

**2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes**  
**November 9, 2020**

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

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

**II. Land Acknowledgement:** The land acknowledgement is a formal statement that recognizes the history and legacy of colonialism that has impacted our Indigenous peoples, their traditional territories, and their practices. It is a simple and powerful way of showing respect and a step towards correcting the stories and practices that erased our Indigenous people's history and culture and it is a step towards inviting and honoring the truth. Senator d'Alarcao read the Land Acknowledgement.

**III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**  
 The minutes of October 12, 2020 and October 26, 2020 were approved (42-0-1).

**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 review 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 commented on what a stressful and anxious week it has been with the elections during the pandemic. Chair Mathur echoed the comments from the President and Provost about what a fantastic campus community it is that we work in and the importance of continuing to provide support and space to one another as we transition as a country. We do need to pay attention to what has come out of this election and to recognize the 'gems.' We had a historic turnout of voters, massive early voting, 100 million people. Young people registered to vote in record numbers, in 32 states across the country, more young people registered to vote in October 2020 compared to November 2016. In Idaho, Georgia, Minnesota, and Vermont youth voter registration numbers exceeded those in 2016 by more than 1/3<sup>rd</sup>. In the 2018 mid-term elections, about 58% of poll workers were age 61 or older. A group at higher risk for COVID. This time around many older workers were reluctant to work the polls. This election high school students and young adults filled in those crucial rolls to keep democracy running. More than 37,000 young people signed up to be poll workers.

Americans really came together with a stronger sense of community. Nowhere was this more obvious than on our campus with the post-election programming done by the committee headed by the Chief Diversity Officer, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Director of State and Local Relations, in terms of voter registration and support. The tremendous work done by Associated Students and students across our campus has been amazing. Native American and indigenous people who were denied the vote for decades, came together in record numbers and many have noted that their votes turned the tide of the election in many states. For the first time in history, the U.S. House of Representatives will have three Native American women amongst its members. In Delaware, the nation's first transgender person was elected to the Senate. A record number of LGBTQ lawmakers will be headed to congress in the next session.

Also, Kamala Devi Harris has risen in national politics higher than any other woman in U.S. history. She has really broken the glass ceiling. There is much work to be done, but for now let us be thankful and celebrate all of these

gems. Chair Mathur is thankful and feels gratitude for the support and collegiality she has seen around our campus, it has been inspiring. Chair Mathur is proud to be a member of the Senate and the University. Kudos to the post-election team as well as many senators in this room, Senator Delgadillo, Senator Yang, Senator Day, and Senator Wong(Lau). The Senate gave a round of applause.

Chair Mathur thanked our veterans for their service. Veterans make sacrifices for the common good, fought for our freedoms. Without the service of veterans, we would not always have the freedoms that we have.

Reminders, the Faculty Trustee nominations are due to the Senate by November 20, 2020. Also, if you are interested in serving on the American Institutions General Education Review Panels, those nominations are due by November 13, 2020.

#### **B. From the President:**

President Papazian commented that she would like to echo VP Anagnos' comments about the glass ceiling, but it isn't broken just cracked. There is still more work to do in that area. We need to remember that while a majority of the popular vote, and 2/3rds of California, voted for the President-elect, the second largest number in U.S. history voted for the incumbent president. This still remains a very divided country in many regards. Which is interesting, because if you look at the policies that both groups would like to pass, they are in more agreement than the vote shows. Think about that. There is a lot of presence of California values in our federal government and it matters. We need to find a way across these divides. It will be important to have those conversations and show leadership in bridging those divides. Our own congressman, Rohit Khanna, proposed a \$900 billion initiative to create science and technology jobs. We need to find a way to get science and technology education out to rural areas. We need to start developing a curriculum around digital economy in places that we haven't traditionally seen it. Think about what we can do as partners with other universities and the community colleges. There is a role for SJSU in this, with our faculty in those programs, computer science and engineering and in other liberal arts programs as well. There may be a role for faculty exchanges where our expertise can be put to service to generate a healthier economy. This is something to think about, there are many opportunities. Alongside of that think about partnerships like with Michigan where they know how to build cars and here we know how to automate, electrify, and all that. Good intersections for our students.

There will be a new administration coming in. President Papazian does think we will see a federal stimulus bill of some kind. Many agencies in Washington are already working with the house and the senate on this. The President is hopeful this will happen before the inauguration, but confident it will happen

after the inauguration. We should find a little relief for our students and some relief for small businesses. The president isn't sure what will happen with regard to the Affordable Care Act.

Our Campus Climate townhall meetings are set for later this week. The president encouraged people to register for them on November 12 and 13, 2020. This is an important campus-wide conversation. The President and CDO will then begin putting together the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion in response to what we learn there as well as other issues.

The Early Exit program deadline from University Personnel is next Monday. It is a pretty clear set of criteria. If you meet the eligibility, then you are eligible.

Our new Spartan Athletic Center on South Campus is on the Board of Trustee's Agenda for next week. We are optimistic that will go through smoothly.

**Questions:**

**Q:** You mentioned that with the new administration that there may be a new stimulus package, can you speak to this?

**A:** I think the best case scenario to start with is the Heroes' Act that passed the house. That would be significant. It is a \$3 trillion dollar package. I do not think we will see that. I think it will be a fight to get it up to \$3 trillion. What I think will probably happen is a smaller package in the short term, and then a subsequent stimulus package after the new administration takes over. The amount will probably depend on the outcome of the election. There is recognition that higher education has taken a huge hit in all this and needs state support. It is a question of whether you do a head count or FTE. Community colleges are pushing for headcount since they have those numbers, but not the FTE. FTE is being pushed by fulltime institutions since a lot of the loss of dollars is in housing. You don't have those kind of losses that are COVID-related in community colleges. There should also be some dollars to support the research enterprise, so we should see a benefit there of some kind since we are active there. Whether there will be some support for the states is still out there. The governors are working hard to see that happens. That would be good for us, that would take the pressure off of campuses. There is a wide range of how this could go. What do you think Melinda Jackson and Ken Peter?

**C:** [Ken Peter] I don't think we will have any hard plans until the new administration is in place on January 5, 2020 until we have information on those Georgia seats.

**C:** [Melinda Jackson] I agree. Whether we will get any more cooperation out of the new congress is really up in the air. We are keeping our fingers crossed.

**Q:** Are part-time lecturer faculty eligible for the Early Exit Program? Can you clarify?

**A:** I'm going to defer to Joanne Wright.

**C:** [Joanne Wright] The 1.0, 3-year entitled faculty are eligible.

**Q:** So, not part-time?

**A:** That is correct.

**Q:** Last week, Chancellor White presented a view of what the CSU might look like post pandemic which increases the amount of online classes. My question is that for the past five years we've heard that enrollments in the CSU will start decreasing over the next five years, and we will be in a budget recovery period. How does that tie in and what are we doing to re-envision where SJSU is then?

**A:** It is a great question. In terms of online classes, we are all trying to figure out what that will look like over the next few years. My opinion is that it will be more hybrid than online. I think you will see some things work well in online and then there are other things that don't work well online. I think it is important we learn the right lessons. Where we can expand outreach that will be a good thing. We've long known that 2025 is a plateau space where the number of HS graduates would drop off. Due to the pandemic, we know that there are a very large number of working adults, or adults who were working that have some college but no degree. The question is how do we reach out to those people? One of the benefits of the online classes is that it does reach out to those people. There is a positive in that when you have employees who have been displaced. Not all of those jobs will come back. We have an opportunity here to help people finish their degree, or to move forward with another degree. Or stackable certificates which will enable them to get particular jobs. I'll defer to the Vice President of Student Affairs here. We also have to look at our graduate enrollment. We should also look at what we can offer in the professional areas and Dean d'Alarcao is looking into this. We also need to pay a lot of attention to the international side. There is some relief at least with the new administration on the VISA issues. I think some of these issues will be addressed on day 1. Once students start to find their way to other institutions, it is very hard to bring them back. We had a robust international student population. We are going to continue working on this. Our College of Professional and Global Education is doing good work on this.

**C:** [VP Day] Absolutely, we have to consider what the hybrid future looks like. There is a lot of information coming out that suggests students want lots of options between online and hybrid. We are also more than likely going to see more transfer students than Frosh. We are already seeing a softening in that population largely due to community college enrollments. The fact that community college students can be enrolled for free. That is okay. We also need to pay more attention to our out-of-state opportunities. We need to think about how, where, and when we deliver our programs. Online is just once piece of the conversation.

**Q:** You have said you are returning the recent SOTES amendment, which is not the same as vetoing it. Given that the CSU has passed a resolution suspending the SOTES for the fall, can you give us an update on this?

**A:** Sending it back is a way of saying I'm not signing it, but it will have comments on there about why. I don't anticipate signing it. We did have a pretty robust discussion in the Senate on this. For me, the student voice is an important voice and I just don't see taking the student voice out of it. This is one piece of a larger picture. Students understand the challenge of modalities, but they have a lot of other things to say that need to be part of the record. There are other ways that faculty can speak to the particular issues or challenges that they may have like the provost's letter.

**Q:** What degree of assurance can you give to our dreamers with the new administration?

**A:** How things are addressed in congress really depends on what congress looks like. However, I have no doubt that the president-elect will support the dreamer. He was a part of creating that in the first place and I see no reason he wouldn't be supportive of that.

**Q:** Given the very stressful semester some of our students are facing at home, shouldn't we offer pass or no pass?

**A:** I am going to defer that question to Chair Mathur.

**A:** [Mathur] In our system we don't have a pass/no pass option, but we do have a credit/no credit option. There have been large conversations around the system regarding this issue. This time around students had more knowledge about the modalities and what they were going to get when they signed up for fall. Also, there has been significant training opportunity for faculty. Students already have the option of taking credit or no credit at the beginning of a class. We were also much better prepared for fall than we were for spring, so there has been no movement forward on credit/no credit. This doesn't mean that the conversation shouldn't continue on our campus.

**C:** Even though students may have been prepared for Fall, I'm seeing that students are extremely, extremely fatigued by a variety of other things. I think that it is really important that we have some conversations around what we can do to alleviate some of the stresses students have. The stresses haven't gone away. They have gotten worse.

**A:** [Papazian] I really appreciate the comments. I know the CDO has had some conversations with students and it is really clear there is a lot of stress across the institution. VP Day can speak to some of the ways they are addressing this for students. This is a real issue and a serious issue, and you are right it is multi-layered. It isn't in one place. Thank you very much for this comment. I appreciate it.

**V. Executive Committee Report:**

**A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:**

EC Minutes of October 5, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of October 19, 2020 – No questions

**B. Consent Calendar:**

Consent Calendar of November 9, 2020—There was no dissent to the consent calendar as presented by AVC Marachi.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Senator Sen presented a motion to suspend the rules under Standing Rule 10c in order to present a resolution from the floor of the Senate. The motion was seconded by Senator Yang. The Senate voted and motion passed with more than a two-thirds majority (39-2-1).

Senators Sen and Yang presented ***Sense of the Senate Resolution, Condemning Anti-Black Racism and Systemic Racism and Calling for SJSU Academic Senate Actions to Promote Racial Equity (Final Reading)***. Several senators spoke in favor of this resolution noting that it is important for the senate to examine itself, in particular there is a value of the Speaker's Series to illuminate parts of SJSU history. It was also noted that the reflective approach is important for the Academic Senate and that this is a moment of truth and reconciliation. This resolution talks about anti-racism and racism in a systemic historical way and ties it to organizational culture. It is self-critical but also provides a structure. Not just a critique, resolved some actions in a way that academic institutions are poised to do. This is a proud document for SJSU, naming this publicly and a courageous one.

**Q:** Has anyone looked at the diversity of the Senate compared to the diversity of our faculty as a whole?

**A:** [Sasikumar] O&G is currently collecting that data. We should have it very soon.

**The Senate voted and the resolution passed as written (46-0-1).**

Senator White presented a motion to suspend the rules under Standing Rule 10c in order to allow Senator Curry to present a resolution from the floor of the Senate. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and motion passed with more than a two-thirds majority (37-2-4).

Senator Curry presented ***Sense of the Senate Resolution, Opposing the Chancellor's Implementation Process for AB 1460 (Final Reading)***.

Senators noted that it is a time to celebrate this requirement for the campuses. Resolution was built on the accomplishments of many faculty on our campus and beyond. We are joining many other campuses in proposing this resolution. It was noted that a similar debate occurred in early 1990s, solution is campus autonomy, many options that our campus can manage on our own. Concerns about growing curricular overreach of the Chancellor's office. Good that students were included in the conversation on our campus.

**Q:** How does this resolution address the tension between AB1460 and SB1440?

**A:** This resolution doesn't address that tension specifically. Part of this concerns the CO moving forward while 1460 was still being considered. Board of Trustees brought this upon themselves. The BOT proposed only one solution.

**The Senate voted and the resolution passed as written (34-1-9).**

**VI. Unfinished Business:** None.

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

**A. 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 (Final Reading)***. **The Senate voted and AS 1785 passed as written (38-0-5).**

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1787, Policy Recommendation, Adding Classes after Advance Registration (First Reading)***. Senator Sullivan-Green noted that pages 4-11 should be omitted. These pages were submitted to the Senate Office in error and were a carryover from the last reading. As many of you are aware, the university modified their use of waitlists for Fall 2020 due to the challenge of getting students into courses that are online only. That change allowed the waitlist to be active for a certain period of time after the start of the semester as well as raising all the graduating seniors to the top of the list. The reason that has not been done continuously is that our current version of Peoplesoft was not designed to allow that to be done on a continuous basis. This policy in part rescinds S93-7, which references touchtone registration and is no longer utilized. It is also the policy that references allowing graduating seniors to be given highest priority when adding classes after advanced registration. This policy provides guidelines to be used for the waitlist in future semesters. In particular, it defines the use of the waitlist, and how long the waitlist would remain active after the first day of instruction. It also allows departments to opt out of using the waitlist for certain courses given that we know this is not a one-size-fits-all solution. It is emphasized that graduating seniors would continue to be given the highest priority. Again, this is what we took out of S93-7. It also defines the situations where the waitlist would not be used to automatically enroll a student in a course if they happen to not satisfy certain conditions. For instance, if they are enrolled in another section of the course, if they have a time conflict with the course, or they will exceed the allowable number of units that may apply to them for a variety of circumstances.

**Questions:**

**Q:** How does the creation of this new policy address the concerns that are acknowledged in the first whereas clause? It would seem to me that if all the sections are at maximum enrollment, you will still have 100 students on the

waitlist that are not going to get in that class to graduate. It seems to me that part of the problem is not having enough classes to begin with and I don't really see how this policy addresses that?

**A:** This policy is just recognizing that classes may be full and that there may not be sufficient seats, but it doesn't necessarily define that it is required that we have additional sections. We know that many programs and many chairs make decisions about adding students over the enrollment caps that are published. We are just recognizing that there may be a scenario where students are trying enroll and they can't be accommodated during advanced registration. Perhaps, it might be better to rephrase that so that it says there may be insufficient seats during advanced registration.

**Q:** Would the committee consider making this policy stronger by not allowing departments to opt out of cancelling waitlists, especially for classes that instructors have historically intentionally lowered their class sizes to prevent students from getting into classes?

**A:** We can take that under consideration.

**Q:** In your introduction you mentioned waitlists for classes that are taught online, yet this policy pertains to all courses correct?

**A:** Right, that is what prompted this change.

**Q:** On the priority orders, that is an order carried over from the older policy and is not redundant with other policies right now, is that correct?

**A:** Correct, there is a registration policy that defines how students would be allowed to register for classes. That is a separate policy and that policy deals with the before classes start and this one deals with as soon as classes start.

**Q:** So, where do you say that shall be on an ongoing basis, I think that could be implementation? I would be happier to see a policy that says these are the priorities, then if it turns out we end up with split registration lists where there are some seats being held only for graduating seniors, I won't care what the implementation looks like. I don't think it needs to be in the policy.

**A:** Okay. Thank you for that comment.

**Q:** So, this is a question about possibly making this a faculty option rather than a department option and let me explain the scenario as to why. If I'm teaching a class and on the first day of class I have them sign up to give speeches or various other things. I get everyone organized and started on their projects and then nine days later, without my knowledge, someone pops into my class because I didn't have to sign off on them adding the class. They might not realize they are at a terrible disadvantage and might not even be able to pass the class, unless they talk to me and get advised on how to go about signing up for the various assignments they need to do. I'm concerned that when students pop into a class unannounced and without permission from the individual faculty member, that the student is at a disadvantage. There needs to be some way for the faculty member to require that the student talk to the faculty member before they add in late. This wouldn't happen if they had to come to class and see the faculty member before they

could add, but it could happen if they are coming in nine days late. Could the committee talk about whether the length of time should be shortened, or whether there needs to be some instruction that the student must see the faculty member first, or perhaps there should be a faculty member option, or some other way of solving that problem?

**A:** I'd like to respond to two things. The first thing is that we really are discouraging the use of faculty in the request, because then that leads to greater inequity across multiple sections and courses. If it is a concern, then the faculty member could make that request to the chair. The second part is in response to the nine day time-period. That was heavily discussed. The information in this policy is based on a survey that was sent from Undergraduate Education to all department chairs, faculty, and advisers and by and large everybody had positive things to say about the waitlist and keeping it automated. We used the nine day time period, because we felt like it allowed for classes that were one day a week and allowed a little time after the first meeting to manage. There were also a number of complaints about SJSU allowing registration too far into the semester for the reasons you specified. It was felt that nine days was a balance of that. We also talked about possibly doing a 'best practices' type document that informs students that it is their responsibility to speak with the instructor if they are added to a course at a later point in time. However, you can always opt out of using the waitlist if you can't go through the department.

**Q:** Yes, but even faculty teaching sections of the same course use different assignments and have different requirements, so for some it wouldn't matter but for others it would.

**A:** Again, if you feel that way then you could ask to the department chair to go to Undergraduate Education and they would take that under advisement. We feel it is more appropriate to have it channeled through the department chair, than to have it individual faculty contacting Undergraduate Education.

**Q:** Has the committee realized just how grateful faculty are to have this waitlist? This is something they have been asking for over ten years and were told it couldn't be done, because of our contract with Peoplesoft.

**A:** We do recognize that this will require some reprogramming of Peoplesoft, because the current version does not allow it, and has not historically allowed it. However, it is being done as we speak with the hopes of having it done for Spring 2021 as well. Many faculty expressed extreme satisfaction that this would be an option for them.

**Q:** Would the committee consider reframing some of the first whereas clauses to say that faculty have expressed this satisfaction with workload?

**A:** We said in the last row that faculty spend a significant amount of time managing student enrollment after advance registration through the use of permission codes.

**Q:** In reading line 57, it looks like graduating seniors would include both undergraduate and graduate seniors is that correct?

**A:** Correct.

**Q:** Would the committee then consider changing the words “graduating senior” to “graduating student”?

**A:** We will take that under consideration. Thank you for that.

**Q:** My question is about communication with students about the waitlist. Situations arise where students are on the waitlist for a class that is essentially full for the entire nine-day period and think they are going to get in the class. Then comes day nine and they realize they aren't going to get in and this creates a crisis. They are not really communicating with the faculty and it appears no one is communicating with them about not getting in the class. This would not occur if they were going to the class every day and they would see after a couple of days that they weren't going to get in and could look for another class. Will the committee consider this?

**A:** In communicating with Undergraduate Education and Graduate Studies they have given us assurances that they will communicate better about what the expectations are for that waitlist. We also had instances where students were at the top of the waitlist and were passed over for the class because they had not satisfied one of the things listed in the policy. This is why we put in the policy that being at the top of the waitlist does not guarantee you will get a seat if there is a situation where your schedule will not permit it.

**Q:** How would this apply to students who want to retake a class?

**A:** In the other registration policy, it does talk allow first time repeat students to register or get on the waitlist at least three weeks before the start of the semester. These students will be treated appropriately once they get on that waitlist. If it is a multiple repeat situation, that would be handled in the manual manner with a form to the instructor requesting permission to take a course. This would only apply to first time repeaters.

**Q:** What if it is a graduating senior who just wants to repeat a course to get a better grade?

**A:** That would depend on the other policy we have that it does allow a repeat if the student received a grade lower than a “C.” If they received a grade higher than a “C,” the system will not allow them to retake the course because they passed it.

**Q:** Historically, once a course has started, it has moved from University control to the faculty member's control. Having the department control the add codes sort of defeats the purpose of the faculty member having control on the first day. Unless the department maintains very close communication with the students, there could be a variety of issues as the nine days unfold. Has the committee considered this?

**A:** Again, when we sent out the survey, we had quite a few responses and the support for this was overwhelmingly positive. There are a number of departments that set aside a number of seats in each class for students that can't get on the waitlist or can't advance register for whatever reason.

Departments can do this. It is just a matter of communicating with the students.

**C:** I think it is very important that departments have the option of opting out. There are a number of complicated situations that we have with labs that can occur. I appreciate the fact that you have recognized this.

**A:** We were adamant that departments be able to opt out.

**B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):** None

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1788, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy, S18-15, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAPC) to Update the Membership of the Committee (Final Reading).*** The Senate voted and AS 1788 passed as written (42-0-2).

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1789, Senate Management Resolution, Amends SM-F15-4, Modification of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee (Final Reading).*** The Senate voted and AS 1789 passed as written (42-0-3).

**D. University Library Board (ULB):** None

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

**VIII. State of the University Announcements:**

**A. Associated Students President:**

Vice President Quock announced that AS had held student decompression sessions after the elections for students to either celebrate or grieve.

**B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):**

We continue to work with the county on a weekly basis and open up new areas of our campus. One area we are very frustrated with is dining. To me, the dining commons looks like a restaurant, smells like a restaurant, and most of the restaurants in Santa Clara County are open for limited dining with social distancing. However, the county has said no, we can't have our students eat in the dining commons. Students have to get their meals and take them to their rooms or an outdoor location to eat. We thought we had a path to open up the dining commons in a safe way, but the county has closed that down. Right before we got that news, we were going to be hosting Thanksgiving dinner in the dining commons, but right now it will be to go. We have a fair number of students in housing over the holiday and this will give them a chance to have a Thanksgiving dinner.

**Q:** In relation to dining commons, in terms of student employees have any of them been laid off?

**A:** Way back in March and April there were a number of students who were laid off and a number of full-time employees who were laid off due to changes in the dining commons.

**Q:** We do have a number of students, including foster youth who are actually on the campus year round. Is that correct?

**A:** Yes, that is why it is so important to do something I think during these holidays.

**C. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):**

Our enrollment applications for Spring 2021 continue to look strong in Frosh and Transfer areas. We are slightly down in graduates, but we are tightening up there and we are excited about it. I'm anticipating those numbers will continue to remain strong. We are continuing to see some course drops so we are doing some analysis on that to determine what is happening. We are looking at how many courses are being dropped, who those students are, and what kind of courses they are dropping. It seems that we have a phenomena occurring in which those students taking an above average unit load are dropping that extra course, which is significantly better than students who were full time dropping to part time in terms of unit load and financial aid. As you might imagine it isn't a huge surprise given this fall.

We are in a space where we cannot one-on-one counseling session ourselves out of the kind of mental health dynamics we find ourselves in in higher education. We are beyond that. There isn't a counseling unit anywhere in the U.S. that can meet the demand. However, we are in a space where we need to and have begun to expand our mental health services for students. Yes, we do continue to do the one-on-one counseling sessions and the emergency response sessions. We also have deployed two different apps to really try to create ways for students to self-help. We offer workshops and group psychotherapy. We continue to expand the ways in which students are engaging mental health services. This is a broader challenge and we are going to have to move to a public health level of approach, multi-pronged. We are going to have to speak to this across courses. We are going to have to speak to it at Orientation. We are going to have to address across our entire institution. Particularly, during COVID and with the elections, we are going to continue to see those kind of things, but I assure you we have a multi-prong way of connecting with students and we are connecting with thousands of students. It is an ongoing challenge. We will talk about this more at length when we have additional time to do so.

We are going to be creating engagement opportunities both for direct input as well as some public meetings with the Taskforce on Community Safety and Policing. You should be hearing about that in relatively short order. We are

finding and looking at data right now from across the institution as well as creating ways to give input on an individual basis.

After post-Thanksgiving, and in spring semester, our requirements around COVID testing have shifted, both here and in the state, and students will be required to be tested before returning to the residence halls. Thus far, we have been very fortunate and our COVID numbers have been relatively low, however, public health recommendations have shifted here and in the state. This is a slow tightening, but in an effort to keep our campus safe as safe as possible.

**Questions:**

**Q:** I'm wondering if any of the students are going to be staying in the dorms over Thanksgiving? Some of us have been helping students where we can and this is a particularly isolating holiday with COVID-19. When I was a graduate student, I had to handle a suicide attempt at the University of Texas during this time of year. I just wonder if there are going to be intervention or ways to address this.

**A:** The answer is yes. We will always have people who are going to remain in the dorms and we have staff who remain as well. There will continue to be ways for students to access services.

**C:** I just wanted to say that there is nothing like having human contact, even if it is socially distant, during the holidays. That was really what I was thinking of as opposed to telephone counseling. Thank you.

**D. Chief Diversity Officer:**

The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) partnered with several different offices pre and post-election for sessions for staff and faculty.

Through all of sessions what we heard is that there is a kind of secondary stress or anxiety by employees trying to support their students as well as facing the stresses of being at home and dealing with their own family as well moving everything to online. One of the greatest things people were seeking was how to stay connected both with their students and their colleagues. What employees are saying is that they miss running into other employees on campus and having that connection. We have offices on campus where we are going to start developing zoom rooms and drop-in rooms on campus where employees can show up. Last week when we had these post elections on campus, we had Empathia here. They were able to give us helpful hints on how to have dialogue, etc.

One thing that came out of the election response committee is a very good working relationship with UPD and our team of campus liaison folks who all worked very hard. A team of about 26 people showed up on campus to be supportive and were available to work with students (using COVID protocols of course). We developed a productive working relationship.

President Papazian already talked about the Campus Climate Town Hall Meetings and the announcement of the nominations for the campus Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, which will happen right after the town hall meetings and come out the following week.

**E. CSU Faculty Trustee:**

At the end of October, the BOT selected the presidents for both CSU East Bay and Northridge. For CSU East Bay we chose the current Chancellor of the University of Alaska-Anchorage. For Northridge we chose the current president of Channel Islands. Both presidents are women and now we have three female presidents in San Francisco, East Bay, and SJSU. I hope President Papazian will find them easy to work with. We now have 13 female presidents, and 9 male presidents with one seat being unfilled due to the vacancy in Channel Islands. This is 60% vs. 40%. Chancellor White mentioned that over half of the presidents are people of color, so we are extremely diverse at the leadership level.

Every September the Chancellor's Office presents the budget request to the BOT. They suggested that we ask for \$237.5 million in addition to our current funding. I was not satisfied with that. I suggested six or seven line items for additional funding. Just last Friday, the agenda for the BOT meeting for November was released. I was very pleased to find that the Chancellor's Office had increased the budget request to \$556 million. That is over \$300 million more than the September request. I take credit for this, because I was the only trustee that asks for additional funds. Will we get it? I don't know, but we will get nothing if we don't ask for it. Let's hope for the best. Most of all I hope these additional funds, if we get them, will be used to help avoid furloughs.

You can read more in my BOT report that will be sent to you in November.

**F. Statewide Academic Senators:**

We had a lively discussion with the Legislative Analyst's Office providing some feedback about things they might wish to consider. I will have a more detailed report in writing for you.

We did approve four resolutions, one of which is linked to subjects that have been addressed here. We approved a resolution 3440, which was Culturally Responsive Anti-Racist Mental Health Services and Well Being. This is intended not just for students only, but also for all SJSU employees as well recognizing the inequities and stresses people are facing throughout our society. Another resolution called for Consultation on Academic Implications of System-wide Fiscal Decisions. It called for a collegial decision making and shared governance between the ASCSU and relevant stakeholders. The ultimate resolution we passed was adopting the amended recommended Core Competencies for Ethnic Studies submitted on November 4, 2020. The

plenary extended beyond its closing time for one hour, and then there was a request for an emergency meeting this week to address the unresolved resolutions and includes some of the Ethnic Studies questions, because we wanted to have a voice to provide to our Faculty Trustee when he attends the BOT meeting, even if they cannot make a decision at this point.

**Questions:**

**C:** You may be aware that the system is being taken to court starting when we moved online in six class action lawsuits. As a result, the plaintiff has asked that all zoom recordings and materials be placed on a legal hold. This is something the legal counsels on both sides are discussing. Our legal counsel is asking that a protective order be put in place to prevent the loss of intellectual property rights, and to preserve privacy for faculty and students. I just wanted to make sure faculty and students were aware that all zoom recordings in LMS shells. can be requested by legal counsel.

Senator McKee presented a motion to extend the meeting for 10 minutes to allow for the rest of the updates from the Administrators. The motion was seconded by Senator Marachi. The Senate voted and the McKee motion passed.

**G. Provost:**

Provost Del Casino announced that we are moving quickly on WASC accreditation. There is a lot of data being collected. Pam Richardson is chair of that committee and has been doing a lot of work. I have two leadership hires out. One is for the Dean of the MLK Library and the other is for a Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics. The dean hire has come through. There is a very interesting and diverse group. We are in the middle of the Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics. If people have a chance, please see the open forums.

Out of the hiring process this past summer, the deans came up with some broad themes for how we think about hires in the future. They have been talking to their chairs about this. My goal is to get them out to the wider faculty community so people can really chew on these things, debate, and talk about these things.

The Honors Taskforce has been launched. From what I can see, there is a lot of great energy and good questions being raised. I'm excited to see what they come up with.

The second podcast I've been doing with faculty went out this week. There are several more coming out. I'm excited to just bounce around the campus and talk to faculty. I'm hoping to do a whole bunch more.

In the sixteen months I've been here there is a real elevation of the presence of our faculty in regional and national conversations. If you pay attention at all to the media, you can't go a day without seeing a SJSU person in the news now. I'll say a lot of that has to do with Robin in Strategic Communications who is very focused, but it is the faculty work and voice that is being represented out there. One of the other things I'm excited about is how do we elevate our faculty in the area of prestigious awards and fellowships. We had three people apply for Woodrow Wilson fellowships this year. We have several potential Carnegie fellows that we will apply for and I don't want to stop there. I think we need to be nominating our colleagues for Guggenheim. We have some outstanding faculty on this campus. I want to really create a conversation around these kinds of awards and then I think as a business model that teaches us how to manage them.

#### **IX. Special Committee Reports:**

Chair Mathur and Provost Del Casino presented the results of the campus-wide survey and feedback regarding the Executive Order on GE breadth to the Chancellor's Office. Chair Mathur thanked all the people who contributed to the report.

From the Chair:

There were 247 faculty and staff responses, and 282 undergraduate student responses. This is an amazing response rate given how quickly we had to respond. The key revisions proposed in the draft Executive Order included a reduction from 12 to 9 units in Area D. On our campus this means a reduction from 9 to 6 lower division units, we have three upper division units in Area D, called Area S. This revision definitely impacts our Area D dramatically.

The addition of an Area F, Ethnic Studies requirement would be a three-unit lower division education requirement. There was also a naming of Ethnic Studies Departments, and departments is underlined because this cuts out programs like our Asian-American Program, and our developing Native-American Studies Program. It did allow for other Ethnic Studies Department names like African-American Studies Department, but it did focus on Departments and not programs. Also, a concern for our campus is requiring two different disciplines for Area D requirements.

We sat down and looked at all the qualitative information that came in and I believe we had 40 to 50 pages of qualitative comments. We did an analysis and here are some of the exemplars about some of the concerns noted across the question. There were lots of concern about reducing Area D. The majority of faculty supported the Ethnic Studies requirement, but were very concerned about reducing Area D. In particular, this was because this is where our Political Science and Government areas are covered. There was a lot of concern over the requirement for two different disciplines in Area D. This would have a significant

impact on some of our Ethnic Studies sequences in area D, because it would require two different disciplines.

Our campus was strongly in support of including the word programs and not just focusing on departments. As an example, we are talking about programs like our Asian-American Studies. There was also some concern from some of the faculty about including other programs such as American and Jewish Studies programs.

There were pages and pages of concerns regarding implementation across the question. One of the key things that most of our faculty, staff, and students would like is to have more campus autonomy about implementation around the Ethnic Studies requirement and more flexibility to allow our campus to make the determination about how this requirement is met. People had different suggestions about how the requirement should be met. People were very clear that the curricular decision-making around Ethnic Studies should be made by the Ethnic Studies Department. People were very concerned about the overreach by the Chancellor's Office. This is just a sampling of comments that came in.

From the Provost:

What we did is structured a letter that started with the issues of autonomy and flexibility and framed that as much as humanly possible with where that is available, please provide us that. Again, we were the concerned about the focus on departments and not programs. Also, there was no need for the naming convention to be put in policy at all, since every campus can determine what they see as Ethnic Studies and that should be determined by the Ethnic Studies faculty. There was general concern about overreach, implementation, and the reduction in units. Fall 2021 implementation is not completely necessary, because after we reread things, it says the courses must be delivered in the first year, which could mean Spring 2022 where we might offer our first courses. This takes some of the pressure off when we might offer the courses. Then there was overall confusion about the different messaging of the requirement. So, in summary we request they expand the Executive Order to allow for inclusion of programs. Take out the requirement on two different disciplines and let the campuses figure that out. Allow for flexibility and autonomy to determine how the requirement should be met. There was also feedback that went directly to the Chancellor's Office from individual faculty.

**Questions:**

**C:** The ASCSU has been dealing with this since January of last year. AB 1460 very specifically requires a separate 3-unit course. The interaction between the law of Senate Bill 1440 and 440 and 1460 ends up putting pressure on the high-unit low flexibility majors. If not lower division GE then you end up with it being pushed into upper division in upper courses work. This is where the tension is. Looking for a better and more peaceful alternative doesn't appear exist.

**Q:** On the topic of consistency, were there any trends among students in the surveys that you noticed?

**A:** One of the trends was that there was a lot of confusion about how this would fit into general education. We also got a lot of responses from students in particular colleges who were concerned about putting this into upper division, because they did not want the requirement to take away from their major courses. We also saw comments from students about autonomy and the campus making the decisions as well.

**Q:** I'm assuming this has already been sent off to Long Beach and I'm wondering if you have any impression as to whether the feedback will be accorded importance and some kind of flexibility will emerge, or is your impression that feedback was requested to mollify the campuses?

**A:** I don't think the feedback was requested just to mollify the campuses, but I think there is some tension about how best to manage this so I don't know how much flexibility this will be given. However, knowing Loren, I'm sure he will pour over every page because that is the kind of person he is. What comes from that I don't actually know. I also don't know exactly what the other campuses submitted. Other campuses have already embedded the learning outcomes into general education and now we are waiting for the finalized executive order. Need to applaud the Senate and Senate leadership who have slowed things down on our campus to allow for conversations with ethnic studies faculty. [Mathur] We took a data-driven approach and I believe that makes our findings more robust since we can speak to the survey responses and campus concerns.

**Q:** I'm in the college of Engineering and there is a lot of concern about this area, because the way we maintain 120 units is through a D1 waiver for students that take AMS1A and 1B, so a D1 waiver isn't going to help us with the 120 units. Are there any thoughts about how we can keep 120 units in Engineering with the addition of the new Area F?

**A:** I don't know if we have an answer for that yet. We may have to go to 123 units. They may argue that this is against the law in AB 1460. Fortunately, there are many Engineering programs that are well above the 120 units. We got back to a place that many campuses didn't in Engineering. However, that might have to be a part of our overall conversation with the system.

**C:** At the ASCSU meeting last week, we heard that the new policy language around Ethnic Studies will be released sometime after the Board of Trustee's meeting next week. In addition, as Dr. Curry will be telling us later, one of the resolutions being considered at the last meeting was to formally take a position around the Ethnic Studies resolution itself and what the updated recommendation would be. We may be having an emergency meeting this week to address that.

**From the Faculty Trustee:**

Thank you for allowing me to give you the perspective of the Board of Trustees on this issue. In the spring, the ASCSU supported the inclusion of the Ethnic Studies requirement into lower division GE. In May, when the BOT's were presented with the Title V change, it included only two items. It included the creation of an Area F in the general education package of 3 units, and in order to lock into the general education units package, they introduced a cut to Area D from 12 units to 9 units. The BOT in July passed the Title V change at the Chancellor's Office recommendation. The inclusion in lower division GE was especially supported in order to maintain the transfer curriculum from community colleges according the law SB1440. Over the summer and then in early fall, more and more resistance developed among the faculty against the inclusion of precisely what the Senate had originally asked for and precisely what the Taskforce on Ethnic Studies had recommended in 2016 after long deliberations. Now the sentiment has changed and especially the Council on Ethnic Studies and the disciplinary faculty wanted to see the implementation as a freestanding graduation requirement. As the opposition of the faculty rose, the Chancellor's Office became more and more baffled as to the original intent of Shirley Weber and AB 1460 was that it should be placed in GE. Also, the law states the number of units for graduation shall not be increased. A program that now has 129 units will not go to 132 units, so the Chancellor's Office must remove 3 units somewhere. It was taken out of Social Sciences, as in most cases Ethnic Studies programs are in Social Sciences, and the thought was that it is the most likely group to get the most units so it was taken from that group. Over time we now have 18 campuses that have voiced opposition. However, the ASCSU did not take a position on it. I reminded the ASCSU that if they did not alter their position taken in March that Ethnic Studies should be included in lower division GE, it would remain the same. As a result of that comment, the ASCSU decided to hold an emergency meeting this week. I expect that the ASCSU will now articulate its opposition to including it in lower division GE. I will then be given the task of bringing this to the BOT. Tomorrow I have an agenda setting meeting with Loren Blanchard and his staff. There is reluctance on the part of the Chancellor's Office to take the requirement out of the lower division GE package and make it a freestanding graduation requirement, because two things will happen. First, it will have to be taken out of somewhere else, most likely the majors, without the majors being able to increase their total units to graduation by law. That might pose issues for accreditation. The second issue is that if campuses are given wide-ranging flexibility for implementation, then this battle will now be transferred to the 23 campuses. The individual campuses will have battles amongst their faculty. They are afraid that will create bigger problems. The Chancellor has to do what is right for all the campuses even if it is unpopular. Keep in mind when Ethnic Studies faculty felt that the Chancellor's office was not moving fast enough, they employed the legislature to enact legislation. Then it was taken out of Area D and the Social Science faculty came in and voiced their opposition. If we rescind and make it a free-standing requirement, will have opposition from faculty with high-unit majors. Even if the ASCSU passes a resolution, the soonest the BOT would be able to review would be March.

**Questions:**

**C:** I'm concerned about increasing to 123 units. There is a lot of opposition from students who are concerned already about graduating with 120 units.

**C:** The college of Engineering gave up a lot of units in our program to go to 120 units. At 120 units we are very much on the border of having enough technical units for accreditation. We are very concerned about accreditation issues with the addition of another three-unit course.

**C:** Under Title V, the 123 unit limit actually excludes high unit programs and Engineering is one of those it could be permissible to increase. In addition, American Institutions and GE waivers have been introduced for other programs across the system. There are alternatives, they are just ugly.

**C:** [Provost] Provost Del Casino encouraged faculty to read the comments. We need to wait and see what the system decides. The high impact majors are critical for us to understand. We have things on our campus that are unique to us such as our physical education units. Need to pay attention to all of the voices in this conversation. Our Ethnic Studies faculty are putting a lot of time and energy into this as well.

**X. New Business:** None

**XI. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.