

2018/2019 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
March 25, 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
Absent: None

CHHS Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

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

COB Representatives:

Present: He, Bullen, Khavul
Absent: None

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Olin, Ehrman, Elliott
Absent: Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

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

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Sullivan-Green
Absent: Ramasubramanian, Kumar

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Riley, Ormsbee, McKee
Absent: Mok, Khan

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, Raman
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:

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

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– The Senate minutes of March 4, 2019 were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Frazier announced that the President is in Washington D.C. at CSU Hill Day along with the Chancellor.

Trustee Sabalius is one of two nominees for Faculty Trustee recommended by the ASCSU to the Governor.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. State of the University Announcements:

A. Provost:

Provost Ficke announced that they have polled 679 tenure and tenure track faculty using the Coache Survey and that is a 47% response rate. The Provost would like to see that over 50%. Hopefully next year that can be extended to lecturers. The survey closes on April 4, 2019.

GUP (Graduate and Undergraduate Programs) has been unpacked this year, and we decided to remove certain functions from student and faculty success to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. What remained was the student success functions. We then analyzed which of these functions should belong with the AVP of Undergraduate Studies, and which functions should belong with student affairs. Advising will always remain with the faculty. Enrollment functions will be more clearly lodged with student affairs and we will have someone overseeing enrollment, which is long overdue.

We did a very comprehensive survey of students as well as held focus groups to determine how students felt about advising at SJSU. What we are trying to do now is to get ahold of all the different pieces.

Questions:

Q: I have a question about the Student Success Collaborative.

A: What do you mean Student Success Collaborative?

Q: From what I understand it is where faculty are being encouraged to submit names of their students that are struggling. I just now clicked on the link and it took me to a page that has my name and five names of my students. I'm wondering if we can get a report on this project? What happens when a name is submitted?

A: I know less than you. Let me ask VP Day about it.

A: VP Day commented: "I do know a little about it. One of the questions I have is what information is coming in, where is it going, and who is stewarding that data. They are getting very good answers to those questions, but the fact that you don't know that is one of the reasons we need to start looking at some of these questions. There are a range of software conversations happening, but I'm not convinced we have done our due diligence to not only implement them, but to communicate what they are."

C: "I just conducted a survey myself on how students felt about advising and were they aware of the advising resources on campus. I received 114 responses. I'd be happy to share this with you if you email me." **[Fernandez-Rios, AS Director of University Advising Affairs]**

B. Associated Students President: Report to be distributed by email.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance:

The Faculty and Staff Dining Room will open at the end of the month in IRC 302.

The grand opening for the Student Recreation and Aquatics Center (SRAC) is on April 18, 2019. VP Faas encouraged Senators to visit SRAC and noted that it was on time and on budget.

Groundbreaking for the new Science building is April 25, 2019. It has been in the works over 30 years.

Down on South campus, we are just finishing the Beach Volleyball Courts. It was mostly paid for by donations and the balance came from naming rights. The courts are open to students, faculty, and staff as well.

The VPAF is currently doing background checks on the prime candidate for the Chief of Police. He will share information on who that is as soon as those checks are completed.

We have an RFP out for pouring rights for beverages on campus. We had three groups reply to that. This would be for soda, water, and various beverages throughout the campus. We have a committee reviewing that.

VP Faas sits on a Revenue Opportunities Task Force out of the Chancellor's Office. We have met about three times and are looking at opportunities to bring revenue to the campus from alternative channels. What some of those opportunities might look like include having a system-wide naming opportunity for an airline such as "Southwest Airlines, the official airline of the CSU," as an example, or "Hilton Hotels, the official hotel of the CSU." What you need to know about that is that it doesn't mean we have to use them, it just means we could get rebates for usage. On May 6th and 7th some of the members of the task force will be on campus and a number of you will be invited to attend those meetings.

Questions:

Q: Could you explain in more detail the use of the foot print for the Science building longer term, one building going up, multiple buildings going up, and a timeline?

A: Sure, the Science building will go up next to the 4th street garage, Duncan Hall will be behind the Science building and San Carlos will be in front of it. It is a 170,000 square foot building with eight stories. It is a small foot print on the ground, but it is going up quite high. It should be done within 1 ½ to 2 years. The plot of land where the AS House used to be is tentatively planned to be the Innovation Center. This would all be donor funded. Right now that would be a three or four story building, but could go higher if fundraising is more successful. We will also

renovate one of the Duncan Towers, then we will flip it and renovate the other one. People will be moved around during the renovations. This should take 1 ½ to 2 years for each tower. After it is done, then we can get rid of the old Science building. Essentially, it should be about six or seven years.

Q: When you are negotiating with the companies over pouring rights, is there any way to get them to not use single use plastics?

A: Absolutely.

Q: I was really looking forward to being the first person in line for the Sports Center, and then I went online and was a little shocked at the price. It was \$50 with early registration a month, otherwise it is \$60 a month.

A: It is a lot cheaper than Club Sport or any of the other places around here.

Q: Actually not, there is a club around the corner from where I live that is the same price. I think it is really expensive. I was hoping for maybe \$30 or something like that. Is there anything being considered to make it more affordable?

A: Those fees are determined by the Student Union Board. It was paid for with student fees so its primary use is for students. It is open to faculty and staff at various rates, and market demand will dictate what those rates are.

Q: Only students that are full time do not have to pay. Students that are part time have to pay \$112.

Q: What does digital asset refer to with regard to the pouring rights?

A: I think the only digital asset we have right now is in front of the Event Center.

Q: This isn't like an app where they are going to connect the student's data to something?

A: There will be no student data coming out.

Q: As far as the new sports center is concerned, I heard through the grapevine that they will be checking people in with a hand scanning. Is there any way to opt out of that?

A: They are actually doing this right now in the Student Union, so maybe you could walk over and ask them. I don't know yet.

Q: I just wanted to ask about the measures being taken to keep the construction quiet during class time?

A: The actual first time anything is put in the ground will be late May, so classes will be out.

Q: Summer classes will be in session then.

A: There will always be some form of construction going on as long as VP Faas is here. We will minimize the interruptions as best as we can. We won't have construction during finals, etc.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs:

The VPSA has been going through the annual process of impactation planning. We are required to submit a plan about how we will negotiate our impactation status and what

kinds of things we will put in place in terms of additional academic requirements and also our admission area. We have added some coursework in Engineering areas. We also considered the expansion of our local admissions area. Students in our local admissions area get a .25 GPA bump when they apply to SJSU. In previous years, our local admissions area has been limited to Santa Clara County. Our colleagues at East Bay, which is also impacted, has a local admissions area that includes all the counties in the Bay and Santa Clara County. When SFSU was impacted, their local admissions area was all the counties in the Bay and Santa Clara County. At some point, we made a determination that we only needed to be in Santa Clara County. We made a recommendation to the President this year that we extend the local admissions area to be consistent with the campuses in the local area. We went through a hearing process and got some really good feedback from folks, particularly in Monterey and San Benito counties. In San Benito and Monterey counties there are very few community colleges. We ended up making a recommendation to the President to extend the local admissions area to include Santa Clara County as well as the counties to the South of us. The President approved that recommendation and we have moved forward with this request to the Chancellor with the exception of the business programs at CSU Monterey. CSU Monterey notified us they are trying to grow their business programs so we did not include them in our area to be respectful to them.

Questions:

Q: We have a few very small programs like Meteorology, do those have the same impact areas as the rest or is it statewide for these programs?

A: Off the top of my head I can't give you an answer to that, but they would be covered by this impact plan. Keep in mind that 60% of the students that apply to SJSU gain admission. We have already had programs that are hard to gain access to because there is extraordinary demand. As you might imagine, those are in Engineering areas.

Q: My question has to do with the admission standards for transfer students. I'm worried if making the admissions standards more stringent isn't an inadvertent way to try and push all programs into ADT. I'm very concerned about that. There are a number of programs in Engineering that have lower division courses that schools don't offer because they are expensive to offer, or don't have a large draw for students. We run into issues with this. Is there any push towards that with the supplemental criteria?

A: Good question. The majority of that is a conversation that faculty need to have informed by the enrollment data that my team can provide. One of the complaints we heard from San Benito is exactly that, that students can't even get those classes that would give them an advantage. We need a different kind of enrollment process. We need to build on what we have so far so that faculty can make those kinds of decisions about those classes.

There are several reviews going on right now including Counseling, and Greek Life. We are also reviewing the enrollment planning process, and we just got the final safety report on the residence halls.

The food pantry has a soft opening today and will have a more formal opening later.

There is lots of noise right now about housing security, but this is being taken very seriously. We are deeply committed to this, but there are no simple answers. If you have any suggestions, please feel free to contact VP Day.

E. Chief Diversity Officer:

The first thing I would like to talk about is Title IX. We will have some interim Title IX procedures that will be in effect until Executive Orders 1096 and 1097 come out in the fall. These changes are based on a USC case; *Doe v. Allee* (2018). The case basically says that after January 4, 2019, we need to provide some sort of hearing procedure for complainants or respondents in particular. The Chancellor's Office and General Counsel have worked out procedures that comply with the court of appeals ruling that provide some kind of buffer for our students in terms of the process of the hearing. As soon as we received this on January 4, 2019, we had to put a stop to all our cases in terms of moving forward. The court cases and the interim procedures cover only those cases that meet these three criteria; one is that it must be a student-on-student sexual misconduct case, two is that they result in serious discipline for the respondent, and three is that the main crux of the case is based on credibility analysis of witnesses and complainants/respondents. For cases that meet the three criteria, we will now have a hearing officer from the CSU system that has been vetted by the CSU that all the CSU campuses will access. We have between four to possibly seven of those cases. What the CSU has told us is that it will not be a direct cross examination, but people can skype in or zoom in. The respondent and witnesses will be in different rooms so that they cannot directly question each other. Also, questions will have to be submitted at least 10 days in advance. We have a long proposed draft of a procedure. I can assure you that between Stanford University personnel, staff from the CDO's office, and staff from the Student Conduct Office, we are going to try very hard to coordinate the hearings so that they occur during normal Human Resources hours. This is where we are at right now. All of the normal functions we provide for students such as accommodations, support, etc. are still going on. There are a group of us, including VP Day, that are heading up to Sacramento State tomorrow for a question and answer session with the Title IX folks and the General Counsel to work out all the nuts and bolts and details.

The Muslim-American community on campus worked with the MOSAIC Center as well as with San Jose Police to organize a vigil on the Saturday following the massacre. It was very well received. About 40 people attended. The speaker gave a multi-religions speech on the steps of MLK. The Diversity Office as well as Student Affairs is keeping in contact with these students in case they need accommodations, et.

On April 25, 2019, the Faculty Diversity Committee and the CDO's Office are putting on a best practices showcase to celebrate diversity, equity and inclusion. We received 51 nominations. The event is from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in Engineering 285/287. The CDO encouraged Senators to attend.

On May 6th and May 7th, SJSU will be hosting all the CDO's from the CSU campuses for a two-day meeting with overnight accommodations in the residence halls.

The new diversity trainer, Craig Alamo, has been working on some pretty comprehensive professional development opportunities for students, faculty, and staff in Social Work and the College of Engineering that will run over the summer and into the fall.

We have enlisted 22 doctorate and post doctorate students from URM group. The CDO thanked the departments that hosted them as well as the speakers that talked to them about working at San José State.

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

G. Statewide Academic Senators:

At the last plenary on March 14-15, 2019, the ASCSU passed are resolutions in support of some legislative bills. Chair Frazier sent this out to the Senate earlier this month for review. The ASCSU also passed a resolution in support of those being separated by border issues and a resolution on infringement of faculty intellectual property. The ASCSU also asked for flexibility in implementation of early start programs on some of the campuses. As you know, that is contentious since the Chancellor is steadfast in implementing EO 1100 and EO 1110. Finally, the ASCSU talked about the GE Task Force report. That report came from a body constituted by the ASCSU. It had members on it that were part of the system including trustees and faculty. It is merely a statement of that committees' views on general education. It is not the official position of the ASCSU or the CSU system. The Chancellor's Office did not issue that report, so all of the reactions to that GE report should be framed as a reaction to the fact that there are several folks out there that think we should be revising our GE. I happen to be one of those folks that think we should always be revising our GE to make sure we are educating our students to the standards that make them most effective at what they want to do with their life. A lot of the campus Senates are rejecting the report. That seems to be the majority opinion. However, the ASCSU has not yet taken an official stance on the GE report. This body's reaction to the report is the most responsible reaction I've seen in the CSU so far. We have decided to constitute our own little committee to review the report and decide what we think GE should be, then we will help the ASCSU craft an opinion.

Questions:

Q: My concern with the GE Task Force document is that it somehow became something that we react to and in some ways gets to set the terms. This is why I have reservations about the process.

A: I agree it set the tone. However, I think the very strong reaction across the CSU set another tone. I'm not sure which direction this will go.

Q: Can you identify for us on that list of legislative bills, what the ASCSU sees as high priority?

A: The highest priorities are in green and go down from highest to lowest. I don't necessarily agree with all the priority.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of February 25, 2019- No questions

Executive Committee Minutes of March 18, 2019- No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of March 25, 2019

The AVC announced the Senate General Election Results for Spring 2019

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

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

A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1738, Senate Management Resolution, Amendment of Bylaw 5, Membership of the Committee on Committees (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: This states that the members will not be members of the Senate, but the AVC sits on the Senate?

A: We discussed that offline, and the AVC is an elected position to Chair the Committee on Committee. That seat is not an appointed college seat.

Q: The AVC sits in her college seat. There is no extra seat for the AVC?

A: O&G will talk about that.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1735, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies (BOGS) Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (First Reading)*. The O&G Committee reviewed the membership and charge of BOGS and decided that BOGS did not need to exist outside the committee infrastructure as an "Other" committee. Next, careful attention to the review of new proposed GE courses at the front end as we do with courses in the major is really what is needed rather than recertification. Periodic review would be folded into the program planning process. Periodic review does include review of all courses inclusive of GE and is already the case. The diversion of all GE courses to BOGS is really not necessary. If the Program Planning Committee has a question or concern about a GE course it can't resolve itself, it could ask BOGS or the GE Advisory Committee for assistance. Next, assessment of the GE program needs to happen at the program level. Discussions in O&G were wide ranging. O&G is recommending that a GE Advisory Committee be constituted as an Operating Committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. College

representatives would be recruited and appointed the same as other operating committee members. The chair would be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Executive Committee. O&G felt it was really important to have an Operating Committee that focused solely on GE with their role being one of support and review of new course proposals.

Questions:

Q: Has the committee considered the workload that the Curriculum and Research Committee will end up having?

A: Outreach will be done to C&R and other committees after this meeting. Secondly, as for the review of new courses, we are only talking about one per month. Prior to this review, the GE Advisory Committee will make a recommendation to C&R.

Q: Why can't this Operating Committee elect its own chair like every other operating committee?

A: In the old policy BOGS reported to the Provost, so it didn't seem appropriate to remove the Provost's involvement completely. This was a compromise. O&G will consider it.

Q: The code requirement is not inherent in the name GEAC, I suggest that we explicitly include that in the name. Will the committee consider this? I also think it is paramount that the committee elect its own chair otherwise it removes power from the committee. There could always be consultation with the Provost. Will the committee consider this?

A: Yes, thank you.

Q: Did the committee consider including the evaluation of GE Assessments during the Program Planning phase in the charge?

A: What would happen if the President approved this is that the department files all its information which includes the five data elements. The call to the departments would still include submitting summary reports of GE and individual assessment materials to the Program Planning Committee. If the Program Planning Committee had questions it could not answer, then it could refer that course to the GE Advisory Committee for advice. The GE Advisory Committee would send that advice back to the GE Advisory Committee.

Q: If the GEAC charge says GEAC receives and solicits course information, what do they do with it? This isn't really clear. Also, under the last resolved can we remove the reference to the year of the guidelines that way we don't have to modify the policy every time the guidelines are changed.

A: O&G will clarify this.

Q: I don't recall if Associate Dean Wendy Ng is included by title in the membership, but if she is not then why not? The other question is about membership in general. Advisory committees are usually advisory because they have expertise. Expertise isn't equally distributed on a college-by-college basis. For instance, there is no seat for an American Institutions representative on this committee, so if you pick the wrong COSS representative, there might be no one on the advisory committee that

can give advice.

A: Hence the O&G Committee left in the language that gives the GE Advisory Committee the ability to constitute what used to be called GEAP Review Panels to give them advice. Also, none of the positions currently in the membership have been deleted. AVP Ng has been the representative to BOGS.

Q: Can you help me understand in light of the external examiners report, what change will this address? Second, why was C&R consulted, but BOGs wasn't consulted until 2 days ago?

A: O&G will get all information before bringing this back as a "final reading." In regard to the external reviewer's notes, O&G was working on the note to clarify GE governance and leadership and that stakeholder's need to find ways think creatively about the program as a whole, and that we should make assessment meaningful. These were principles from the external report that were discussions in O&G.

Q: The examiner's report noted that there was a problem with too many agencies being involved. This doesn't change that at all. Would the committee consider addressing how this actually improves governance?

A: Certainly. However, I would say that consideration has already been part of the discussion. The GE Advisory Committee acting in giving feedback back to the Program Planning Committee really does clarify this process.

Q: There is no mention of faculty led development of GE, and quality of proposal or quality of content? Would the committee consider adding language?

A: What is in here calls on the GE Advisory Committee to work within the content of the GE Guidelines. I don't think we will need to bring in much of that.

Q: I'm concerned about moving away from college elections of faculty representatives to the Committee on Committees appointment process. Will the committee consider this?

A: It would follow the normal Committee on Committees process for all committees.

Q: I'm concerned about bias in the selection of committee members and so I would also like to see more language about the criteria for membership. Would the committee consider this?

A: The information we are taking in is coming from two streams. One stream really applies to the GE Guidelines. This will result in O&G compiling reports that will then be given to the group that will be updating the GE Guidelines. We will make sure all the information gets to the people updating the guidelines.

Q: Do you know who is updating the guidelines?

A: GE Advisory Committee.

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

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

Senator White presented *AS 1713, Policy Recommendation, University Writing:*

Requirements/Guidelines and Support by the University Writing Committee (Final Reading).

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 162 to read, “Graduate Studies of at least three units in which a major written report is required.” Senator Mathur presented an amendment to line 154 to strike “elective.” The Mathur motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Mathur amendment was approved unanimously. Senator White presented an amendment to line 151, section a. where it reads, “Every department (or equivalent unit) responsible for a graduate degree program shall...” to change it to read, “Every department (or equivalent Unit) responsible for a graduate degree program shall include a course that also includes GWAR in the program requirements and overall units.” The White motion was seconded. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to the White amendment that was friendly to the body to change it to read, “...shall include a course that satisfies GWAR in the program.” Senator White noted that the title was not what he had submitted and lines 8 and 83 needed to be changed to read, “University Writing: Requirements/Guidelines and University Writing Committee (UWC).” [Note: The original document had two different titles on the first and second page. The Senate Administrator believed that “Support by” was accidentally dropped from page 2 and added it in.] Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 138, section d.ii, to read, “... approved by the Curriculum and Research Committee.” Senator White presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “recommend” in line 177 to “recommended.” Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment to add “written in English” after “publication” in line 166. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Sullivan-Green Amendment passed with 2 Nays. Senator Ehrman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to 2.b.iii. on line 167 to add, “with a substantive writing requirement” after, “Completion of a master’s or doctoral program.” Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to strike, “every three years” on line 177 and replace it with, “at the time of the course home department program planning process.” The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Shifflett Amendment passed with 7 Nays. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to add “normally” before “at the time of the course home departments program planning process.” The amendment was not seconded. **The Senate voted and AS 1713 passed as amended unanimously.**

Senator White presented *AS 1736, Amendment A to University Policy S14-9, Guidelines for Concentrations (First Reading).*

Questions:

Q: In section IV, where it states that, “the Office of Undergraduate Studies and College of Graduate Studies will evaluate existing concentrations,” that is referencing curriculum which should be in the purview of faculty but there are no faculty in the College of Graduate Studies to evaluate existing concentrations.”

A: The committee will consider it.

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1730, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S15-3, Leaves of Absences for Students (Final Reading).*

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add to line 25, “Resolved that S15-3 be amended as shown below.” Senator Rodan presented an amendment to Senator Peter’s Amendment to add “in its entirety” before “as shown below.” The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the amendment failed. Senator Rodan presented a motion to refer back to the committee. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Rodan motion failed. **The Senate voted and AS 1730 was approved as amended with 1 Nay.**

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1731, Policy Recommendation, Rescind and Replace S05-4, Qualifications for Student Office Holders (Final Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: In section 1.1, line 31, it says, “The CSU memo delegates to campus presidents the authority to define specific terms of the policy to establish additional requirements for student office holders.” With that language in place, in section 2.1.6, can’t we adjust the semester unit to a maximum of 150 and 50 units for graduates. Does the language in 1.1 give us the authority to change the information in 2.1.6?

A: I believe that language is about education requirements, but does not give the President the authority to make the information in the memo less stringent.

Q: The language “additional” does in general terms mean you can make it stronger.

A: What is your proposition?

Q: Bring it down.

A: The committee will consider it.

Senator Shifflett made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed and the meeting adjourned.

- E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):** Senator Peter presented *AS 1728, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy S15-7, RTP Procedures; Criteria for “Late Add” Materials (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1728 was approved unanimously as written.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

- X. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.