

2017/2018 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
February 12, 2018**

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Faas, Wong(Lau), Willey,
Feinstein
Absent: Papazian

COB Representatives:

Present: Bullen, He, Jensen
Absent: None

Deans:

Present: Elliott, Stacks, Ehrman,
Jacobs

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Donahue, Gill, Norman
Absent: Busick, De Guzman,
Hospidales

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Chung, Pyeon
Absent: Sullivan-Green

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Bacich, Ormsbee
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, White, French
Absent: Kim

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Trulio, Hart
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Trousdale, Matoush,
Kauppila
Absent: Higgins

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of December 11, 2017 were approved.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Frazier welcomed Senators Jensen, French, Pyeon, and Norman. Chair Frazier also welcomed Senator Trulio back from sabbatical.

Chair Frazier announced that Senate elections are underway and he encouraged Senators and their colleagues to run for the Senate. The deadline for nominating petitions to be turned into the Senate Office is February 23, 2018.

Chair Frazier reminded everyone that the Senate Retreat is this coming Friday, February 16, 2018.

Committee Preference Forms will go out shortly after the Senate elections are completed.

B. From the President of the University – Not present.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of December 4 2017 – **No questions.**

Executive Committee Minutes of January 8, 2017 – **No questions.**

Executive Committee Minutes of January 29, 2017 – **No questions.**

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of February 12, 2018 was approved as amended by AVC Riley.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

V. Special Order of Business –

Proposal to extend the term of Senate Chair Frazier for one year.

Chair Frazier was re-elected for one year by acclamation.

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

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

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1674, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F17-1, Policy for the Protection of Human Research Subjects (First Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1674 a final reading. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. **The Senate voted and AS 1674 was approved with 2 Abstentions.**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1675, Policy Recommendation, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA (First Reading)*.

In May 2017, the Senate passed a policy recommendation on RSCA. After this policy recommendation was passed, C&R reviewed the language on the non-disclosure agreements. C&R, in consultation with the Executive Committee, felt the language in this area needed to be clarified. C&R asked the Executive Committee to refer the policy recommendation back to C&R for clarification.

For some colleges, engaging in a Nondisclosure Agreement (NDA) for a specific period of time may allow additional research to be conducted. This policy

specifically addresses nondisclosure agreements related only to RSCA. It does not address all nondisclosure agreements. Thus far C&R has consulted with the Deans and Faculty, and is now bringing this policy recommendation back as a first reading to the Senate.

Questions:

Q: In the NDA section there is a bullet that says that NDAs may be time limited. Is C&R anticipating that there may be times when NDAs are not time limited?

A: Further down it states that the duration of the NDA will be negotiated by a member of the Research Office and shall not exceed one year.

Q: Would it be possible to get rid of the word “may?” Every other NDA I’ve ever read doesn’t permit the possibility that an NDA could be permanent.

A: We can take that back to the committee and discuss that.

Q: Also, can you clarify what exceptional circumstances means?

A: The committee will discuss this.

Q: On page 4 where it talks about principal investigator eligibility, you say that the candidates must be qualified based on education, training, and experience, and yet the faculty members that are listed there are Assistant, Associate, or full Professors. I am questioning why lecturers are excluded, especially those with terminal degrees that would qualify?

A: So you are referring to B.1. Part of the discussion in the committee is that there is an expectation of RSCA activity for tenure/tenure-track faculty that is not included in appointments for temporary faculty. However, if you go back to the initial whereas clause, we are not excluding temporary faculty if there is an appointment where that is included. Tenure and tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in RSCA activity, but for many temporary faculty there is not an expectation of RSCA activity within their appointment.

Q: On page 5, section B.3. it says that adjunct faculty can serve as Principal Investigator (PI) with the prior authorization of the AVP for Research. Why must prior authorization be obtained?

A: I can bring that back to the committee, but when the committee was discussing this it was out of concern about the appointment of temporary faculty. There is an expectation of RSCA activity for tenure/tenure-track faculty, but that expectation is not there for adjunct faculty. If that appointment is done for adjunct faculty the approval needs to be at a different level.

Q: On page 3, could you clarify for the committee why FERP faculty are listed under the exceptions?

A: Part of the committee discussion was that FERP faculty are considered retired. This puts them in a different expectation with appointment. The idea is to allow people interested in RSCA to participate, but to make sure the safeguards are in place and appointments are not misconstrued. All the categories under the exceptions are people that are affiliated with the university, but do not specifically have RSCA included in their hiring clauses.

Q: On page 9, near the top, second paragraph, 3rd sentence, where it starts, “The university may not pressure a RSCA team member into participating in a project that requires an NDA...” Could you take back to the committee the request to end the sentence after “NDA.” Also, a few lines down where it talks about a conflict of interest can you clarify what “RSCA team management” means in the final reading.
A: The committee will look at this.

Q: There is a disagreement in terms of qualified and eligible. Perhaps the term eligible should be changed to qualified, unless this is what you intended?

A: Yes, that’s why there are the exceptions.

Q: I thought there were lecturers right now that are central PIs?

A: There are with prior approval and that’s under B.3. where there are exceptions.

Q: Then wouldn’t it be better to say it in another way rather than imply they are not eligible?

A: What we are trying to say is that tenure/tenure-track faculty, due to their hiring, are eligible for this without additional approval, but lecturers require additional approval because may not be included in their hiring.

Q: It just seems like you might want to retitle the principal investigator eligibility to make it clear. The way it sounds like now is that there are some people that are never going to be eligible. It’s a very negative way of writing.

A: Maybe we can add another whereas. The committee will work on this.

Q: On page 2, the second paragraph of I.B. there is a generally very negative way of writing in this paragraph. The other question is that this paragraph seems to be explicit examples of the paragraph above, so maybe there’s a better way of clarifying this.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: On page 9, the second paragraph, the sentence after the sentence that begins, “The University may not pressure” appears to be just a different way of saying the same thing.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: I have a suggestion for the “Internal Eligibility” section. Please consider referencing “Exceptions” at the end of “sponsored projects.”

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: The policy that this policy will rescind is a very different kind of document. Is everything to do with that policy rescinded?

A: Yes, we went through everything and moved anything that was still relevant to RSCA into the new policy. Some of the items were far out of date. We had several different constituencies look at this.

Q: What do you mean on page 9 by “individual legal liability?”

A: What we were trying to say is not to enter into an NDA without following the

process we have outlined, and to make sure that you are not committing resources without the proper authorization.

Q: I'm not an attorney, but perhaps you should consult with one before you phrase it as "Individual Legal Liability."

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1676, Policy Recommendation, Request by Department or School for a Name Change (First Reading)*. There is a policy that currently exists, F13-9, that directs the actions for merging, dividing, transferring, and eliminating academic units. However, there is no policy in existence that identifies what an academic unit should do when requesting a name change without these other processes occurring. This has occurred with several departments when a change in name has been needed to better reflect interdisciplinary changes. The Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Office (GUP) has a process in place and they have been trying to house this under University Policy S13-9, but it doesn't really address name changes without the other processes occurring. C&R has consulted with the Chairs/Directors and Deans and a version of this policy has been posted on the GUP website for input and suggestions.

Questions:

Q: Why does number 7 contain a most insulting statement to our Provost, which states that the Provost "may seek additional clarification...?" Would the committee be willing to eliminate this?

A: The committee will discuss this. This is the process GUP recommends using right now.

Q: In the section where the college curriculum committee reviews the request, it says the college curriculum committee records its vote. However, did you consider the department should record what their vote is also?

A: I'm a little confused because line 39 specifies this.

Q: I'm sorry I didn't see that.

A: Does that address your concern?

Q: Yes.

Q: Is this process trying to imitate the process we have for the approval of curriculum? It looks like the same process.

A: To an extent.

Q: It isn't clear from procedural part of it if a proposal needs to advance even if it gets a negative vote along the way. For a curriculum proposal, if the department turns it down the college committee will never review it. If a department votes against a department name change does the process continue?

A: It does say in line 33 that a majority of the faculty approve the name change, but we could add some clarity here to be sure it clarifies the process would stop.

Q: Would the committee consider returning to a simpler form that is something like...the department signs off on it, and if there is not major objection from the university the Provost signs off on it?

A: The committee will consider it.

A: The reason the committee did not go with something more simple is that we have seen a couple of situations where the lack of communication has led to disagreement on the name change. What it has come down to when we've seen it is what does your department support and what does your college support. So we wanted the policy to clearly state that you need the verification and evidence at each stage or level.

Q: This speaks to the laundry list of everything that must be included in the memo. This seems very onerous to me. Maybe the committee could take that back and look at it?

A: One of the reasons we came up with that was to give some guidance and provide some information to those that are going through the process. Some of the things included are due to things that came up last year where departments didn't follow any procedure.

Q: It just seems kind of in-depth there.

A: We can look at that.

Q: We do need to go through the whole process. I'm speaking from experience on O&G. We did a review and this list is what was needed. We need to know what the academic standards in that profession are, if this is going to meet industry standards, and what the students' perspective was on this.

Q: Two years ago the Creative Arts program in the Humanities Department went through a process which included the chair writing a memo saying the department approved it, then the college approved it, then it went to the Chancellor's Office where it fell into a black hole and we never heard from it again. I don't see the Chancellor's Office listed on here, but I'm wondering if this policy will give hope to programs like Creative Arts? Do you think this will help?

A: I'm not going to make predictions on what the Chancellor's Office will do, but we can look at this.

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – No report.

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1673, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S88-5 and F02-2 (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1673 was approved unanimously.**

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1677, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F72-1: Athletics Board Composition (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1677 was approved unanimously.**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1679, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F88-5, Continuing Education Committee (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS**

1679 was approved unanimously.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1678, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-6, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)*. Last semester the PS Committee brought a policy on the review of Chairs and Directors to the Senate. This policy included a provision on proportional voting for FERP and Partial Reduction in Time Base (PRTB) faculty. After that passed in the Senate, we had two policies that gave voting rights in a different fashion to FERP and PRTB faculty. This proposal recognizes the most recent discussion and debate in the Senate regarding votes for FERP and PRTB faculty in support of proportional voting. This amendment brings the voting rights policy into agreement with the chairs and directors policy so FERP and PRTB will have departmental voting rights proportional to their appointment.

Question:

Q: The committee may want to take a look at the statement “proportional to their appointment,” because I believe the chairs and director’s policy said “proportional to their annualized appointment.” This means that a faculty member that has a .50 appointment in fall but none in spring, will still get a .5 vote in fall and spring.

A: Thank you. The committee will follow-up and verify with Faculty Affairs.

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

VIII. State of the University Announcements. Questions.

A. CFA President (By Special Invitation):

CFA President Preston Rudy provided information on the Janus v. AFSCME Supreme Court case that impacts labor laws. The decision in this case will have broad implications for a contractual relationship with the university and with public education more generally. CFA President Rudy felt it was his responsibility as President of the CFA to speak to the Senate briefly because of these broader implications for the CSU, for faculty participation and governance, and for the faculty’s economic standing.

The division of labor between the Senate and the CFA is established by law. In 1978 Governor Jerry Brown signed AB 1091 known as HEERA, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act. CFA President Rudy recently read through the principles and policies of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) which has an enlightening history of our division of labor. Among the many items of interest, CFA President Rudy found the following paragraph from the 1985 document, “Collegiality in the CSU. The Academic Senate of the California State University does not believe the shared decision-making of the collegial model and the shared decision-making of the collective bargaining mode are inherently incompatible. They represent different approaches to different types of decisions.” “As faculty we are simultaneously implicated in two coequal structures: one the long tradition of shared governance between faculty and administrators, and the other the tradition of collective bargaining between faculty

employees and administrative managers. These two decision-making processes mutually support each other and if one of the processes weakens the other may as well. This would be significant as the CFA and the Academic Senate collaborate on matters of shared concerns: Academic Freedom, Intellectual Property, Workload, and Tenure Density. CFA has also been at the forefront of demanding genuine joint decision-making which has been violated recently with the development of Executive Orders.

On February 26, 2018, the Supreme Court will hear arguments in the Janus case. The case was instigated initially by the billionaire governor of Illinois, Bruce Rauner, in his fight to shrink public services by crippling public employees collective bargaining. If the court sides with the governor and Mr. Janus, they would reverse established law in the 1977 Abood case. That earlier decision ruled that public employees whose contract is negotiated by the union must pay for the representation and bargaining provided by the union whether they are members or not. These are known as agency fees or fair share fees and we hear both of those terms.

In the name of free speech, the Supreme Court will weaken the united voice of employees. They will enhance the opportunity for public employers to be more autocratic in limiting employees' ability to exercise voice in the workplace and in public policy. In the absence of that collectively erected platform the employees' free speech disappears under the authority of employers. The purpose of the Janus case is to weaken public employees, because they are the main advocates for public services in agencies like the CSU. As representatives of the CSU faculty, the CFA regularly visits Sacramento to lobby for more robust funding of the university, to advocate for students and their families on fees and tuition, and to help legislators craft legislation. The CFA has a long record of promoting a CSU that provides a high quality, accessible, and affordable education to the people of California. The Janus decision will change all of this. If Janus is successful, the CFA will be less effective at defending the gains we have achieved during the last 30 years of bargaining. The University of Wisconsin as you probably know is the horizon that shows us desired outcome behind Janus. In conclusion, shared governance is at risk as much as our contract is. Remember, the CFA's origins are in the provocations of Chancellor Glenn Dumke, and his intransigent resistance to collegiality and disrespect for shared governance."

Questions:

Q: Is the CFA concerned that the case is going to come out in a negative way, or is the CFA just trying to balance things out by making sure we are well informed in case it does go that way?

A: Well, given the appointment of President Trump's new Supreme Court Justice, and given the statements made by Justice Alito and others, the thinking is that the decision is going to go in the direction of Mr. Rauner and they are going to reverse the 1977 law. This is why the CFA is very concerned.

Q: Recently I received some correspondence in the mail from the CFA that defined the difference between the agency fees and the other fees. Agency fees were about supporting bargaining activity and the other fees were for other lobbying. The split seemed to be about 60/40. What was the motivation for sending that particular correspondence out? Does the upcoming Supreme Court decision affect only that kind of political lobbying or both?

A: The court decision would eliminate agency or fair share fees. What that means is that currently non-members pay for the bargaining and representation they get and that is their fair share. What they do not pay for is the political lobbying, and you can always opt out of that. That would mean that you are not paying for any of the political activities, which seemed to be the objection of Mr. Janus and his supporters. The reason for sending that particular correspondence was to let faculty know that if they do not want to support political lobbying, they can opt out of that. The bulk of the fees pay for bargaining and representation that the union has to do whether you are a member or not.

Q: Does the CFA have any contingency plans in case the Janus decision goes against the CFA in terms of raising revenue?

A: We are encouraging everyone to become a member and that is our plan. We are going to get organized.

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

Today we moved back into the CIES part of the Student Union. It took a little longer than we wanted, but we wanted to make sure we got rid of all the moisture and didn't have any ongoing problems.

Two weeks ago the VPAF put out an RFP for food service, there were two different activities related to this over the past week. Six different groups were brought onto the campus. They surveyed the students, faculty, and staff last week. The week before that they surveyed the different spaces where food is served around the campus. The VPAF expects responses back to the RFP over the next month or so. After that, a committee will review the responses to see if there is one clear cut favorite to recommend, or if there are a number of groups then they will be brought back on site for interviews. The whole process should be completed by April 15, 2018. On June 1, 2018, we will have either a new contract with Spartan Catering or a new food service provider on campus.

Questions:

Q: How long will the contract with the vendor last? In other words, if we signed a five-year contract and after a year they were not performing we would be stuck with them. Can you do a shorter contract?

A: Sure, we can even do one-year contracts. The firms we are talking with are international firms and they have a track record and that is part of the RFP. We are asking the hard questions up front. However, the longer the term the more funds we may get to help us build a new dining facility. Those are the tradeoffs the VPAF is looking at.

Q: What is your take on tech companies expanding into downtown and the impact on BART coming to downtown?

A: The two are completely independent. The best case scenario for BART is to be here in 2026. Getting to Berryessa was supposed to be here six months ago, then that was extended to June, and now it is October. The VPAF isn't sure when BART will actually get here. Google is talking about buying the land near Diridon, because they see the expansion of Diridon Center as reaching out to the central valley and reaching out to more affordable places for people to live. The VPAF applauds that because the tech companies can drive behaviors for our transit companies. However, VTA has a \$20 million deficit this year and a \$29 million deficit next year. This means they will have to cut service and when they cut service two groups get hit the worst. These groups are the lower income people and our students. The VPAF was talking to the Mayor of Fremont on Friday and they were talking about the cut of one of the buses that goes from Fremont to SJSU. This VTA 163 bus is being cut as soon as BART opens up and it will have a major impact on our students. The VPAF is talking to VTA and trying to keep those lines of communication open.

Q: Do you know anything about Google employees parking in our parking garages for \$8 a day and then Google sending a bus to pick them up?

A: No, there might be a couple of people doing that but there are not a lot of people. There have been a few people sighted that come with an employee, probably a spouse, to the campus and then take a bicycle over to Diridon Station. However, the VPAF hasn't seen anything of significance.

Q: My fingers are hurting, because when it gets cold in my office my extremities hurt. It has been that way for a few weeks. In addition, I just learned that we are supposed to have a Forensics lab in the Health Building and we may not be able to do so because they do not have ducting and it is a health requirement when working with chemicals. Isn't there a prioritization of academic facilities on this campus when things go awry? Is there a plan for that?

A: This is the first I'm hearing of some of these issues, so call me or come by when something comes up. We are taking care of them as quickly as we can when we hear about the issues.

Q: On the food service contract, who has that contract right now? Also, on the new contract what type of sustainability requirements will the vendor have?

A: Spartan Shops is currently our food service vendor and is an auxiliary on campus. Part of the RFP cites going through the CSU requirements for sustainability.

Q: I'm concerned that we have a number of students and staff members that work for Spartan Shops right now, and it would not be a good thing to hire someone that pays substantially lower. Has this come up in discussions with the food service vendors?

A: We have about 950 students that work for Spartan Shops and they are all making the wages set by San José and there will be no back tracking on that. As far as the number of jobs, there will be more than 950 student jobs with the plans we discussed with the vendors. There are currently about 50 to 60 staff members that work for Spartan Shops and usually about 95% of those workers are rehired by the new vendor. We anticipate having more food service outlets on this campus, so the jobs should increase. When student wages jump to \$15 in San José, they will also jump to \$15 on campus.

Q: What is the status of the Science Building and what came of the idea of affordable faculty housing?

A: We continue to make progress and hopefully will begin site preparation within a year. There won't be any faculty housing in that building. It turns out that the Science Building is a very expensive building to build, much more so than a typical classroom building. Adding floors above the eighth floor on that building is cost prohibitive and having housing on the first floors won't work with the type of building, so this wasn't feasible. However, the VPAF continues to discuss and look for ways to increase affordable housing for our students, faculty, and staff on or near the campus. This is the hot topic in the Silicon Valley Leadership Group right now.

Q: It seems to me that having 2,000 high tech jobs come to downtown could create an affordable housing crisis for the university.

A: The VPAF is in agreement, and is looking for ways to address the issue.

Q: With the increase of bicycles around the campus, we are beginning to see them littered all over the sidewalks, etc. This concerns me.

A: Yes, we now have these semi-motorized scooters as well as the bicycles all over campus. The VPAF is working with FDO to come up with a plan on how to handle this.

Q: With the VTA bus lines being cut, and the increased cost for transportation as well as for food and housing, what plans are in the works to help ensure students can still afford to attend classes here?

A: That is a long answer, because there are a lot of things we are doing. The cost of attending school here is a major concern as well as the cost of housing. We have to make sure any housing we have for our faculty, staff, and students is below market rate. We are working on a number of projects and the VPAF would be happy to discuss it further offline when there is more time.

Q: My concern is that Aramark is one of the food service vendors being considered and during my research on school privatization in Chicago, they had some very serious health and safety concerns. What kind of internal vetting process will the vendors go through?

A: We have an outside consultant that is working with us as well as an independent third party. In addition, we have a committee of folks that are assessing the bids, so this is not just blind listening to what they have to say.

Q: Another one of the VTA bus lines that is being affected by the BART extension to Berryessa is the 168 Express bus to Morgan Hill and Gilroy. The cost for riding this bus is slated to increase \$2.25 each way in addition to having a clipper card/eco pass as soon as the BART extension is finished. This is an additional \$22.50 per week for students, staff, and faculty. There are a lot of students that live in the Gilroy area and take this bus. This will have a substantial financial impact.

A: They have talked about taking away the direct route and instead of an express bus having a local bus for the same price.

Q: The VTA 68 bus is the local bus that goes all the way to Gilroy along Monterey. This bus must make over 50 stops along Monterey and takes more than two hours to make that trip one way.

A: We are working on it, but there are no good options here.

C. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):

The VPSA congratulated Academic Affairs on winning the Third Annual Spirit Competition on Saturday.

This is the last day to add. There is a “Key Dates” calendar that you can pick up on your way out with key dates for the Spring semester related to registration.

It has been a busy start to the semester. SA is concluding five weeks of welcome activities for new students starting with the “Ask Me” tables. Right now SA has a graduate student mixer going on in the Student Union.

Today is also the reopening of the Bowling Center. There are dollar games on Friday for employees.

Our three new student success centers (African-American, Latinx-Chicano, and UndocuSpartan) have opened.

February is African-American Awareness Month. There are a lot of activities planned. SA is also participating in “CSU Super Sunday” which is an outreach to African-American churches to bring more African-American students to campus.

Today 614 students were served at the mobile food pantry. This is the second highest number of students we have ever served, and we just had one two weeks ago where we served 530 students. We also sent a team to a CSU Basic Needs Initiative Conference last week and we are hoping they are going to come back with some new ideas on how we can better serve our students that are struggling with these very real concerns.

We are still open for graduate admissions until May 1, 2018. We received over 36,000 Freshman applications, and 16,000 transfer applications.

D. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

Our Intergroup Dialogue Program is starting on February 23, 2018. Two of our facilitators are Senators (Gill and Riley). They participated in four weeks of training and a refresher course. We have dialogues open for faculty and staff as well. They have a curriculum and have trained facilitators. There are three different time periods over the eight-week period. The morning sessions runs from 9 a.m. to noon, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., and then 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. We anticipate hosting about 5 to 6 groups. Food will be provided as well as materials. Please encourage students to attend.

The CDO's office participated in the Leadership Today Leadership Institute. They led a retreat for two days in Watsonville where there was no WIFI, and nobody could look at their phones. There were about 72 students that attended.

Our Faculty-in-Residence have been running some programs for faculty, such as the "Pre-Tenure" Workshop. Deans were asked to work with their Chairs to identify faculty that should be invited to attend. They also have a separate reading group of about 20 faculty that runs for six weeks.

The CDO will be facilitating one of the workshops during the Senate Retreat.

The Chief of Staff and CDO met and talked with the Deans about Title IX cases and working with faculty and chairs in explaining their duty to report. The meeting went very well.

Questions:

Q: Student Teachers are not really employees of the schools they are placed in, so what kind of work is being done to inform student teachers and interns on what their reporting responsibility is?

A: The California Executive Orders cover all employees as well as all students. As long as they are part of the SJSU community, Title IX covers them.

E. Faculty Trustee:

Trustee Sabalius commented that in December he reported on the flurry of activities that he had to attend as a new Faculty Trustee. Things have calmed down over the break.

Trustee Sabalius attended the ASCSU meeting in Long Beach and the Board of Trustees meeting in January 2018. Trustee Sabalius was invited to give a speech at the CFA Board of Director's meeting in Sacramento at the beginning of February 2018. None of the five living former faculty trustees had ever reported to the CFA Board of Trustees and Trustee Sabalius' appearance was much appreciated.

Trustee Sabalius' speech called on all CSU entities: the students, the unions, the CSU Board of Trustees, etc. to work together to obtain a larger allocation for the CSU from our state legislators.

Trustee Sabalius will be visiting the off campus center of CSU San Bernadino, CSU

Los Angeles, and SJSU in March 2018.

Trustee Sabalius will also be a part of several presidential searches and graduation ceremonies this year.

The CSU Board of Trustees (BOT) won the National Award for Board Leadership that is bestowed annually to one out of 400 boards that demonstrate innovation and exemplary leadership.

Trustee Sabalius volunteered at the food pantry on campus before the Senate meeting. He reminded Senators that for the next two months the food pantry is serving food right before the Senate meeting, and he encouraged all Senators to volunteer for a few hours.

F. CSU Statewide Senators:

Senator Van Selst sent a written report to Senators on January 30, 2018 to the Senate regarding ASCSU actions and discussions.

EO 1100 and 1110 are still being resolved. Their implementation under Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) is progressing nicely.

G. AS President:

There are a few events coming up. Students voted on events they would like to see on campus and one of them is “Dapper Day” which will be hosted on February 14, 2018. There will be a number of activities. Students will be shown things like how to tie a bowtie.

Eco Pass has changed to Smart Pass. AS is hosting a “Ride to School” day this Thursday, February 15, 2018, 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Students, faculty, and staff are encouraged to ride their bikes to school and there will be repair stations on 7th street and other information regarding bicycling.

AS provides scholarships every year. This year AS has \$81,000 to give away in scholarships. Please encourage your students to apply. Applications are due in April.

There is a Spartan Legacy Training Academy tomorrow, February 13, 2018, from noon to 2 p.m. There are a number of workshops that will be going on and tomorrow is Graduate School.

AS Elections are coming up and applications are already sent out. Applications are due March 1, 2018.

There are also a lot of jobs available for students at the Child Development Center. These jobs are specifically for child development majors. There are also some jobs available in the Transportation Solutions Center. Please let your students know.

There is a Black Student-Faculty-Staff-Admin mixer on February 22, 2018 from 4 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in meeting room 4A. AS will be hosting a series of these mixers.

A tuition increase of \$228 is being proposed. AS is collaborating with Students for Quality Education to work on efforts. The vote on the increase has been pushed until May, and AS is focusing on lobbying our legislators. If you know any students interested in participating have them contact AS President Manzo.

Questions:

Q: I attend lobby day every year, and it is really important to have student voices there.

Q: On the scholarships that you mentioned, would it be possible for you to send this information to the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD)?

A: Yes.

Q: It has never been more critical for students to get registered to vote. Do you have any ongoing programs, because 2018 is coming fast and we need to get everyone onboard?

A: Thank you for bringing that up. In March we have students going to Sacramento from March 10 to March 12, 2018 to the California Higher Education Student Summit. We are taking 10 students to Sacramento to lobby. We are also open to whatever else we can do. In addition, AS has a Student Lobby Corp Committee that focuses on college campaigns. One of the campaigns AS is working on now is “College Brawl.” Also, every year AS has a budget allocated to getting students to vote. That information will be coming out soon.

H. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs:

There are four candidates coming to campus for the Lurie College of Business Dean search starting on February 19, 2018 and going through March 1, 2018.

The Provost is also in the midst of the College of Science Dean search as well. The search committee came up with 12 semi-finalists. There will be some airport interviews over the next few days, and on campus interviews begin on March 14, 2018.

Thanks to everyone that stayed on Friday for the Strategic Planning exercise. A lot of good work was done. If you haven’t seen the five goals that we came up with there is a handout at the back of the room. We have also created the taskforce committees as well and they begin their work next week. There is additional information on the Strategic Planning website.

On March 15, 2018, the Student Success Center led by Stacy Gleixner and Debra Griffith will be opened. There will be lots of keynote speakers coming to campus to speak about student success and the Provost encouraged everyone to attend.

Questions:

Q: Where are we with strategic planning right now?

A: On the Strategic Planning website there is a time line you can take a look at to see where we are at. We had a forum in the fall to kickoff strategic planning. We have had a number of interviews and surveys. We received feedback from 500 faculty members. We've had about 10 meetings with external groups as well. The event on Friday was an unveiling of the draft goals. Now we will have individuals reviewing those goals and coming up with a set of desired outcomes, as well as establishing an initial set of strategies to meet those outcomes. This will be happening next spring. On May 9, 2018, we will come together again as a campus community. Our plan in the fall is to finalize the strategic plan and go live.

- IX. Special Committee Reports** – No report.
- X. New Business** – None
- XI. Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.