow departments to have multiple honors tracks within each of their programs.

Questions:

Q: There is a requirement that there be separate coursework as part of the honors sequence, so presumably all those other requirements stay the same. There is also a limit as far as the percentage of students in a program that

could receive honors. I assume this would exclude a department from having a “honors track” as a concentration or program?

A: Everything is the same whether we call this departmental major honors or honors in the major. It just allows for a department to have two honors tracks or as many honors tracks as they have degrees within there. There is still the expectation that honors in the major be based on specified coursework that leads to the honors designation. There would just be different tracks for different degree programs as opposed to the department.

Q: Was there any discussion about possible drawbacks to this proposal in the committee?

A: No, the subcommittee who did the work they did not share any speedbumps. The only thing that was questioned was whether there were any graduate programs that had honors programs that would then be encompassed within and we determined that with CGS there aren't any honors tracks in them. This is specifically related to undergraduate education.

C: In Humanities, we have three separate BA programs. The three do not share curriculum so all of our students were prevented from participating in this, because it said department honors and not major honors. We have three majors and each of those majors can comply with the rest of the policy, but this means the creative arts majors, humanities majors, and liberal studies teacher prep majors, all of whom have very different curriculum, can participate like other students.

C: I actually helped to bring this policy together when I was sent a chair in the 1990s, and there was originally an independent department honors policy that was even older. We just merged it virtually unchanged. I am positive that this is simply an oversight or it goes back to an era when there were virtually no distinctions between a major in a department. Or if there were. no one had department honors in many departments. I think even to this day have not applied for the privilege of having department honors. So, I think this is an issue that came up recently and I think this is a slam dunk.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented ***Amendment D to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards to Provide Guidance during External Reviews (First Reading)***.

This is a first reading which is designed to promote discussion and conversation. Professional Standards wanted to find a way to provide encouragement and structure for faculty who have non-traditional scholarship that means scholarship that isn't always peer reviewed. The committee has received some feedback from some groups already.

Questions:

Q: Has the committee considered, for candidates who have went through the review process where an external review was used but was not part of the

guidelines, producing a recommendation for the department to incorporate such guidelines? Consider a long-term change to department guidelines? Guidelines to consider what was the reviewer's basis, where were they coming from?

A: Fewer than half of our departments have guidelines.

Q: In line 60 it refers to an institution "similar" to SJSU. What does similar refer to? What is the intention of that sentence?

A: It comes from a conversation I had with the Provost. I interpreted it to mean that we want people who are reviewing and interpreting our scholarship to understand the kinds of resources and mission of SJSU. Yes, it is ambiguous so I'd be happy to have some language that is more precise.

C: [Provost] Thanks to PS for taking this up. We might not need to do this in policy, we might do this in implementation. The question is do faculty want any parameters around external review? Provost Del Casino was at a university that did external reviews and there was a candidate who had a small amount of work, but when the external reviews came back it turned out that the work he did was the most significant research in that field in the last 25 years. It was very hard to turn that person down for tenure based on that quantitative measure. There is a potential for implicit bias in our review system particularly in multi-disciplinary departments. We might need to evaluate any kind of research including peer review, but need to provide contextualization at SJSU.

Q: How would a candidate know when to ask for an external review? Is it up to the department?

A: The existing language just says a candidate can request an external review. Without giving some kind of guidance people don't know. Some faculty come from departments where it isn't traditional to ask, so if they ask no one knows how to handle it. Consequently, there are faculty that do a lot of research that isn't peer reviewed. They don't get much credit for it, because they don't know to ask to have it sent out for review by disciplinary peers. This is particularly true for emerging fields where we are having a hiring push. One way or the other, we have to do a better job of helping to set up these faculty members. The question is how do we do this without panicking everyone else who does peer reviewed work and convincing them that now they are going to be expected to send their portfolios out as do R1 institutions. It is kind of the third rail of RTP. Every time external review has been mentioned in previous years when we have looked at it at SJSU, it has inspired fear. It is a very ticklish thing to do and we need your help.

Q: Provost Del Casino mentioned Op Ed pieces and in my college Op Ed pieces are not even considered part of research and scholarship. It has to be part of implementation for people to understand.

A: There was an RTP case of a faculty member who had several very thoughtful Op Eds about political reform and also met with a legislative body to testify and follow-up on the Op Eds. These Op Eds and the testimony of

this faculty member were solicited only because of this faculty member's particular expertise. This faculty member sent the Op Eds and testimony to an external reviewer. The reviewer wrote an evaluation of how it fit within the discipline and that took unpublished and non-peer reviewed material and gave it a review by a scholar in the field that was helpful to RTP committees and decision-makers as they were going to evaluate the significance and weight of that work. That is a model we ought to be repeating especially at SJSU.

C: [Provost] This is part of the value of department policies, which is to sketch out what the expectations are for your colleagues. Just because we use external reviews doesn't mean it is the only parameter we might use to tenure someone. Having done this at Long Beach when I was a chair, we came out with variations of what we thought was appropriate. I understand the nervousness of people, although I don't particularly get it when 95% of people get tenure. I don't think there has been enough discussion at the local level about some of the expectations people have. When faculty interview our expectations should be part of the process. There is nothing wrong with having expectations and saying we demand a variation of kinds of things.

C: I echo the comments about line 60 about what is considered "similar." Often from some of our cutting edge scholars in areas like pedagogy or the research on how to decolonize a STEM discipline and many do come from R1 institutions. Also, there may be entire centers like at Indiana University that look at STEM and pedagogy and even like Ethnic Studies who could evaluate the work and who come from external agencies and not from R1s.

Q: My question is about the timeline. My assumption is that in the RTP process that which is submitted is what is evaluated, so you can't pedagogy on the submission? I just want to make sure you are not trying to change that?

A: No. In one draft we required that the nominations occur three months before, but we took that out as being too procedural. However, it is true. If you want to have your work externally reviewed, you have to plan well in advance.

C: I think you could take out this whole section whenever it refers external reviewers and just replace it with collaborators? Our department strongly encourages collaboration and encourages the candidate to produce evidence and documentation from the collaborator on the role of the candidate and the role of the collaborator.

A: The committee will consider.

Q: I agree with the comments the Provost has made. I don't see this as something to be afraid of. We can exclude external letters today and we will still be able to exclude external letters in the future, is this correct?

A: Yes.

C: So what changes is that the department can now request an external review on your behalf. There are two paths now that exist. I don't think this

should be restricted to unpublished and public scholarship. It is helpful to people with published scholarship that are not necessarily in the field and able to be evaluated, moreover it may also be helpful in identifying false positives. This is the risk the candidate takes if they request it. I also agree with Senator Wong(Lau) about changing the language regarding “similar” institution in line 60. I believe the language that is usually used is “peer aspirational institution.” There are also all sorts of issues that can come up procedurally. We have a very transparent process where the candidate is allowed to see a lot of the process, so that all needs to be worked out. I had experience working on one of these in an R1 institution. My final comment is that timeline issues come up. Our process takes a long time. The timeline should not be a restriction. Many institutions request the external review in August and finish the process in March or April so I don’t think that should be a deterrent. Our timeline is so long we should be able to get this done.

C: [Papazian] This is way too complicated. The language should be simplified tremendously. It seems as if we are trying to account for every possible iteration that could happen. I have been at five institutions none of which were R1s and all of which required some version of external review. This is not an R1 issue. There is this perception that our faculty are somehow less than faculty at other places and external peer review is to be feared. Our faculty are extraordinary and every bit as good as other reviewers. We are under selling our faculty. What matters is the quality. I do not see this as false positives. What is relevant is the trajectory, the collection and the constellation of work. For every reviewer, and every letter that goes out there asked not to make that evaluation, that’s not their evaluation to make. There are contexts here based on teaching load and other obligations and values and the like (not relevant whether they say they should get tenure, what is relevant is the evaluation of the work). Often peer reviewed can make a difference. I would not fear this so much. It worries me that our faculty are afraid. There is no reason someone forging a new way shouldn’t be recognized for it. Don’t over complicate this. It just makes it harder to help faculty.

A: Thank you. However, it is complicated for the faculty though, it is politically.

C: [Papazian] I think what I’m trying to say is the policy can be simpler instead of writing all the implementation in the policy. I think there is value in clarity amongst the departments. Good work holds up. It is exciting to see that and see it recognized by colleagues.

C: [Provost] You want to get to yes, and to support people through their career. What I have noticed in our processes are some biases. If you’ve been through peer review and have been published in a journal then you are right, some of the best people have reviewed you. The problem is sometimes people don’t understand that process, or that journal, or don’t understand how spoken word could be peer reviewed. People just don’t get it. External review often frames that for people. How I’ve framed it in the past is, “I do this kind of

work, and in this work this is how this body of literature that this person produced fits and this is the impact it has had.” This also helps all of us and Provosts who can’t know every field. This will help all future Provosts at SJSU.

IX. Special Committee Reports: None

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.