

2018/2019 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 11, 2019

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

Ex Officio:

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

CHHS Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Ficke, Wong(Lau),
Faas, Papazian
Absent: Day

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Bullen, Khavul
Absent: None

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Olin, Ehrman, Elliott, Stacks
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo, Gill
Kethepalli, Pang, Rodriguez
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Ramasubramanian, Sullivan-Green, Kumar
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

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

Emeritus Representative:

Present: McClory

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

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

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Trousdale, Hurtado,
Higgins, Monday
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes— The Senate minutes of December 10, 2018 were approved as amended by Senators Rodan and Khan.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Frazier welcomed Senators back for Spring 2019.

Chair Frazier announced that there is a new faculty dining room and it is located in IRC 302. Chair Frazier thanked Senior Vice Provost Kemnitz and VP Charlie Faas for making this happen, as well as a committee that worked on it: Jonathan Roth, Sharmin Khan, Judith Lessow-Hurley, Tsu-Hong Yen, Janet Kitajima, and Frazier.

Chair Frazier recognized Senator Julia Curry for winning the Wang Family Excellence

Award for Service. Senator Curry received a standing ovation.

B. From the President of the University –

The President recognized the work of the administrators, including Senator Stacks, during the Government shutdown.

Questions:

Q: As a Senator, I've been approached about the recent appointment of lots of administrators and the perception from some faculty is that it has been done with little to no input from rank and file faculty.

A: Comments from President Papazian: Change by definition is uncomfortable. Everyone wants to be at the core of the conversations around change. I appreciate the concern. It is always an interesting and delicate balance between how, when, and with whom we have those conversations. I hope we all can agree that we needed to make change. We were in a period of stagnation. As an institution we were not moving forward as fast as we should. I've also said that shared governance is not co-management. These are different functions and processes and they have different kind of responsibilities. Shared governance is about having meaningful influence in areas where it is appropriate. Co-management is a different matter. Administrators are held accountable for different things. Administrators are at will employees. They don't have five-year contracts. We have responsibilities to ensure what we do is done with integrity and that we follow all rules, regulations, and laws. We have obligations to do these things. There are always grey areas. We have brought in new leadership with experience and new eyes and we have taken a look at what is needed in the divisions and across the university. In terms of some of these changes, lots of conversations have taken place. They just haven't taken place in a public forum. No one has recommended a change without there being substantial conversations before it was made. However, I have found that no matter how early I reveal an idea, it is never early enough. Our old structure was inefficient and we were losing money in some areas. For example, we are a \$500M institution and yet we purchase technology separately. This doesn't utilize our buying power effectively. Every dollar we save can go back towards the academic mission. Our deans are relatively stable now. I anticipate most large changes being completed within 18 months so we have the right structure and support in place to meet our strategic plan.

Q: I think many people were surprised with the recent name changes that were done without anyone outside those colleges ever seeing them. I'm concerned that if someone new comes in and there is an expectation of change, without seeing how things fit together, that then will influence change no matter what.

A: Both of those recent name changes, for College of Professional and Extended Studies and College of Graduate Studies, came from those areas and were not top-down decisions. The change in the name and title for International and Extended Studies came about as a result of a request from Dean Huard who has been here five years. The change for the College of Graduate Studies was the result of the strategic visit from three Deans of Graduate Colleges that visited the campus and made recommendations. This was their recommendation.

Q: Can you discuss how programs that are heavily weighted with graduate programs, or that have only graduate programs, are articulated with the current college or the newly created College of Graduate Studies?

A: The College of Graduate Studies is a vehicle to work with all the colleges around graduate education. The President deferred to the Provost.

C: Provost: I'll be very direct. We have a College of Graduate Studies with an Interim Dean. We had a strategic visit from three deans. They came in and made a quality judgment as to what SJSU should be looking for going forward for post-baccalaureate education. The goal was to combine all the efforts in the post-baccalaureate structure going forward. When I started here in July, there wasn't one person that didn't ask me when we were going to get a Graduate College. Clearly there was interest here and it is the design we want going forward. That's why we are doing this.

Q: The curricular aspect will then be handled through the College of Graduate Studies?

A: When you say curricular aspect, there are levels to that. One level is conversations about why it should be for the students coming into our program. Are we prepared in ways that make sense for their needs, not our needs necessarily? The second level is accrediting organizational functions that go along with any curricular action. We will continue to pursue that through the graduate structure. This semester I am clarifying what are the pathways to making a curriculum actually happen, and part of that is accrediting in this area. We will do that through the Graduate College and Dean Marc d'Alarcao and AVP Stacks are working closely to ensure that happens.

Q: The library has been significantly impacted from the recent salary savings to centralized budgeting. As of today, the library currently has no funds to buy any books, journals, etc. I was wondering if this is going to continue in the future?

A: President: It is true we no longer believe core functions of the university should be funded by salary savings. We are an underfunded public university, and we never have enough to fund our needs. When we sit down as a leadership team each year, we make certain decisions about say staffing for example. We make decisions on where those faculty lines need to go based on highest needs of the institution. Those decisions are made with the expectation that those positions will be searched for and hired. If a line is allocated to the library, but you have to hold open several lines to get the salary savings you need to purchase journals, then there is something wrong with this budget. We haven't then put the money where we need to. For example, Student Orientation was being funded by salary savings. Student Orientation is a core function of this institution and needs to be funded. What we did this year was anticipate salary obligations and mandatory costs without knowing what our funding would be, and we also wanted to fund the RSCA initiative. The only way we could do that was to pool the funds and ask colleges and VPs to identify everything that needed to be funded so that when we allocated a line it was expected to be searched for and filled. Now we are going through a process of determining how we can best fund what needs to be funded. Some things can be handled with one-time funds. We are looking at all of this

and will try and normalize the process over the next two years. I have the feeling your dean is already having these conversations about the library's budget needs right now.

Q: There is a lot of anxiety in my college and department from faculty over the amount of changes that are occurring so rapidly and it appears to them to be without their input. Would it be possible to get an idea about what other seismic changes will occur?

A: Provost: It was my understanding when I came in that there had been considerable conversations in the college about the name change, and it became the College of Health and Human Sciences. Subsequently, there was a leadership change. I don't talk about personnel changes. What I did do was meet with the department chairs in January and spoke about their need to focus on who they wanted to be and what that looked like. The substance of that conversation was this should be organic, and should be a conversation that is held with faculty. I made the wrong assumption that the chairs would discuss this with their faculty. I repeatedly asked the chairs to have conversations with their faculty and have decisions organically made about who you are, where you want to be, and what that should look like. I met with your dean this morning and she spoke with me specifically about Social Work and the need to satisfy accrediting requirements having to do with size and advanced standing. Advanced standing needs to meet accrediting standards in Social Work, and this will govern some of your decisions about how you admit and what that curriculum will look like in order to satisfy not only your professional desires, but also the accrediting needs of the college. What I did say was that those conversations can't go on for all time. I would like the dean and the associate dean to shape that conversation so that there is a back and forth dialogue between the chairs and the departments about the focus of the college that has been renamed the College of Health and Human Sciences. My understanding is that those conversations are occurring and that the outcome of those conversations is uncertain, but it is trending so that there will be focus on the mission of the college. One of the very significant aspects of what happens in a College of Health and Human Sciences is that there will be three doctoral programs in very short order. They are an extension of what those programs need to become specifically in Occupational Therapy, Nursing, and, more than likely, in Audiology. Those doctoral efforts are an extension of what those careers and accrediting bodies are telling us we need to do and they will hover over the mission of the College of Health and Human Sciences as is the case always with doctoral programs. That's the mix. My expectation as Provost is that those conversations happen with the disciplinary experts, and mostly with the faculty of that college. I can't answer your questions. I have some ideas where I think you should land based on my own experiences, but I really want to hear from the faculty in that college about where they see themselves going. I can't say A is going to happen, B is going to happen, and C is going to happen. I can make some educated guesses, but I need to see the faculty are having those conversations.

Q: One of the things I didn't hear when you were speaking about salary savings is related to differences in salaries. We have a lot of faculty that are RSCA active that buy out their time and then we rehire. Lots of departments use that difference in salary

for one-time payments of things. I think, at least in the College of Engineering, those savings are the savings that are felt acutely right now because it is how we buy moderately expensive equipment, etc. These type of purchases are not what we would want to add into our base budget for every year. Can you share any thoughts on those savings?

A: I'm sure your deans are having these conversations with the Provost, but the idea is to ensure the deans have some funds to use for these type of purchases. We are still working through the process. The message I would give to faculty and chairs is to make sure your deans know. Trust me, your deans are not shy about sharing this information with the Provost.

Q: I went away from the campus for about four or five days and when I returned I felt like there had been about seven or eight major changes while I was gone. I also had faculty coming to my office asking what I could do about all these changes. You mentioned 18 months, does that mean constant change over the next 18 months?

A: That is a good point. No, changes won't go on for 18 months. It was just the beginning of the semester and we had a lot of information to get out. We actually worked on not having them all come out on the same day. There may be little bursts like that. It won't be like that every day for 18 months.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of December 3, 2018 – No Questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of December 10, 2018 – No Questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of February 11, 2019 was approved.

C. Senate Appointment Calendar of 2019-2020:

There were no comments or questions.

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

Approval of the Senate Calendar for 2019-2020.

Questions:

Q: Why are there policy committee meetings scheduled for the week of Thanksgiving?

A: Several members of the Executive Committee suggested that the policy committees might need more time in the Fall, given that there are 10 policy committee meetings in the Spring and only eight in the Fall. A member suggested that if the meeting is not needed, the policy committee can cancel a meeting easier than they can add a meeting. [Note: The original calendar was drafted and brought to the Executive Committee with no policy committee meetings scheduled for the week of Thanksgiving. A motion was made to add policy committee meetings to the week of Thanksgiving as there are no other Mondays available to hold an additional policy committee meeting that do not fall on holidays or religious holidays. The motion was

seconded and approved by the Executive Committee on January 28, 2019.]

The Senate voted and the calendar was approved with 2 Nays and 6 Abstentions.

V. Unfinished Business: None

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

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

Senator White presented *AS 1718, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to S14-5, Modification to General Education Area D (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented an amendment to add to the end of the first whereas clause, “...The Chancellor’s Office requires an immediate change to our General Education Area D curriculum. The Senate has been informed that a change will be imposed if we do not produce a compliant policy recommendation; and”. The amendment was seconded. Senator Peter presented an amendment to the amendment that was friendly to the body to move it to the end of the second whereas clause. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Peter Amendment that was friendly to the body to change it to read, “The Chancellor’s Office has informed SJSU that a change will be imposed if it does not produce a compliant policy recommendation; and”. Senator Papazian expressed concern that she felt the amendment belonged in a separate Sense of the Senate Resolution, and that the policy amendment should contain only curricular changes. Senator White called the question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the question was called with 4 Nays and 8 Abstentions. The Senate voted and the Peter-Van Selst Amendment passed with 1 Nay and 5 Abstentions. Senator Rodan presented an amendment to a new Whereas clause to read, “Whereas, the Academic Senate does not believe that the removal of the requirement for distribution of units over the three Area D sub areas is in the best interest of students;”. The Rodan amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Rodan amendment failed (3 Ayes, 5 abstentions). Senator Khan presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change section 1) to read, “Students may choose, from at least two different curricular disciplines, ...”. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to the Khan Amendment to change it to read, “Students may choose, from a minimum of two disciplines or in an interdisciplinary sequence, ...”. **The Senate voted and AS 1718 passed as amended (19-17-5).**

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1725, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S03-6 and S93-11, Campus Smoking Policies (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1725 passed unanimously.

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented *AS 1726, Amendment C to University Policy F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (First Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented a motion to extend the clock to finish this item. The Shifflett motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the clock was extended.

Questions:

Q: Would the committee consider revising the sentence that begins, “faculty may choose to exclude the survey results from one course per year...”? For lecturers, it is not one academic year, it is one calendar year so it would be spring and fall. This would mean if lecturers were teaching 15 units in the spring, you could exclude one class. I’d like for the committee to consider revising that.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Would you clarify when SOTES are collected for special sessions, I know there is uneven collection of special session data?

A: We just communicated that concern to SERB that oversees SOTES. They weren’t aware of this problem so stronger enforcement is on the way.

Q: In the language where it describes, “at least fifteen WTUs (equivalent of five three unit courses),” you don’t make a distinction between C or S classification. Is there a difference?

A: Not so far in policy, but if you’d like to send us some language we will look at it.

Q: So, as it stands supervisory courses would count in the WTUs?

A: I believe they do now, but WTUs were introduced as a way to try and explain to faculty how much they would need to teach before they could exclude a course.

Q: In the sentence where it says, “Faculty, however, under some circumstances may exclude the results of an occasional course from their periodic evaluations,” can you elaborate on what those some circumstances are?

A: The rest of the paragraph explains the circumstances. They can exclude one from their personnel file on which they are evaluated. The circumstances are one per year when they meet the 15 WTUs.

Q: What happens to the excluded evaluation?

A: It goes in their permanent personnel file, but is excluded from the working personnel file.

Q: In the sentence that, “Faculty may choose to exclude one course...”, I would say something like “per review period.” This would apply to regular faculty and to lecturers.

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: When you are working with probationary faculty and they are not teaching 15 teaching units, but maybe only 12 would they need to include all of them? Also, sometimes they may only teach nine units in the Fall so would this then eliminate them from excluding any units?

A: With regard to the 12 units for the entire year, yes, they would have to include them all.

Q: Some probationary faculty have research units in addition to teaching units so would they have to include them all?

A: Under the current and proposed policy they would have to include them all. With regard to the mini reviews, I'm going to have to take that back to the committee.

Q: I recommend keeping the language as a year, because if it is review period that is going to vary based on faculty rank. If you have just been promoted to tenure as Associate Professor, you don't get reviewed for another five years.

A: Possibly "appropriate annual review period." The committee will work on the language.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): [Note- all of the following items were moved to Unfinished Business for the 3/4/19 meeting.]

AS 1720, Senate Management Resolution, Amendment to Standing Rule 10 (Motions) (Final Reading)

AS 1719, Senate Management Resolution, Charge and Membership of Senate Policy Committees (Final Reading)

AS 1722, Policy Recommendation, Charge and Membership of University Committees (Final Reading)

AS 1656, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Bylaw 1.10 (Final Reading)

AS 1717, Senate Management Resolution, Amendment of Bylaw 15a; Editorial Changes – Senate Documents (Final Reading)

AS 1721, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S13-9, Policy for Merging, Dividing, Transferring, and Eliminating Academic Units (Final Reading).]

E. University Library Board (ULB): None.

VII. Special Committee Reports:

The SJSU Strategic Plan:

Co-Chairs of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, Stefan Frazier and Dean Walt Jacobs, presented a draft of the 10-year Strategic Plan for the Senate's Review and Consideration for Endorsement.

Chair Frazier sent out the plan to the Academic Senate on Friday morning. What the Senate received is a culmination of 18 months of work. This draft Strategic Plan is the result of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee's extensive consultation with a variety of constituents both on and off campus that is greater than Chair Frazier has ever been a part of for any plan or issue on campus. From this input the themes were distilled under five groupings. Each one was fleshed out by a task force. The five groupings begin on page 11 of the document. The goals are a good summary of the wishes and desires of our campus for the next 10 years.

The next steps include the committee taking one last look at it and then it goes back to the President to be finalized. The President can then order an implementation phase and task certain individuals with certain aspects of the plan. The President will also be asking for a communications plan to accompany the role out of the strategic plan. In fact, the date has been set for the campus rollout of the plan for Monday, March 12, 2019, [Note: The Chair meant to say March 18, 2019; however, this date has been recently moved to April 8, 2019.]

time to be announced. In the next several months the plan will be finalized and implementation will begin. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee will continue to operate, monitor, and report on the plan and its implementation. The Co-Chairs of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee are happy with the plan and seek the Senate's endorsement.

Dean Jacobs thanked Senators for their input during this long process. One of the priorities of the committee was to be as inclusive as possible so that is why it took longer than anticipated. We got a lot of feedback and went through multiple drafts.

Questions:

Q: Did the SPSC have input into the mission statement? If not, will the SPSC have input into it?

A: Everything before page 11 has been added. We sent what starts on page 11 forward to the President's Office and this is what was returned. That includes the mission statement.

A: President: The mission statement came about from the spirit of all the feedback from the campus. The SPSC will have a final chance to review.

Q: The current mission statement is passive about engaging students as partners on the campus.

A: Please send language or suggestions for changes to Chair Frazier or Dean Jacobs.

Q: In the first 11 pages of the document, there are three mentions of teaching and about 20 mentions of research. Could you clarify what does that mean for the mission of SJSU? Also, what does it suggest to students that come to SJSU for teaching that there is so little mention of teaching?

A: We only received the first 10 pages and haven't had time to review them. However, if you can forward that to me we will make it a point of discussion.

Q: Can you clarify the mechanics of the process by which the goals will be made into action items?

A: The implementation plan is the next phase and will be ordered by the President. Certain aspects of each plan get one point person and that person will be tasked with creating an implementation plan. If you go to the final page there are a number of links and one of the links points to the five documents sent to the President's Office in October by the SPSC. What remains of each of those documents from page 11 on is the first page of each of those documents. The rest of it, all the fine print below, is a whole bunch of details in order to show why the SPSC came to the decisions it did and included with that are a number of implementation suggestions.

Q: Related to the outcomes, in the initial statements there are comments and mention of faculty, but in the desired outcomes there is very little said recognizing the support and outcomes directly related to faculty. As the President said in her remarks, there is no student success without faculty success. It would be desirable to see some of those outcomes reflect faculty in a little bit more direct way. It would be great to see some faculty success directly

indicated in some of those things. My second question is if there is a plan to ensure the taskforce plays a role in the implementation and evaluation of the Strategic Plan moving forward?

A: We could do that. The taskforce members themselves would probably beg not to have to do more work. There are lots of people involved in the implementation.

A: President: What we hope to do over the next few months is that this plan be effective 2019-2029, and would be launched on July 1, 2019. Clearly, there is a role for the steering committee, but taskforces do their work then go away. The Strategic Plan must inform every decision we make at the university. This becomes the way the performance would be evaluated over the course of a year. I also envision metrics, both quantitative and qualitative. I envision my Chief of Staff being the point person for the campus.

Q: I just think that it is very important to have some of the taskforce members be on the SPSC.

Q: Having served on two strategic planning adventures at SJSU, I would like to congratulate all of you. There are two issues I would like to raise. Did you do an environmental scan?

Also, was any kind of threat assessment done about what could get in the way of accomplishing the goals? In 2008, when the budget was cut across the board, the strategic plan went out the door. If our strategic plan can't serve us in times of crisis, it has absolutely no utility whatsoever.

A: We didn't do anything like a threat assessment as part of the SPSC, but built into the BAC and SPSC policy is a strong communication between the two. All of the plan needs resources and monitoring and in terms of how resources get allocated, there has already been a great deal of communication between the two committees.

A: President: We have to collectively prioritize. Also, we have a comprehensive campaign and there is an overlap of that effort and the development of the strategic plan. The comprehensive campaign is to build some of the aspirational goals in the strategic plan and to keep tuition costs down. We make that case to our donors. I think every day about how we can position our goals with the larger goals of the CSU and state of California. The CSU, faculty, and leadership across the institution are very committed to these goals. I think a lot of what is in the goals is something the trustees could support.

Q: One of the key aspects of looking to the future is to honor the past. SJSU was originally a teaching school. Is there a way to honor the history of the university in the introduction?

A: Please send language and we will include that in the feedback.

Q: I see there is a new draft mission statement here. If we endorse this are we endorsing all of it or just the strategic plan?

A: I don't know. I think the Senate can make any motion it wishes. A motion could be made to endorse specific parts, say just the strategic plan.

Q: Are we thinking about how we can measure the return on the investment we make?

A: At the end of the day we care about our student success and the health and well-being of our faculty and staff.

Q: We have to make choices if something costs a lot and has a small return.

A: We are always trying to stretch our resources to have the broadest impact. However,

sometimes it might cost us. There is no one size fits all. The decision has to be weighed against what is best.

Senator Peter presented a motion to endorse the Strategic Plan on pages 11 through 21 of the document. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the motion passed unanimously.**

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

- A. **Vice President for Student Affairs:** Moved to next meeting.
- B. **Chief Diversity Officer:** Moved to next meeting.
- C. **CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation):** The CSU Faculty Trustee submitted his report electronically to the Academic Senate.
- D. **Statewide Academic Senators:** Moved to next meeting.
- E. **Provost:** Moved to next meeting.
- F. **Associated Students President:** Moved to next meeting.
- G. **Vice President for Administration and Finance:** Moved to next meeting.

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.